

# PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

## Minutes

July 23, 2013

A meeting of the Panhandle Water Planning Group (PWPG) was held on Tuesday, July 23, 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:

Dr. Nolan Clark, David Landis, Grady Skaggs, John Sweeten, Joe Baumgardner, Janet Tregellas, Steve Walthour, Tonya Kleuskens, Vernon Cook, Dean Cooke, Amy Crowell, Rusty Gilmore, Bill Hallerberg, Emmett Autrey, Jim Derington, Sandy Keys, D.E. Williams, Danny Krienke and John Williams.

### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Janet Guthrie, Rick Gibson and Ben Weinheimer

### OTHERS PRESENT:

James Beach, Mick Baldys, Steve Amosson, Cleon Namken, Ray Brady, Simone Kiel, Matt Williams, Sarah Clifton, Dale Hallmark, Qingwu Xue, Kent Satterwhite, Doug Shaw, Alan Abraham and Korri Britten

### 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**

Dr. John Sweeten designated Dr. Steve Amosson to be his Designated Alternate for this meeting.

#### **3. Consider – The Minutes from the Regular Meeting held on April 5, 2013**

Dr. Clark noted that under item #6, Rusty Gilmore's name was omitted from the list and Dean Cooke's name was not listed as it should've been. David Landis also noted that he was listed as being both present and absent and he should've been listed as present. David Landis made a motion to approve the minutes as amended and Steve Walthour seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **4. Discuss and Action as Needed – Consideration of Appointment to the Vacated Water Districts Seat Previously Held by Tom Baliff**

Judge Vernon Cook made a motion to appoint Bobbie Kidd to fill the seat previously held by Tom Baliff. John Williams seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**5. Discuss – GMA #1 Membership Position on the PWPG**

Danny Krienke, newly appointed GMA#1 representative, gave a status report on GMA proceedings. He noted that the most important task GMA #1 has right now is to maintain an administrative record for the DFC process. He noted that November 2016 is the deadline for information to be included in the State Water Plan and that GMA #1 has a lot of work to do in order to meet the state deadlines and statutory requirements.

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

Dr. Nolan Clark began by stating that the state contract for Phase 1 was \$136,810 and \$63,267 has been expended with a draw from the state of \$123,000 of the \$136,000 leaving a balance of approximately \$60,700 currently. Dr. Clark then reviewed the expenses by line item. The total contract with TWDB is \$527,865. He noted that there is money available for the completion of phases 1 and 2. In relation to the local funds account, Dr. Clark noted on October 1, there were \$65,768 and that \$71,220 has been received during the current fiscal year. Currently there is approximately \$80,632 in the local account with expected expenses to equal \$56,356. Dr. Clark then presented a Local Funds History sheet showing the status of the local funds contributed by several user groups. He stated that 95% of funds requested have been remitted. However, he pointed out that the local funds balance since October 2009 has dropped from approximately \$100,000 to approximately \$50,000. He stated that TWDB funds may no longer be utilized for administration by the PRPC and that local funds have been used to cover these expenses. Dr. Clark stated that approximately \$78,000 is necessary to meet expenditure demands, but that only \$71,000 is being collected. He noted concern that local funds have been used for several special projects over the last few years and that there may be a need to increase requested funds in order to cover expenditures and continue with special projects. Ms. Kleuskens inquired as to why income may be less than assessed. Chairman Williams noted that all assessments are voluntary and Dr. Clark explained assessment formulas. Mr. Walthour asked if there were any special studies expected in the next planning cycle. It was answered that the increase would primarily cover administrative costs, but that there will be some costs regarding prioritization, etc. John Williams suggested placing this item on the agenda for the next meeting. Steve Walthour made a motion to approve the financial report and Emmett Autrey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## **7. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Population and Municipal Demand Revisions**

Ms. Kiel noted that at the last meeting it was discussed that a survey would be submitted to the different water user groups (WUGs). She presented population change requests based on those surveys. Ms. Kiel's presentation will be included in these minutes. She noted that only 9 WUGs requested either a population change or a change in water demands. Ms. Kiel noted that Carson, Dallam, Hansford, Ochiltree, Moore and Randall County requested changes. In Cactus and White Deer, population increases were requested due to either annexations or large municipal development. The City of Cactus' population increased by about 1000 people and White Deer increased by about 200 people. Ms. Kiel noted that 6 cities requested population decreases. Groom, Spearman, Perryton and Lake Tanglewood requested decreases from Board projections and Carson County-Other and Ochiltree County-Other did the same. Bill Hallerberg asked why the State submitted such high population growth projections and John Williams noted that all of the Counties in the Eastern Panhandle have large population growth estimates. In relation to the Region's population, Ms. Kiel noted that our proposed growth follows fairly closely to the state proposal. She noted that population change is proposed to be approximately -2% through 2070. John Williams noted that his understanding was that regions were not allowed to change population estimates. Doug Shaw answered that TWDB is not as concerned about population decrease requests, but that population increase requests would not be allowed. Dean Cooke asked what the population decreases mean and Ms. Kiel noted that the decreases are insignificant and that our decreases would more than likely be utilized in other areas of the state. It was noted that the possession of this survey data will be helpful to present to TWDB if there are questions to our region's rate of growth.

In relation to Municipal Demands, there were two changes that were found. One of the municipal demand changes was due to Errors and Corrections, City of Cactus, and the other was due to Alternate Dry Year GPCD, City of Shamrock. It was noted that a corrected sales data caused the decrease for the City of Cactus. Ms. Kiel stated that 2006 will be suggested to be utilized for the dry year demand instead of 2011. Ms. Kiel also noted that the City of Wheeler requested to increase their demands due to a reverse osmosis system being constructed. TWDB noted that they would prefer to handle that to the demand side and add the City of Wheeler into the request for demand increases to include the waste stream associated with the reverse osmosis facility. There was general discussion that demands should not be based on 2011, drought of record GPCD

usage. When reviewing municipal demands, Ms. Kiel showed that the proposed changes will only minimally impact TWDB draft demands.

Bill Hallerberg made a motion to approve the population revisions and municipal demand changes as presented by Ms. Kiel with the addition of the data from the City of Wheeler. David Landis seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

**8. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – TWDB Revisions to Mining Demand Projections**

Judge Vernon Cook made a motion to approve the mining demand projects as presented at the previous meeting and Joe Baumgardner seconded that motion. Motion carried unanimously.

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

James Beach with LBG-Guyton made a presentation regarding managed available groundwater. His presentation will be included with these minutes. He encouraged everyone to engage in the DFC process if a groundwater project is planned. He briefly explained the DFCs as adopted in the previous DFC process. Mr. Beach's presentation centered on the comparisons between the MAG and the 2012 Water Supply Source Availability.

**10. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Water Management Strategies**

Ms. Kiel discussed Water Management Strategies. Her presentation will be included with these minutes. This data is based on surveys sent out in 2013. In 2011 Water Plan Strategies, there are 21 entities that have been suggested to drill new groundwater. She also noted that conservation, a new reservoir and water purchases are included in the 2011 strategies. Two questions were asked regarding issues with water quantity and quality. 6 cities noted concerns with quantity and 4 cited concerns with quality. Thus far, she noted that Pampa has drilled new groundwater wells and the Potter County Well Field, Phase 1, both of which were strategies in the 2011 water plan. 4 cities are slated to drill new wells by the end of 2015. 8 entities which did not have strategies included in the 2011 plan noted the desire to drill new wells. The City of Amarillo stated they are looking into additional reuse and the City of Wellington answered in the survey that it is looking into transferring water. 6 entities stated their plans to drill new wells have changed. Ms. Kiel noted that prior to new water management strategies being researched, a new scope of work must be completed and that the new scope of work can be completed in phases. She then explained the next steps in the strategies process. John Williams inquired as to the needs analysis that must be done prior to the development of the scope of work. Ms. Kiel

answered that the TWDB will be responsible for the needs analysis after supply and demand comparison has been completed.

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

Ms. Kiel then discussed Drought Planning in relation to the municipal water use surveys. Her presentation will be included with these minutes. From the surveys it was determined that 10 entities have updated their drought contingency plans and one is currently in that process. In relation to emergency connections, only 4 municipalities have multiple sources and the City of Dumas noted that they have 2 well fields. Very few cities can meet the emergency connections requirement by the TWDB. Mr. Ingham noted that multiple well fields in the same aquifer can be considered emergency connections and Doug Shaw noted that the TWDB would probably consider that fulfill the requirement. Further clarification regarding the emergency connections requirement was requested from the TWDB. In relation to drought triggers, the two largest responses were that referencing the drought contingency plan and the aquifer/water source triggers drought restrictions. TWDB has discussed that there may be a need to adopt a regional drought contingency plan with regional triggers. However, it is noted that the regional water planning group is allowed to recommend referencing back to local drought contingency plans. Ms. Kiel noted that FNI will continue to coordinate with SUGs and WWP's on drought response and emergency interconnections and will incorporate drought response into strategies as appropriate.

#### **12. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Legislative Items Related to the 83<sup>rd</sup> Texas Legislature**

Chairman Williams noted that in the 83<sup>rd</sup> legislature there wasn't much action taken in relation to regional water planning. House Bill 4 funding infrastructure was passed, but requires voter approval for funding. There were no other bills that directly impacted regional water planning. There were several conservation bills that passed according to the Chairman.

#### **13. Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Timeline for Regional Water Plan Development and Adoption**

Mr. Ingham updated the group that the timeline presented in April is still correct. Mr. Ingham also went over the timeline in relation to the passage of H.B. 4 should voters approve the funding of that bill at the November election. These timelines will be included with the minutes.

#### **14. Texas A&M Agrilife Presentation on Corn 12/200**

Dr. Xue from Texas A&M Agrilife presented the North Plains Research Field 12-200 Limited Irrigation Corn Production Study. His presentation will be included with the minutes. He noted that the purpose of their project was to see if 12" of rain could produce 200 bushels/acre of corn. Dr. Xue explained the lessons they

learned regarding water application in relation to drought and anticipated crop yield.

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

Doug Shaw from the TWDB gave the Region O and Region B reports. Region O is expected to take action on their irrigation and non-municipal demands at the end of July. Mr. Shaw noted that Region B is in line with Region A's current plan.

**16. Report or Comments from TWDB Personnel**

Doug Shaw gave an update from the TWDB. His presentation will be included as a part of these minutes. He noted that there was a Chairs conference call in early July and that no major changes are currently expected for the planning process. Also discussed at the conference call was the vote on November 5 which will decide whether to approve SJR1, which will create the State Water Implementation Fund for Texas (SWIFT) and upon passage would move \$2 Billion from the Rainy Day fund into this account. The new calendar based on this action was also discussed. Project prioritization will take place by region and then those projects will be compiled in the State Water Plan. The TWDB will convene stakeholders in September to determine standards. Mr. Shaw noted that the state water plan prioritization will be based on several different factors. He stated that if the SWIFT committee is created, the role of the committee will be to provide comments regarding rulemaking related to project prioritization and to evaluate scoring. Legislation calls that 20% of the loan funds must be used for conservation or re-use projects and that 10% of the funds must be target rural and irrigation conservation. John Williams asked whether or not the State Budgeting process included project prioritization money. Mr. Shaw answered that money was appropriated for that purpose. Mr. Williams asked how and when that money will be allocated and Mr. Shaw answered that he does not know the exact amount or how/when it will be allocated. He added that TWDB will work to provide any information they can. Chairman Williams asked if there will be any money allocated for travel costs and Mr. Shaw answered that he would find that out.

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

Nothing

**18. Public Comment Relating to PWPG Activities**

None

**19. Adjournment**

Nolan Clark made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Emmett Autrey seconded the motion. Meeting was adjourned at 4:10pm