

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

Minutes

April 28, 2010

A Public Hearing of the Panhandle Water Planning Group (PWPG) was held on Wednesday, April 28, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. in the Auditorium of the Texas AgriLife Research and Extension Center, 6500 Amarillo Blvd. , Amarillo, Potter County, Texas.

Mr. C.E. Williams, Chairman, presided.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Nolan Clark, USDA-ARS; David Landis, City of Perryton; John Sweeten, Texas Ag. Experiment Station – TAMU Ag. Res & Ext; Steve Walthour, North Plains Groundwater Conservation District; Cole Camp, Panhandle GCD; Ben Weinheimer, TCFA; Bill Hallerberg, PWPG; Emmett Autrey, City of Amarillo; John Williams, CRMWA – Ret.; Grady Skaggs, Oldham Co.; Joe Baumgardner; Gale Henslee, Xcel Energy; C.E. Williams, Panhandle Ground Water Conservation District; Virginia Sabia, Texas Water Development Board; Simone Kiel, Freese & Nichols; Curtis W. Campbell, Red River Authority;

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Janet Guthrie, Hemphill County UWCD; Janet Tregellas; Denise Jett, ConocoPhillips; Tom Baliff, Greenbelt Municipal & Industrial Water Authority; Charles Cooke, TCW Supply, Inc.; Kendall Harris, Mesquite Groundwater Conservation District; Rusty Gilmore, Rita Blanca Well Service; Jim Derrington, Palo Duro River Authority; Vernon Cook, County of Roberts; Kent Satterwhite, CRMWA;

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Bowser, Livestock Weekly; Al Alford; Marty Jones, Sprouse Firm; Mina Johnson, League of Women Voters; Jennifer Foster, Sen. Robert Duncan; Steve Stevens, Mesa Water; Gina Dowdy, Sen. Kel Seliger; Steve Amosson, AgriLife Extension; Ray Brady; Four Price, IMHP&C; Ed Hansen, City of Spearman; Nancy Skaggs, Oldham Co.; Joyce Hinsley, LWV Amarillo, Kevin Welch, Amarillo Globe-News; 1 attendee with an indiscernable name from Claude

STAFF PRESENT:

Kyle Ingham, Local Government Services Director; Jonathan Ellis, Local Government Services Program Specialist

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. C. E. Williams called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. and thanked everyone for coming.

2. RECOGNITION OF WATER PLANNING GROUP MEMBERS

Kyle Ingham called role and introduced the Group as well as some other members of the audience. Mr. Ingham spoke to the efforts involved in advertising and preparing for this hearing. Making note that this hearing had been advertised by in every county clerk's office, county library, and county newspaper, additionally a notice had been sent to every judge, every mayor, all interested parties, surface water rights holders, and water utility providers in the panhandle.

3. RECOGNITION OF LEGISLATIVE DELEGATION

Mr. C.E. Williams recognized the Jennifer Foster from Senator Duncan's office, Gina Dowdy from Senator Seliger's office, and Ford Price running for David Swinford's office.

Mr. Williams proceeded to turn the presentation to Simone Kiel to present on the Initially Prepared Regional Water Plan.

4. PRESENTATION OF INITIALLY PREPARED REGIONAL WATER PLAN (IPP)

Ms. Kiel introduced herself as the a representative of Freese & Nichols which had been the primary group contracted to create the 2011 Regional Water Plan, additionally Ms. Kiel recognized several groups which assisted and contributed in the creation of this Plan: Texas AgriLife Extension & Research and Intera—a groundwater consulting firm.

Ms. Kiel gave a brief history of water planning in Texas beginning with Senate Bill 1. The current plan is the 2007 State Water Plan which consists of plans from all the Texas regions. Ms. Kiel spoke to some of the driving forces and members which made up the Panhandle Region, before speaking of the structure and make up of the Plan which was the subject of tonights hearing. Ms. Kiel indicated that this plan was to be an update of the 2006 Panhandle Water Plan and that it consists of eight chapters currently, and would have ten (the legislatively mandated amount) by the time of submission. Ms. Kiel spoke to the primary and secondary sources of water in the Panhandle Region, indicating that groundwater is the major source of water. Ms. Kiel spoke to the number of groundwater conservation districts, then spoke briefly of the seven whole-sale water providers in the region.

Ms. Kiel spoke to current populations and population projections, how this growth along with irrigation trends impacted current PWPA demands and how it impacted projected PWPA demands. Ms. Kiel spoke to the current availability sources broken down by aquifer: for the Ogallala (with the Rita Blanca included) a 40/50/80 approach; for the Dockum, Seymour, and Blaine a 1.25% decline in storage approach; and a safe yield approach for reservoirs. Ms. Kiel further spoke of the water supplies associated with surface water sources. Ms. Kiel proceeded to speak on the technique for determining supply and availability. It was determined that the Ogallala numbers would be determined with an existing Northern Ogallala GAM 40/50/80 approach. Ms. Kiel described what this meant.

Ms. Kiel proceeded to speak on the total volume of available water—by water source—in the region based on the previously described approaches. These volumes indicated currently developed or available to be developed sources of water. Using these volumes, Ms. Kiel spoke to allocations available to individual water users according to

area: implementing constraints such as geographical, infrastructure, contract, etc. A comparison was then done of supply to demand as both currently stand. There were 27 user groups with identified shortages both current and projected, the majority being connected to irrigation: in 2010, 99% of these shortages were associated with irrigation, for 2060, 91% are projected to be associated with shortages.

Ms. Kiel proceeded to speak to Water Management Strategies which had been developed to address the individual shortages identified, these strategies were described in detail but overall include: conservation, development of new groundwater, additional purchasing from providers, and alternate strategies such as precipitation enhancement and transmission.

Ms. Kiel also spoke on two other items included in the IPP: an Ogallala GAM update, and a lake Meredith study regarding recharge rates. Regarding the GAM update, Ms. Kiel stated that there had been updated red bed data; updated historical pumping; improved calibration over the 2004 model; and these improvements resulted in changes in availability. Some of this change was associated with the red bed data, and some associated with aquifer designation. The end result was that new projected shortages were identified or some which were previously identified were projected to happen sooner than originally expected.

Regarding the lake Meredith study, there were many items investigated as being a possible contributing factor on recharge, the end result was that some were able to be disregarded and some were identified as needing more investigation as to the possibility of their being a contributing factor. It was determined that: annual precipitation, potential evaporation, and changes in irrigation practices were not impacting factors. It was determined that: rainfall intensity, increase in shrub land/decrease in pasture land, and decreased in groundwater levels had potential for being impacting factors.

Ms. Kiel concluded her presentation with a PWPA water supply summary, made up of two pie charts which depicted "where the water is coming from" for the years 2010 and 2060. In 2010: 88% is from the Ogallala; 6% is other aquifers; 4% is other supplies; and 2% is surface water. In 2060: 50% is from the Ogallala; 40% is conservation; 4% is other aquifers; 4% is other sources; and 2% is surface water.

Mr. C.E. Williams asked if any of the attendees had questions for Ms. Kiel before opening up for formal comments. Al Allford asked some questions of clarification regarding the final graph presented. The issues were cleared up, Mr. Allford asked what was meant by conservation. Mr. Williams explained that the 50% conservation represented: "a reduction in use due to unmet needs, or using less to accomplish the same thing."

5. RECEIVE ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMENTS REGARDING THE IPP

There being no further questions for Ms. Kiel, Mr. Williams asked the attendees for presentation of formal comments.

Marty Jones, an attorney from Sprouse Schrader and Smith, representing George Arrington, Mesa Water, other land owners had a presentation regarding IPP chapter 3, particularly page 3-3 of the IPP. Mr. Jones spoke to the subject of groundwater supplies. Mr. Jones noted that in previous plans this Group had relied on a 1.25% decline approach, generally known as a 50/50 plan. Ms. Jones noticed that this has changed in this plan with the intent to adopt the 40/50/80 conditions coming out of the

Groundwater Management Area #1 Joint Planning Committee. Mr. Jones questioned if this was a wise adoption. Mr. Jones presented a chart from the TWDB staff report regarding the reasonableness of the GMA #1 Desired Future Conditions (DFC). This chart stated how the 40/50/80 numbers were derived; Mr. Jones noticed that these numbers were derived by averaging the demand from the counties which were found within the three area divisions of the DFC. Mr. Jones spoke to the fact then that averaging was already in place in the GMA #1 area DFCs. Mr. Jones proposed that this averaging be considered but over a much larger area. Mr. Jones indicated, again referencing the TWDB report, that the average over the entire GMA#1 area using the three numbers was 49%. Mr. Jones indicated that this number was very close to 50% and therefore the 50/50 rule. That being the case, Mr. Jones suggested that the group go back to saying simply that the goal for this area is 50% remaining in 50 years, this due to being the practice in the past and this due to the fact that the end result for the region will result in the same average. Further, Mr. Jones spoke to the controversial nature of the DFCs. This being the case, Mr. Jones indicated a belief that there will be legislative action to change chapter 36.108 under which DFCs are determined. Mr. Jones indicated that if that or any of the numerous challenges to DFCs result in a rule change, then the work of the group will have based its work on DFCs which may change and thus result in the need for revision. Mr. Jones indicated that to go back to the 50/50 standard would result in a lessening of risk of challenge and possible revision in the future. Further, Mr. Jones pointed to the fact that the other aquifers in the area are remaining at a 1.25% decline as possible reason to make the rule apply elsewhere. Mr. Jones urged the Group to go back to the 50/50 standard. Mr. Jones concluded by saying that the current adoption of DFCs favors the groundwater conservation districts and might possibly favor the agricultural stakeholders over others in the area whereas a decision by the Group represents more diversified interests. Mr. Jones again urged the Group to revise chapter 3 and particularly page 3-3 to reflect a 50/50 standard.

Joyce Hinsley representing the Amarillo League of Women Voters, Ms. Hinsley stated that the LWV does support the PWPG's IPP for several reasons: 1) the various DFCs stated in the plan are reflective of the various conditions and needs of the GCDs which comprise GMA #1. The DFCs adopted were only reached after many months of trying and failing to reach consensus. It was determined that a break from the 50/50 rule was favorable after it was found that the needs of the two areas for which the 40/80 were adopted were distinct and separate from the needs of the area in which a 50% rule was adopted. In a consensus meeting held by Amarillo LWV on April 20, 2010 the membership agreed that varied DFCs are a reasonable and valid approach to the management and conservation of groundwater in GMA#1.

Al Alford had several questions incorporated into his comment. He asked about the sand content in an acre-foot of Ogallala water, Mr. C.E. Williams offered an answer of 8-foot of sand per acre-foot of water. Mr. Alford suggested that a great deal of the rainwater associated with the increased hydrologic loss of Lake Meredith could be attributed to a spread of salt-cedar. Mr. C.E. Williams stated that the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority was attempting to address the spread. Mr. John Williams stated that CRMWA has treated 10,000 acres in an attempt to solve the salt-cedar issue and that there are about 10,000 more acres to go. Mr. Alford indicated that he had identified 55,000 acres covered by salt cedar which he believed was causing a great deal of the shortage in the panhandle, he stated that he had worked back the loss generated by the salt-cedars back to 2006 and then projected out to 2040. Mr.

John Williams stated that all the treatments which CRMWA is conducting are in the area above Lake Meredith, he has no information on areas or salt-cedar concentrations below Lake Meredith. Mr. Alford stated that he had created two scenarios which projected the increased demand from population and from salt cedar increase, he stated that there is an optimum level of demand per person per day usage which he projected to be able to be reached and maintained after 2024, this level he had found was 140 gallons per day per person. This optimum level was applied to various scenarios of uniform loss over the years. In the -1% per year decrease scenario the optimum level could be reached by 2024. Incorporating a -3% per year decrease scenario, the optimum level could be reached and maintained after 2035.

Robert Eakles had a comment. Mr. Eakles stated that he had been working with governors of the United States. He stated that a pipeline from California was needed to pump seawater across the country. He stated the he'd been working with engineering at Amarillo College and this pipeline could convert this water to wherever was needed in the United States. He went on to describe the capabilities of this pipeline and stated that it could deliver freshwater where needed and could utilize seawater for industrial purposes. He proceeded to say that he was a consultant and that he'd been in contact with the governors of New Mexico, North Dakota, and Rhode Island he stated that they had been talked into it.

6. **COMMENTS FROM THE REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP**

Mr. C.E. Williams thanked everyone for coming and stated that if any one wished to submit a written comment outside of the meeting they could do so within the next 60 days. The hard date for submission then being June 28th, 2010 at 5:00 pm.

Dr. John Sweeten asked to make a comment. Dr. Sweeten stated that he is a member of the PWPG and that his organization has for many years and would continue to develop research in regard to reducing water use: improved crops, dry land farming, etc. Dr. Sweeten spoke to some upcoming events in which these water reduction practices can be explored.

7. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING & MEETING ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further comments, Mr. C.E. Williams adjourned the public hearing at 7:10 pm.

July 13, 2010

Draft Response to Comments on the 2010 Initially Prepared Regional Water Plan for the Panhandle Regional Planning Area

Agency Comments

Comments received from Carolyn Brittin, TWDB, June 28, 2010

General comments:

1. All documents for the final plan will be submitted in final format.
2. Sources for all base maps were from the TWDB in accordance with Contract Exhibit D. The source for the maps shown on Figures 3-9 and 3-10 is the TWDB Northern Ogallala GAM (2004 Dutton GAM). This source was added to these figures.
3. A list of potentially feasible water management strategies is included in a subsection following Chapter 4.

Executive Summary:

4. The TWDB requires the regions to report firm yields for all surface water sources. Safe yield or reliable supply is the amount of water that is considered available for use by water user groups. This distinction is clarified in the Executive Summary.

Chapter 1:

5. A new subsection was added to describe the threats to agriculture and natural resources.

Chapter 2:

6. The population and water demands tables by county and river basin are included in the DB12 Data Tables in Appendix A in the final plan.
7. The water demands on wholesale water providers by county and river basin are included in the DB12 Data Tables in Appendix A in the final plan.

Chapter 3:

8. The identification of the Dallam County PGMA was added to the discussion in Chapter 1, Section 1.5.1, Groundwater Regulation. Groundwater availability is discussed in Section 3.1.1. The availability approach for the Ogallala Aquifer followed the recommendations of the Groundwater Management Area #1, which includes the Dallam County PGMA. There are no known water availability limitations set forth by the Dallam County Commissioners within the designated PGMA.

9. Wholesale water providers are discussed in Chapter 4, including the sources of water supplies. Details of the supply sources for wholesale water providers are included in the DB12 Data Tables in Appendix A in the final plan.
10. To our knowledge the plan includes all ongoing surface water development projects. There has not been a consumptive surface water right issued by TCEQ in Region A since 1991, and the source of the water for this right is groundwater.
11. The discussion of reliable yield is included on Page 3-19. The values are based on studies conducted by CRMWA and provided to the PWPG by CRMWA staff. The 30,000 acre-feet per year value reported in 2010 is the allocation amount adopted by the CRMWA Board of Directors for supply distribution to its customers. The 50,000 acre-feet per year estimate for subsequent decades assumes that Lake Meredith will recover storage from the current drought. A reference was added to Chapter 3.
12. This was corrected.
13. These tables reflect a supply and demand comparison by county. The projected shortages by water user group are shown in Tables 3-29 through 3-31. The projected surplus or shortage for each water user group by county and river basin is included in the DB12 tables in Appendix A. A footnote was added to Tables 3-25 through 3-27 noting that the sum of individual shortages may differ from the surplus or shortage shown in this table. A reference to the tables with WUG shortages was added.

Chapter 4:

14. A table of alternative strategies is included in a subsection following Chapter 4.
15. A description of the cost assumption for conservation was added on Page 4-9.
16. The plan does include information for all strategies evaluated.
17. Capital costs were corrected.
18. The projected needs for each wholesale water provider by county and river basin are included in the DB12 tables in Appendix A.
19. Capital costs were corrected.

Chapter 6:

20. Conservation strategies are recommended or alternative strategies that conserve water over the long-term. Drought management plans are plans developed by a political subdivision to address short-term responses to drought conditions. Synopses of drought contingency plans that were submitted to the PWPG are included in Chapter 6.
21. Data was reconciled.

22. The overallocation of Lake Meredith is the result of inconsistencies with the data entered for CRMWA by Region O. The TWDB is working with Region O to resolve this issue.

Level 2 Comments from the TWDB:

Chapter 3:

1. Totals were added to all tables where appropriate.
2. The Dockum GAM run report 09-014 was completed after the IPP was published and this information was not used for water availability or distribution of supplies. At this time it has not been adopted by the GMA 1. No changes are made.

Chapter 7:

3. Added title and table number to the regulatory table in Chapter 7.

Comments received from Ross Melinchuk, TPWD, June 24, 2010

The PWPG appreciates the TPWD comments on the 2010 Initially Prepared Plan and support of the recommended conservation strategies. The PWPG agrees that protection of the region's natural resources, including springs and playa lakes, is important to the region. The regional water plan generally provides for flexibility in developing water management strategies such that environmental sensitive areas can be avoided if possible. It is assumed that during the development of a project, more detailed assessments of potential impacts will be conducted.

Public Comments

Oral Comments received at the Public Hearing on April 28, 2010:

Mr. Marty Jones, representing George Arrington, Mesa Water and other land owners:

Mr. Jones questioned the adoption of the GMA #1 DFCs for the Ogallala aquifer in lieu of the 1.25% decline approach that was used for the 2006 Regional Water Plan, and he requested that the PWPG adopt a 50/50 standard for all aquifers in the Panhandle region. **Response:** The PWPG carefully considered all options in determining the approach to water availability in light of on-going activities with the GMAs and local GCDs. The PWPG concluded that following the approach adopted by the GMA #1 for the Ogallala was consistent with the intent of HB 1763. No changes were made to the plan.

Ms. Joyce Hinsley, Amarillo League of Women Voters:

Ms. Hinsley iterated support for the 2010 Panhandle Regional Water Plan. The PWPG appreciates the support provided by the Amarillo League of Women Voters.

Mr. Al Alford:

Mr. Alford asked several questions during the public hearing, which were generally answered at that time and recorded in the minutes of the meeting. In response to the question about conservation achievement dates, Mr. Alford provided a spreadsheet and subsequently spoke to Simone Kiel of Freese and Nichols. It was determined that Mr. Alford's assumptions and those used for planning were different. No changes were made to the plan.

Mr. Robert Eakles:

Mr. Eakles discussed the possibility of pumping seawater to meet future water needs. The PWPG appreciates Mr. Eakles input. No changes were made to the plan.

Written Comments received during the Public Comment Period:

Mr. Larry Henard, water rights holder, Wellington, TX:

The Mesquite Groundwater Conservation District regulates the issuance of groundwater permits, including well spacing and pumpage. The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality regulates surface water. The PWPG has no authority in this matter. You may wish to contact your local groundwater conservation district or the TCEQ.

Women League of Voters, Amarillo, TX, May 13, 2010:

The PWPG appreciates your comments and the copy of the Water Study report. No changes made to the plan.

Donny Hooper, City of Pampa, June 16, 2010:

The PWPG appreciates your input to the 2010 Regional Water Plan. The reuse water that your city is providing to the golf course was added to the existing supplies. The PWPG cannot change water demands at this time, but your input will be considered for the 2015 Regional Water Plan. The City of Pampa currently does not show a need for water over the planning period. We understand the need to rehabilitate and replace lost capacity of existing wells. The supplies shown for water from the Ogallala in Gray County are based on the methodology used for regional water planning. This methodology limits the amount of annual withdrawal based on

having 50% of the storage remaining in 50 years. As a result, the supplies from the City's existing well field are limited to 1,000 acre-feet per year in 2010 and reducing to 238 acre-feet per year by 2060. With the updated 2010 Intera GAM model there appears to be some additional supply associated with the current well field. To provide the full request of 2,581 acre-feet per year in 2020, the City will likely need to expand its existing well field. The regional water plan was updated to include the City's requested water management strategies. No changes were made to the City's demands or existing supplies.

Dan Reese, City of Canyon, May 12, 2010:

Mr. Reese provided an updated cost estimate for the recommended new groundwater strategy. The costs were updated in the regional water plan.

Written Comments received from the PWPG during the Public Comment Period:

John Williams Comments, March 1, 2010

Primary Comments:

- A. Surface water supplies are clarified in Tables ES-1 and Table 3-18 to show the reliable supply for Lake Meredith and safe yield for Greenbelt Reservoir. These values are used for representing total available supply from these sources for regional water planning.

To clarify which version of the Northern Ogallala GAM was used for different purposes, the models are now distinguished as the 2004 Dutton GAM and the 2010 Intera GAM. The 2004 Dutton GAM refers to the GAM model that is currently used and maintained by the TWDB. The 2010 Intera GAM is the model version that was updated by Intera as part of this regional water plan. Both models were updated in different ways. For the discussion in Section 3.2.1, the 2004 Dutton GAM was updated with new projected pumping amounts based on the revised agricultural demands developed by Texas AgriLife. The updates for the 2010 Intera GAM are documented in Appendix F and include updates to the aquifer structure and calibration. Changes were made to the plan to clarify these distinctions and better document the data sources.

Availability calculations shown in Appendix D were determined using the 2004 Dutton GAM. These calculations are not based on the projected demands, but rather the criteria set forth by the PWPG. The pumping amounts were initially set and adjusted for each grid cell in the model to meet the 40/50/80 criteria. The results reported in Appendix D represent these pumping values (i.e. demands = availability). The storage

output from the 2004 Dutton GAM that was the basis for determine availability was added to Appendix D. These storage values are reported in Table 3-1, along with storage values estimated from the Southern Ogallala GAM. The interaction of flow between grid cells in the GAM model does not provide for a simple arithmetic calculation between Tables 3-1 and 3-2.

The updated pumping demands used for the discussion in Section 3.2.1 and used for the predictive runs in Appendix F were added to Appendix D.

To better document the data sources for tables showing supplies and demands, footnotes were added as appropriate.

Other General comments:

1. The sentence on Page ES-8 states that if no desired future conditions have been adopted, then the plan recommends using 1.25% of the saturated thickness. This is correct. Desired future conditions have been adopted for the Ogallala and Rita Blanca aquifers. These DFCs were used for groundwater availability. Sentence was re-worded to clarify this distinction for the Northern Ogallala GAM.
2. County maps were revised. Graphical displays for surplus/shortages by county are different based on PWPG input for the 2006 plan. The counties with different graphical displays are those counties with shortages.
3. The text is correct. The TWDB requires 11 interest groups. The PWPG elected to add another, making 12 interest groups in total.
4. Updated data with personal income for 1998 and 2008. Some economic data is older because the 2007 Economic Census had not been released at the time of publication.
5. Comments 5 through 7, 9, 10 and 12 were incorporated in the final plan.
6. Comment 8: The supply to Amarillo is limited to 42,987 acre-feet per year due to infrastructure constraints. The split between surface water and groundwater is based on the percentage of supply from each source rather than the contracted percentages. The 42,987 ac-ft/yr limit is less than the contracted percentages.
7. Comment 11: Both the Lake Meredith National recreation Area and Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument are included in Section 7.4.2, on page 7-4.
8. Comment 13: A strategy will be added for Fritch.

John Williams Comments, March 25, 2010 (email to Simone Kiel)

1. Comment regarding the city of Borger's contracted amounts with CRMWA and the need for a water management strategy for additional water from CRMWA. **Response:** Freese and Nichols contacted the city of Borger and confirmed that the city is using its full allotment of groundwater from Roberts County. The currently available supplies to Borger will be changed and the recommended strategy to purchase additional supplies from CRMWA will be removed. The City will continue to have a need, which will be met through developing additional groundwater.
2. Comment regarding the city of Amarillo's contracted amount with CRMWA. **Response:** The supplies to Amarillo are limited by infrastructure, not contractual amounts. No changes will be made to Amarillo's supplies from CRMWA.

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 9257
Phone: 806-372-3381

Amarillo, Texas 79105
Fax: 806-373-3268

Memorandum

To: Panhandle Water Planning Group Members
From: Kyle G. Ingham, Local Government Services Director
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Agenda Item #9

Discuss – Discuss and Action as Appropriate – Adoption of the 2011 Panhandle Regional (Region A) Water Plan

Over the last 3 years the PWPG has worked to develop a 2011 Regional Water Plan for the Panhandle Region. On March 1, 2010 the Initially Prepared Plan was submitted for agency review and public comment. Comments were received by the end of June. Based on those comments and discussion under Item #8 on this agenda packet, minor revisions and clarifications have been made. Additionally, Chapter 9, based on the IFR Surveys discussed under Item #5 of this agenda, was developed and Chapter 10 describing the process by which this plan was developed has been put together. The socio-economic analysis performed by the TWDB was completed and a summary of the findings is included in Chapter 4. Further, many attachments and appendices relating to specific chapters have been included in this draft of the Plan.

This agenda item provides a final opportunity for membership, TWDB Staff, and the general public to discuss any components of the proposed 2011 Panhandle Regional Water Plan. This item also provides opportunity for the PWPG to adopt the Plan.

Attachments: Electronic copies of the final draft of the Regional Water Plan will be available on the Region's website at www.panhandlewater.org. A hard copy of the main report of Regional Water Plan in its finalizing state will be mailed to each PWPG member requesting a hard copy. This draft will be available prior to August 4, 2010. This will give members one full week for a final review.

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 9257
Phone: 806-372-3381

Amarillo, Texas 79105
Fax: 806-373-3268

Memorandum

To: Panhandle Water Planning Group Members
From: Kyle G. Ingham, Local Government Services Director
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Agenda Item #10

Discuss – Acceptance of Panhandle Water Planning Group Member Resignation

Due to a change in job assignments, it is anticipated that a PWPG member will be resigning at this meeting.

The vacancy will be filled according to the bylaws at the next PWPG meeting and will coincide with the advertising of vacancies via standard PWPG protocol.

Attachments: Cole Camp Letter

Kyle Ingham

From: Cole Camp [ccamp@pgcd.us]
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 1:53 PM
To: Kyle Ingham
Cc: C.E. Williams
Subject: PWPG Resignation letter
Attachments: PWPG resignation July 2010.docx.pdf

Good Afternoon –

Please find the attached letter of resignation from the PWPG.

Respectfully,

Cole Camp
Assistant Manager
Panhandle Groundwater Conservation District
www.pgcd.us
Phone - 806.883.2501
Cell - 806.336.3117

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 9257
Phone: 806-372-3381

Amarillo, Texas 79105
Fax: 806-373-3268

Memorandum

To: Panhandle Water Planning Group Members
From: Kyle G. Ingham, Local Government Services Director
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Agenda Item #11

Discuss – Upcoming PWPG planning processes

This agenda item is intended to allow the PWPG and TWDB Staff to discuss the upcoming regional water planning cycle, any potential interim projects, and how the group would like to approach the coming years.

Attachments: NA

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 9257
Phone: 806-372-3381

Amarillo, Texas 79105
Fax: 806-373-3268

Memorandum

To: Panhandle Water Planning Group Members
From: Kyle G. Ingham, Local Government Services Director
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Agenda Item #12

Regional Reports – B and O

Attachments: NA

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 9257
Phone: 806-372-3381

Amarillo, Texas 79105
Fax: 806-373-3268

Memorandum

To: Panhandle Water Planning Group Members
From: Kyle G. Ingham, Local Government Services Director
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Agenda Item #13

Report or Comments from TWDB Personnel

Attachments: NA

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 9257
Phone: 806-372-3381

Amarillo, Texas 79105
Fax: 806-373-3268

Memorandum

To: Panhandle Water Planning Group Members
From: Kyle G. Ingham, Local Government Services Director
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Agenda Item #14

Other business and closing comments from the Chairman and the Board Members.

Attachments: NA

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 9257
Phone: 806-372-3381

Amarillo, Texas 79105
Fax: 806-373-3268

Memorandum

To: Panhandle Water Planning Group Members
From: Kyle G. Ingham, Local Government Services Director
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Agenda Item #15

Scheduling the next Panhandle Water Planning Group Meeting

The next PWPG meeting will include the election of officers, solicitation and appointment of new members, and the possible consideration of an interim study.

Attachments: None

PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

P.O. Box 9257
Phone: 806-372-3381

Amarillo, Texas 79105
Fax: 806-373-3268

Memorandum

To: Panhandle Water Planning Group Members
From: Kyle G. Ingham, Local Government Services Director
Date: August 12, 2010
Re: Agenda Item #16

Public Comment – Relating to PWPG activities

Attachments: None