

**Minutes of the  
South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group  
May 2, 2013**

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. in the San Antonio Water System's (SAWS) Customer Service Building, Room CR 145, 2800 US Highway 281 North, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas.

Twenty-eight of the 29 voting members, or their alternates, were present.

**Voting Members Present:**

Gená Leathers for Jason Ammerman	Dan Meyer
Tim Andruss	Gary Middleton
Donna Balin	Con Mims
Evelyn Bonavita	Ron Naumann
Rey Chavez	Iliana Peña
Alan Cockerell	Charles Ahrens for Robert Puente
Will Conley	Steve Ramsey
Don Dietzmann	Diane Savage
Art Dohmann	Suzanne Scott
Vic Hilderbran	Greg Sengelmann
Rick Illgner for Karl Dreher	Milton Stolte
Kevin Janak	Tom Taggart
Bill Jones	Bill West
Micah Voulgaris for John Kight	Tony Wood

**Voting Members Absent:**

Mike Mahoney

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Wally Bubby, Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife (TPWD)  
Ron Fieseler, Region K Liaison  
Don McGhee, Region M Liaison  
Matt Nelson, Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)  
Ken Weidenfeller, Texas Department of Agriculture

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Public Comment**

Melissa Grote, Program Specialist, Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB), helps manage the Water Supply Enhancement Project (formerly known as State Brush Program) for TSSWCB and is currently working on a project on the Guadalupe River and provided handouts for the program across the state.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Con Mims asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from March 14, 2013. Ron Naumann made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Gary Middleton seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Status of Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)**

Dr. Robert Gulley, EAHCP Executive Director, provided an update on the implementation of the Habitat Conservation Plan. Dr. Gulley reported all work committed to be accomplished on the HCP is in the process of being implemented, such as work on the spring system, attention to flow control measures, the Aquifer Storage Recovery (ASR) leasing program and the Voluntary Irrigation Suspension Program (VISPO) leasing program. Dr. Gulley also reported on the ongoing adaptive management process and the next phase of the program, such as a phase two decision which will ultimately decide if the measures implemented in the HCP are enough, too much or not enough. Dr. Gulley is working with a Science Committee of local experts, as well as the National Academy of Sciences through the National Search Council (NRC). The NRC has agreed to provide independent science review of the implementation process and help sort through the issues of the best available science.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Status of Guadalupe, San Antonio, Mission, and Aransas Rivers and Mission, Copano, Aransas, and San Antonio Bays Basin and Bay Stakeholder Committee (BBASC) and Expert Science Team (BBEST) and Nueces River and Corpus Christi and Baffin Bays Stakeholder Committee (BBASC) and Expert Science Team (BBEST)**

Suzanne Scott, Chair of the Guadalupe, San Antonio, Mission, and Aransas Rivers and Mission, Copano, Aransas, and San Antonio Bays Basin and Bay Stakeholder Committee (BBASC), reported the next GSA BBASC meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 23, 2013. The stakeholders are continuing to try to find funding for implementation of studies listed in the Work Plan for Adaptive Management. The stakeholders have requested funding through the potential water supply project funding. The rider is \$2M to fund work plan studies. The Science Advisory Council (SAC) and the Environmental Flows Advisory Group (EFAG) would prioritize the work plan studies and a BBASC may request funding for studies.

Mr. Mims, Chair of the Nueces River and Corpus Christi and Baffin Bays Stakeholder Committee (BBASC), had nothing new to report on the process. At the March meeting, Mr. Mims stated the Environmental Flows Standards and Strategies had been submitted, as well as the Work Plan for Adaptive Management with a response from TCEQ still pending.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) Communications**

Matt Nelson, TWDB, reported the request for funds for regional water planning is still moving forward in the legislation.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Texas Water Development Board Presentation on Revised Regional Water Planning Rules, Part 2**

Mr. Nelson, TWDB, provided the second part of the presentation on the new rule revisions for Regional Water Planning, focusing on Chapter 7, Drought Management and changes in the regional water planning process for Drought Response.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Legislative Activities**

Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if anyone would like to discuss specific legislation of interest for regional water planning. Diane Savage informed the Planning Group of a bill changing the deadlines on Desired Future Conditions (DFC), which may change the Groundwater Management Area's reporting. Mr. Mims informed the group the legislation for Unique Stream Segments is waiting to be heard in the House Natural Resources. Dianne Wassenich, San Marcos River Foundation, discussed a bill regarding Firm Bank Springs in Hays County, as well bills regarding impervious cover regulations (Senate Bill 1918 and 1919), weakening impervious cover regulations.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Authorizing Administrator to Begin Soliciting Nominations for SCTRWPG Voting Members Whose Terms Expire in August 2013 (12 members)**

Erin Newberry, SARA, provided an overview of the proposed schedule for accepting nominations for upcoming vacancies on the Planning Group. There will be 12 vacancies to be filled. A draft copy of the Public Notice was in the agenda packet for review as well as a copy of the current members' terms of office.

Mr. Mims informed the Planning Group he received a letter from South Texas Regional Alliance (STRWA), regarding representation on Region L. Mr. Mims provided the names of entities that make up STRWA. Several STRWA members (cities and water utilities) could potentially be nominated under several Interest categories by STRWA at this time so representation could be covered. Mr. Mims asked if there was a representative of STRWA to speak. There was no response.

Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there was any interest in increasing, decreasing or re-categorizing any of the Interest categories with vacancies that currently has more than one representative and no motion was made.

Art Dohmann made a motion to authorize the Administrator to begin the solicitation process to fill existing vacancies at the August 2013 meeting. Will Conley seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Report, Discussion and Appropriate Action from Work Groups**

- **Eagle Ford Shale Work Group – Suzanne Scott, Chair**
  - **Presentation by UTSA Institute for Economic Development - Region L Eagle Ford Shale Population Projection Study, Dr. Thomas Tunstall, Ph.D., Research Director**
- **Carrizo Aquifer WMS Work Group, Greg Sengelmann, Chair**

Dr. Sheryllynn Roberts, Center for Community and Business Research at The University of Texas San Antonio (UTSA), presented the three phased population projection study findings for

counties within Region L affected by Eagle Ford Shale. The study was based on: Phase I: region population projections based on UTSA's Eagle Ford Shale workforce forecasts; Phase II: population projection based on housing units in conjunction with persons-per-household multipliers in order to project population; and Phase III: population projection based on school enrollment. Dr. Roberts also explained the methodology UTSA used to gather and apply all data used for the study, as well as some of the challenges of finding data sets in rural areas. Dr. Roberts also informed the Planning Group UTSA collaborated with HDR Engineering throughout the study.

Following the presentation of study findings for Region L counties, Ms. Scott explained the challenge in formulating a recommendation to the Planning Group. The Work Group, working with HDR Engineering, would like time to analyze and compare the new information with TWDB draft population and water demand projections to see if some of the issues relative to water consumption may be calculated into the gallons per capita daily (GPCD) in the Eagle Ford Shale affected cities and counties. In further analyzing, it may be found that TWDB's draft water demand projections may already account for increased population and water use via the draft water demand projections.

The Eagle Ford Shale Work Group recommendation is as follows:

The Region L Eagle Ford Shale Work Group met Wednesday, May 1, 2013 with the Institute for Economic Development at UTSA and received a briefing from UTSA regarding the results of their study. As a result, the Work Group highlighted several counties within Region L where the analysis by UTSA indicates population projections, based on labor workforce, school enrollment and housing data, could be different from TWDB's population projections and potentially require a request for a modification to the population projection. For the identified counties the Work Group believes the UTSA study results require further review by Region L's Technical Consultants and the Work Group members.

The Region L Eagle Ford Shale Work Group requests authorization from the Planning Group to allow it to continue to work with HDR Engineering and the Institute for Economic Development at UTSA to further review the population projections for DeWitt, Dimmitt, Goliad, Gonzales, Karnes, LaSalle, Refugio and Victoria counties. The Work Group will further study and compare the UTSA study findings with the TWDB population projections to formulate a recommendation on whether to submit a request to the TWDB to consider modifications to population for one or more of the counties. The Work Group further recommends that the Planning Group's Executive Committee be authorized to review and consider the Work Group's recommendation for submission to the TWDB in June. The Work Group will report its final recommendations to the Planning Group at the August 1, 2013 meeting.

Additionally, the Work Group recommends the final UTSA study report be forwarded to the offices of each County Judge within Region L for information. In addition, any recommendations made regarding requests for changes to population projections that are submitted to the TWDB on behalf of the Planning Group will also be shared with the appropriate County Judges.

Ms. Scott made a motion to accept the Work Group's recommendation as presented. Gary Middleton seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Greg Sengelmann, Chair of the Carrizo Aquifer Water Management Strategies (WMS) Work Group, provided a brief update on the Work Group's recent meeting on April 15, 2013. Mr. Sengelmann stated the group initially clarified the TWDB rules on not breaking Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) and ensuring WMS' do not exceed a MAG in any Groundwater

Management Area (GMA). Secondly, the Work Group reviewed a list of Carrizo Aquifer MAG and existing permit information to determine where the Carrizo stood on existing MAG and tried to determine whether to use existing pumping or permitted amounts. The group determined for planning purposes, the permitted amount would be used in calculations to determine availability of water, if any. HDR Engineering will work to obtain permitting data from each Groundwater District to calculate what is left in the Carrizo. Finally, the group discussed how to account for exempt usage. HDR Engineering will also obtain exempt use from each Groundwater District to assist in the final calculations of the Carrizo. The next meeting of the Carrizo Aquifer WMS Work Group will be May 22, 2013.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Consultants Work and Schedule**

Brian Perkins, HDR Engineering, presented an updated 2016 Regional Water Planning (RWP) Consultant Schedule and briefed the Planning Group tasks HDR Engineering is currently working on. In addition to the schedule, Mr. Perkins reviewed the list of potential issues that the Technical Consultant and Administrator are tracking that may affect the planning process.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Population and Population-Related Water Demand Projections (Task 2B) Recommendations to TWDB**

Mr. Perkins provided a presentation on Draft Population and Water Demand Projections Survey Results, which incorporated survey results from responding water user groups and wholesale water providers. There were fourteen water user groups that requested HDR Engineering contact them to discuss the data provided in the survey. Of the fourteen HDR Engineering contacted by request, 9 water user groups have requested revisions that will require discussion and appropriate action by the Planning Group on whether or not to forward to TWDB as revision requests. Those entities requesting revisions to their population and population-related water demand projections are: City of Cibola, Comal County, City of Converse, City of Cotulla, Fair Oaks Ranch, SS Water Supply Corporation (WSC), City of San Marcos, City of Schertz, and City of LaVernia. All entities with the exception of the City of Cotulla have provided some documentation to HDR Engineering for validation of their requests, in accordance with the guidelines provided by TWDB. Mr. Perkins will contact those entities that may require additional documentation before forwarding to TWDB. Mr. Mims also clarified that by forwarding the revision requests with documentation provided, the Planning Group was simply forwarding the requests to TWDB for TWDB consideration. Mr. Nelson, TWDB, also stated after reviewing the requests and documentation provided, if additional information is needed, HDR Engineering would be contacted.

Mr. Middleton made a motion to forward all revision requests reviewed today to the TWDB for consideration by TWDB. There were no objections to the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Draft Water Needs Analysis (Task 4A & Task 4B) to be Refined and Included in the Preparation of the Needs Analysis Survey (Phase 2 of Online Survey)**

Mr. Perkins informed the Planning Group since the last meeting, HDR Engineering has completed the draft evaluation of existing supplies in order to calculate the draft water needs for

the 2016 RWP. Mr. Perkins reviewed the pieces: 1) Reliability of surface water from the Nueces River Basin, 2) Reliability of surface water from the Guadalupe-San Antonio River Basin, to include the use of spring flows associated with the Edwards Aquifer HCP and the use of the 2011 historical effluent discharges, 3) Reuse, and 4) Groundwater, to include groundwater availability from the Edwards Aquifer with the implementation of the HCP as a WMS.

Mr. Perkins then provided the draft water needs by Water User Group (WUG). Mr. Perkins referred to the handout provided which was broken out by county and WUG and provided the following information by county and Water User Group: 1) Draft demand numbers, 2) Supply sources, 3) Sources of draft supply numbers and 4) Calculated needs or management supply.

Bill Jones asked Mr. Perkins why Victoria County reflects a need for Steam-Electric in the amount of 53,178 ac-ft beginning in 2020. Tommy Hill clarified the need is for Steam-Electric, not specifically Exelon. Mr. Perkins also confirmed that per the Bureau of Economic Geology at University of Texas (BEG) Report, there is a demand for Steam-Electric, though the amount of water estimated in 2020 is less than the 53,178 ac-ft the Planning Group approved as a draft non-municipal water demand, due in part to the future demand of the Exelon Project. Mr. Jones asked if the minutes from the meeting where the decision was made to retain the need for a Steam-Electric water demand in Victoria County at 53,178 ac-ft be revisited for the rationale as to why the Planning Group decided to approve that water need. Per Mr. Jones' request, Mr. Middleton read the following from the November 1, 2012 minutes:

"Mr. Perkins also addressed one final issue in the Steam-Electric category that has occurred since our previous meeting. Exelon has pulled their Early Site Permit in Victoria County and will not require the additional water demand as reflected in the draft projections. However, Victoria County still reflects a need for Steam-Electric in later years and the draft projections reflect that need. Mr. Perkins asked the Planning Group if they would like to revise their previous approval of the draft projections for Victoria County, in the Steam-Electric category, or leave the draft projections as TWDB has stated. Mr. Mims asked if there were any objections to leaving the existing draft projections, approved by the Planning Group at the August 2, 2012 meeting, as they are currently stated. The Planning Group had no objections to leaving the draft projections as stated."

Mr. Jones stated he still did not understand the Planning Groups' rationale. Mr. Middleton stated that due to the projected need for Steam-Electric in Victoria County, the Planning Group left the existing water demand allocated for Steam-Electric demands in Victoria County for use. Prior to projecting draft water demands for the Exelon Project, the Steam-Electric demands in the BEG Report for Victoria County are: 1,478 ac-ft by 2020, 30,802 ac-ft by 2030, 38,202 ac-ft by 2040, 54,623 ac-ft by 2050, 71,720 ac-ft for 2060 and 2070.

Mr. Jones made a motion to remove the Steam-Electric demand from Victoria County. Ms. Bonavita clarified a Planning Group could not remove a projected demand, but could request to revise the projected water demand for the future Steam-Electric need by subtracting out the amount of water for use by Exelon. Mr. Middleton asked Mr. Jones to clarify his motion. Mr. Jones revised his original motion to state his motion is to revise the non-municipal water demand projection for Steam-Electric in Victoria County by eliminating the amount of water requested by Exelon and to adopt the BEG Report recommended water demand for years 2030 through 2070. But for 2020, revise the Steam-Electric water demand by increasing the BEG recommended amount by the difference between the 53,178 acft/yr in the 2011 plan and the amount for the Exelon Project (49,126 acft/yr), approximately 5,000 acft/yr. This difference is

actually 4,052 acft/yr, making the Year 2020 projection for Steam-Electric in Victoria County 5,530 acft/yr (4,052 + 1,478).

The revised non-municipal water demand for Steam-Electric in Victoria County will be as follows:

5,530 ac-ft by 2020, 30,802 ac-ft by 2030, 38,202 ac-ft by 2040, 54,623 ac-ft by 2050, 71,720 ac-ft for 2060 and 2070

Ms. Bonavita seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Mr. Perkins presented the Draft Water Needs (demands minus existing supplies) projected in the 2016 RWP versus the 2011 RWP. As there were some changes to several Water Needs (municipal, industrial, steam-electric, mining, and irrigation) Mr. Perkins reviewed changes with the Planning Group.

The second part of the survey, Needs Analysis Survey (Phase 2 of the online survey), will be sent out late August or early September, after TWDB approves projected water demands for use in the 2016 Regional Water Plan, to all Water Use Groups.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Evaluation of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies (Task 4B), Draft Scopes of Work and Budgets for Submittal to TWDB (Task 4D)**

At the March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Planning Group Meeting, HDR Engineering received authorization to begin drafting scopes of work and budgets for eight WMS: EA HCP, Water Conservation, Drought Management, Recycled Water Program, Local Groundwater, Surface Water Rights, Facilities Expansion, and Balancing Storage (ASR and/or Surface).

Mr. Perkins presented the results for the Planning Group. With Planning Group authorization, HDR Engineering will submit, to the Administrator, a scope and budget request. The Administrator will then submit the request to TWDB.

Mr. Perkins then requested Planning Group authorization to begin drafting scopes of work and budgets for twelve additional WMS: 1) Wells Ranch – Phase 2 (Canyon Regional Water Authority (CRWA) and Others), 2) Brackish Wilcox for the RWA (CRWA and Others), 3) Hays/Caldwell PUA: Phases 1 & 2 (San Marcos, Buda, Kyle, CRWA), 4) CRWA siesta Project (CRWA), 5) Brackish Wilcox for SAWS, 6) Expanded Local Carrizo – Bexar County (SAWS), 7) Brackish-Wilcox – Gonzales County (SSLGC), 8) Texas Water Alliance Carrizo Well Field – Gonzales County (TWA), 9) Carrizo Aquifer – Wilson County (Cibolo Valley Local Government Corporation), 10) GBRA Mid-Basin Project and Alternatives (GBRA), 11) GBRA Lower Basin Off-Channel Reservoir (GBRA), and 12) GBRA Lower Basin New Appropriation (GBRA).

HDR Engineering will develop the draft SOW and budget for each approved WMS listed and bring them back to the Planning Group in August for discussion.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Authorizing Political Subdivision to Submit Request for Notice-to-Proceed for Evaluation of Eight Water Management Strategies and Authorize Administrator to Execute Contract Amendment with TWDB**

Ms. Bonavita made a motion to authorize the Administrator to submit a request for the Notice-to-Proceed for Evaluation of WMS to the TWDB and to authorize Administrator to execute the contract amendment with TWDB to revise the scope of work to replace Task 4D and to remove the requirement of a Notice-to-Proceed from TWDB Contract No. 1148301323. Mr. Middleton seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: Possible Agenda Items for the Next South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group Meeting**

Mr. Middleton proposed the following agenda items for the August 1, 2013 Planning Group Meeting:

- EAHCP Update
- Status of SB3, Environmental Flows Process
- Report, Discussion and Appropriate Action from Work Groups

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 16: Public Comment**

Recommended for approval.

  
GARY MIDDLETON, SECRETARY

Approved by the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group at a meeting held on August 1, 2013.

  
CON MIMS, CHAIR