

## PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

### Minutes

November 7, 2013

A meeting of the Panhandle Water Planning Group (PWPG) was held on Thursday, November 7, 2013, at 1:30 PM in the PRPC Board Room, 415 West Eighth Avenue, Amarillo, Potter County, Texas.

C.E. Williams, PWPG Chairman, Presided.

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Nolan Clark, David Landis, Janet Guthrie, Clay Crist (DA Grady Skaggs), John Sweeten, Joe Baumgardner, Janet Tregellas, Steve Walthour, Vernon Cook, Dean Cooke, Amy Crowell, Rusty Gilmore, Bill Hallerberg, Bobby Kidd, Emmett Autrey, Jim Derrington, Rick Gibson, Beverly Stephens (DA Sandy Keys), CE Williams, Danny Krienke, John Williams, Janet Guthrie

#### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Rick Gibson and Ben Weinheimer, Tonya Kleuskens

#### OTHERS PRESENT:

Doug Shaw, Charles Munger, Cindy Cockerham (Senator Seliger); Matt Williams; Kent Satterwhite; Simone Kiel; Steve Shumate; Ray Brady; Robert Bradley

#### STAFF PRESENT:

Kyle Ingham, Local Government Services Director; Jamie Allen, Local Government Services Coordinator; Joe Price, Local Government Services Specialist

#### **1. Call To Order**

#### **2. Roll Call of Members to Establish Quorum and Acknowledgement of Any Designated Alternates**

#### **3. Consider – The Minutes from the Regular Meeting held on July 23, 2013**

Judge Vernon Cook made a motion to approve the minutes as amended and John Williams seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **4. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Review and Consider the Current Financial Reports**

Dr. Nolan Clark noted that there were three items included in the financial report. The State Fund Balance shows a balance of \$60,160 with an accounts payable

of \$42,012. He stated that about 20% of the State Contract had been spent. In the Local Water account, \$84,342 had been expended carrying forward \$52,716 for the new year. John Williams asked about the approximately \$13,000 in negative expenses. Dr. Clark answered that the PWPG spent that amount more than was brought in during FY 2013. Dr. Clark then discussed the new fee structure as discussed at the last PWPG meeting. He noted that all fees are voluntary and discussed the various fees by contributor group. It is anticipated that, given the approximate 10% increase, the PWPG should receive approximately \$79,496 in FY 2014. As directed by the full PWPG, the PWPG Executive Committee authorized the 10% increase. \$67,600 has already been received for FY 2014. Dr. Clark made a motion to approve the financial report as presented and Bill Hallerberg seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**5. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – TWDB Review and Consideration of Submitted Population and Municipal Demand Revisions**

Kyle Ingham discussed that at the previous meetings, these two items were approved and submitted and Doug Shaw noted that the TWDB had approved the new Population and Municipal Demand Revisions. No action required.

**6. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Amendment to TWDB Contract #1148301312**

Kyle Ingham discussed that a portion of the contracted funds had not been allocated to this point, but that an amendment for those funds to the current contract is expected. The amendment will ensure that all dedicated funds for the planning effort are made available to PRPC and the PWPG. David Landis made a motion to approve PRPC to amend the contract when the amendment is received from the TWDB and Judge Cook seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**7. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Groundwater Modeling Process and Development**

James Beach noted that the GAM updated by Interra is currently in use.

**8. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Preliminary Needs Analysis**

Simone Kiel presented the Preliminary Needs Analysis which will be utilized to create the Scope of Work. Her presentation is included as an attachment to these minutes. John Williams asked how the new MAG numbers compare to the availability and Simone noted that the numbers are comparable to one another. There was general discussion of how Industrial and Livestock numbers were accounted for in the GAM Allocation.

**9. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Scope of Work (SOW) for Development of Water Management Strategies Including Costing Tool**

a. Consider Scope of Work for Task 4D

Ms. Kiel presented the methodology by which the SOW has been developed. She noted that a Notice to Proceed to spend Task 4D funds wouldn't be issued by TWDB until a Scope of Work is produced. Ms. Kiel's presentation will be included as an attachment to these minutes. Dr. Clark asked about the AG Conservation strategies and inquired as to whether the Texas Agri-Life Extension Service would be developing Ag strategies. Ms. Kiel answered that yes, Steve Amosson and Texas Agri-Life would be developing all of those strategies.

b. Approve PRPC Submission of Request to Release Task 4D Funds

c. Approve PRPC Amending Contract Services Contract to add 4D SOW

Emmett Autrey made a motion to approve the Scope of Work as presented by Simone Kiel, as well as approving the Submission of the Request to Release Task 4D Funds and amending the PRPC Contract Services to add the 4D Scope of Work. John Williams seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**10. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Chapter 7 Drought Planning**

Kyle Ingham noted that a regional "drought trigger" is required to be considered by the PWPG. TWDB has released a template for this process and Doug Shaw commented on this template. Mr. Shaw noted that the template is a suggested outline which meets all requirements. Kyle Ingham asked about the PWPG responsibility to monitor drought contingency plans. Mr. Shaw noted that all plans should be collected and maintained on file by the PWPG. John Williams inquired as to the "drought of record" and asked about the definition of the drought of record. Mr. Shaw answered that determining the "drought of record" is the responsibility of the PWPG and that there is no clear definition or guidance on how to determine it. Dr. Sweeten noted that the 2011-2012 may not be automatically assumed to be the drought of record, but could be considered such in the future. Kyle Ingham asked what the responsibility of the PWPG was regarding ensuring water availability for individual cities. Mr. Shaw answered that the PWPG has no direct responsibility for ensuring water availability and that the PWPG is in existence to advise cities. The PWPG consultants will take responsibility to ensure this chapter is completed appropriately. No action was necessary.

**11. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Proposition 6 Texas Constitutional Amendment Outcome and Implications of Regional Water Planning**

Chairman Williams noted that Proposition 6 passed in the last election. Mr. Shaw noted that a “SWIFT” advisory committee has been developed, and that committee is charged with developing rules on how the money from this fund will be allocated. It is estimated that revolving loan funding will not be available until the Summer of 2015. All cities wishing to utilize these funds must have their project listed in the Regional Water Plan. Rick Gibson asked if only cities would be able to utilize these funds and Mr. Shaw answered that currently only political subdivisions of the State would be eligible. However, that decision is dependent upon rule-making.

**12. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Developments Related to the Prioritization of Regional Water Planning Strategies**

Chairman Williams explained House Bill #4. He presented a very rough draft of a template by which prioritization can be determined. Bill Hallerberg asked about the weighting and Doug Shaw explained. Chairman Williams noted that once projects are scored and weighted regionally, the State will then put those regional scores into a larger process and projects will then be prioritized statewide. David Landis asked about the weight of this prioritization vs the other prioritization criteria and Chairman Williams answered that it hasn’t been determined how the regional scoring will be weighted statewide. John Williams asked about needing to prioritize projects in the previous plan and Mr. Shaw answered that by Summer 2014 those projects in the previous plan must be prioritized utilizing the prioritization criteria as related to the statewide prioritization template.

**13. Regional Reports – Region B and Region O**

Doug Shaw noted that Region O met in late October and that they have just approved their Task 4D Scope of Work. Region O is looking for a new entity to serve as a local subdivision as High Plains no longer wishes to serve in that capacity. Region B has indicated some hesitancy about having to collect all Drought Contingency Plans.

**14. Report or Comments from TWDB Personnel - None**

**15. Other Business, closing comments from Chairman and Board Members**

Panhandle Water Conservation Symposium – February 12, 2014

**16. Public Comment Relating to PWPG Activities – None**

**17. Adjournment - The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:45pm**