



c/o San Antonio River Authority
P.O. Box 839980
San Antonio, Texas 78283-9980

(210) 227-1373 Office
(210) 302-3692 Fax
www.RegionLTexas.org

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Con Mims
Chair / River Authorities
Mike Mahoney
Vice-Chair / Water Districts
Gary Middleton
Secretary / Municipalities

DATE: October 31, 2013

MEMBERS

Tim Andruss
Water Districts
Dr. Donna Balin
Environmental
Gene Camargo
Water Utilities
Rey Chavez
Industries
Alan Cockerell
Agriculture
Will Conley
Counties
Don Dietzmann
GMA 9
Art Dohmann
GMA 15
Blair Fitzsimons
Agriculture
Vic Hilderbran
GMA 7
Kevin Janak
Electric Generating/Utilities
John Kight
Counties
Genâ Leathers
Industries
Doug McGookey
Small Business
Dan Meyer
GMA 10
Iliana Peña
Environmental
Robert Puente
Municipalities
Steve Ramsey
Water Utilities
David Roberts
Small Business
Roland Ruiz
Water Districts
Diane Savage
GMA 13
Suzanne Scott
River Authorities
Greg Sengemann
Water Districts
Milton Stolte
Agriculture
Thomas Taggart
Municipalities
Dianne Wassenich
Public
Bill West
River Authorities

TO: Members of the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group

FROM: Steven J. Raabe, P.E.

The schedule and location of the meeting of the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group is as follows:

TIME AND LOCATION

Thursday, November 7, 2013
10:00 a.m.
San Antonio Water System
Customer Service Building
Room CR 145
2800 US Highway 281 North
San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas 78212

Enclosed is a copy of the posted public meeting notice.

GMM/en

Enclosure

**NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING OF THE
SOUTH CENTRAL TEXAS REGIONAL
WATER PLANNING GROUP**

TAKE NOTICE that a meeting of the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group as established by the Texas Water Development Board will be held on Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. at San Antonio Water System (SAWS), Customer Service Building, Room CR 145, 2800 US Highway 281 North, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas. The following subjects will be considered for discussion and/or action at said meeting.

1. Public Comment
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Status of Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)
4. Chair's Report
 - Update of RWPG Project Prioritization Committee (HB4)
5. 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)
6. Review/Approve Administrator's Budget for CY2014
7. Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) Communications
 - TWDB Administrative Update
 - New Planning Group Member Presentation
8. Report, Discussion and Appropriate Action from Work Group
 - Carrizo Aquifer Work Group, Greg Sengelmann
9. Presentation of "Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB) Water Supply Enhancement Program – Enhancing Surface and Ground Water Supplies Through Brush Control in Region L" – Aaron Wendt, TSSWCB Natural Resources Specialist
10. Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Consultants Work and Schedule
 - Technical Memorandum Update

11. Report on TWDB Final Recommendations on Population and Water Demand Projections, Results of Phase 2 Survey to Water User Groups (WUG) and Wholesale Water Providers (WWP) and Draft Needs Analysis Review (Tasks 4A & 4B)
12. Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Evaluation of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies (Task 4B), Draft Scopes of Work and Budgets for Submittal to TWDB and Inclusion into Planning Contract, TWDB Contract No. 1148301323 (Task 4D)
13. Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Authorizing Political Subdivision to Submit Request for Notice-to-Proceed for Evaluation of Twelve Water Management Strategies and Authorize Administrator to Execute Contract Amendment with TWDB
14. Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies (Task 4B), Draft Scopes of Work and Budgets for Consideration at the Next South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group Meeting
15. Set Dates and Times of Regional Water Planning Group Meetings for 2014
16. Possible Agenda Items for the Next South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group Meeting
17. Public Comment

The South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Area consists of Atascosa, Bexar, Caldwell, Calhoun, Comal, Dewitt, Dimmit, Frio, Goliad, Gonzales, Guadalupe, Karnes, Kendall, La Salle, Medina, Refugio, Uvalde, Victoria, Wilson, Zavala and part of Hays Counties.

www.RegionLTexas.org

AGENDA ITEM 1

Public Comment

AGENDA ITEM 2

Approval of Minutes

**Minutes of the
South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group
August 1, 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-seven 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	Tyson Broad for Iliana Peña
Alan Cockerell	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 West	Tony Wood
John Kight	

Voting Members Absent:

Mike Mahoney
Bill Jones

Non-Voting Members Present:

Matt Nelson, Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)
Steve Ramos, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, South Texas Watermaster
Charles Wiedenfeld, Region J Liaison

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Public Comment

There were no public comments at this time.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Approval of Minutes

Chairman Con Mims asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes from May 2, 2013. Mr. Mims received minor corrections and provided the corrections to the Planning Group. Mr. Mims asked for a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Gary Middleton made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Ron Naumann seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Chair's Report

Mr. Mims asked Matt Nelson, TWDB, to provide an update to the Planning Group on House Bill 4 and the ramifications to regional water planning and project prioritization.

Mr. Mims also informed the Planning Group the Unique Stream Segment legislation passed through the Senate with no opposition and landed in the House; but died in House Natural Resources.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Status of Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)

Dr. Robert Gulley, EAHCP Executive Director, provided an update on implementation of the Habitat Conservation Plan. Dr. Gulley stated on August 13, 2013, the Edwards Aquifer Authority (EAA) and San Antonio Water System (SAWS) boards will consider a contract between EAA and SAWS to implement the ASR Program, which is a key piece of the HCP.

The second element of the HCP is the *Refugia* Program. At the last Implementing Committee meeting, the committee made the decision to fund the three facilities US Fish and Wildlife serves in San Marcos, Uvalde and Inks Dam. The intent of the *Refugia* Program is to ensure adequate protection of the species; to preserve the capacity for the species to be reestablished in the event of the loss of populations of the critical species.

The third element is the process of completing the negotiations on a contract with the National Research Council (NRC). The NRC will be providing independent science review of all activities for the first 7 years of the HCP. Once the contract is in place, the NRC will create a panel of experts to review the different models and approaches being taken towards developing an Adaptive Management Program and preparing for the Phase 2 decision.

Suzanne Scott thanked Dr. Gulley for his leadership, expertise and guidance throughout the process of the HCP. Dr. Gulley recently announced his retirement.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: 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)

Mrs. 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), informed the Planning Group the BBASC was successful in its request during legislation for funding allocation for studies (work plan elements) in the Work Plan for Adaptive Management. The GSA BBASC established a work group to discuss how the GSA BBASC could provide recommendations to the TWDB on how to prioritize the study submittals for the funding allocation.

The next GSA BBASC meeting will be at the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority River Annex on August 22, 2013. Ms. Scott also informed the Planning Group there is currently a vacancy open for nominations in the Regional Water Planning Group category. If anyone is interested, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) will be announcing the vacancy and providing the nomination forms.

Mr. Mims, Chair of the Nueces River and Corpus Christi and Baffin Bays Stakeholder Committee (BBASC), informed the Planning Group that the group submitted their Work Plan for Adaptive Management and have not received feedback.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Nominations to Fill Voting Member Vacancies

Mr. Mims opened the discussion by informing the Planning Group the Executive Committee met to review the nomination packages and interview nominees for the twelve vacancies on the Planning Group with terms expiring in 2018. The twelve vacancies are in the following Interest Categories: (1) Public, (1) Counties, (1) Industries, (1) Agricultural, (2) Small Business, (1) River Authorities, (3) Water Districts, and (2) Water Utilities.

The Executive Committee recommended the reappointment of current incumbents as follows: Will Conley, Counties; Suzanne Scott, River Authorities, Steve Ramsey, Water Utilities; Tim Andruss and Greg Sengelmann, Water Districts. Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there were any objections to the reappointment of current incumbents as presented. There were no objections to the Executive Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Mims continued by informing the Planning Group he will present the Executive Committee recommendations by Interest Category for Planning Group consideration, as follows:

For the vacancy in the Public Interest Category, the Executive Committee recommended Dianne Wassenich. Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there were any objections to the recommendation. There were no objections.

For the second vacancy in Water Utilities, the Executive Committee recommended Gene Camargo. Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there were any objections or recommendations to the recommendation. There were no objections.

For the vacancy in Industries, the Executive Committee recommended Gená Leathers. Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there were any objections or recommendations. There were no objections to the recommendation.

For the vacancy in Agriculture, the Executive Committee recommended Blair Fitzsimons. Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there were any objections or recommendations. Robert Puente seconded the motion to elect Ms. Fitzsimons to represent Agriculture. Art Dohmann nominated Pat Calhoun to represent Agriculture. Mr. Andruss seconded the motion to elect Mr. Calhoun. Mr. Mims stated that as consensus was not achieved, a vote will be taken. The final majority vote was in favor of Ms. Fitzsimons.

For the two vacancies in the Small Business Interest Category, the Executive Committee recommended David Roberts and Brad Smith. Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there were any objections or recommendations from the list of nominees presented. Mr. Puente made a motion to nominate Judge Renolds Cate to one of the vacancies for Small Business. Bill West seconded the motion. Donna Balin recommended Doug McGooky to one of the vacancies for Small Business. Tony Woods seconded the motion.

Mr. Mims put the vacancies to a vote, one vacancy at a time, with four nominees recommended; David Roberts, Brad Smith, Doug McGooky and Judge Reynolds Cate. With the majority vote,

David Roberts was elected to the first vacancy for Small Business and Doug McGooky was elected to the second vacancy.

For the remaining vacancy in Water Districts, the Executive Committee recommended Roland Ruiz. Commissioner Will Conley recommended Erin Banks to the vacancy. The recommendation failed due to no second to the motion to nominate Erin Banks. Mr. Mims asked if there were any objections to recommending Roland Ruiz to the third vacancy. The Planning Group had no objections.

Mr. Mims welcomed the new Planning Group Members. Mr. Mims recognized Ms. Bonavita, Mr. Naumann and Mr. Woods for their time on the Planning Group. Ms. Bonavita and Mr. Naumann both served 15 years on the Planning Group and Mr. Woods served 5 years. Mr. Mims thanked them for their contributions to Regional Water Planning.

Mr. Mims informed the Planning Group the two vacancies on the Executive Committee will be filled in February when regularly scheduled elections are held for the Executive Committee positions.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) Communications

Mr. Nelson provided an update on the staff and board changes at TWDB per Legislation that will take effect September 1, 2013.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Consultants Work, Schedule and Budget

Brian Perkins, HDR Engineering, presented a status update on the schedule of tasks/scope of work HDR is currently working on, as well as an update on their budget for those tasks. Mr. Perkins also reviewed deadline dates for the Technical Memorandum, the Initially Prepared Plan (IPP) and the draft Regional Water Plan (RWP). Mr. Perkins also reviewed the timeline for draft water projections to be provided to TWDB in time for adoption by TWDB's board in September.

Commissioner Conley asked Mr. Perkins if they could meet to review the draft projections for Hays County after the meeting to ensure the projections are in line with the Hays County Water Management Plan. Mr. Perkins will follow up with Commissioner Conley to schedule a date and time as soon as possible.

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

- **Eagle Ford Shale Work Group – Suzanne Scott, Chair**
- **Carrizo Aquifer WMS Work Group, Greg Sengemann, Chair**

Mrs. Scott, Chair of the Eagle Ford Shale Work Group, provided a brief synopsis of the Work Group's actions taken since the previous Planning Group Meeting. Mrs. Scott reminded the Planning Group that at the May 2, 2013 Planning Group Meeting, the Planning Group authorized the Work Group 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. Additionally, the Work Group could 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 was also authorized by the Planning Group to present the final recommendations to the Executive Committee for review and consider the Work Group's recommendation for submission to the TWDB. The Work Group was to report its final recommendations to the Planning Group at the August 1, 2013 meeting.

Mr. Perkins informed the Planning Group how HDR Engineering and the San Antonio River Authority staff worked to put the population projection results from the UTSA study in context with the TWDB draft population projections and analyzed the effect potential revisions to population projections may have on water demand projections in the eight counties discussed.

In order to fairly compare draft water demand projections, HDR Engineering used each of the UTSA population study scenarios to create multiple draft projected water demand projections to compare against TWDB's draft water demand projections. The Work Group chose to account for the highest water demand possible of the different scenarios for each county and, due to the challenges in requesting population revisions, the Work Group recommended adjusting draft water demand projections, county by county, to account for transient populations. This method assures we are providing adequate existing water supplies and future water supplies to meet the potential highest water demand in those areas.

The draft recommendation and analyses was sent to the Work Group on July 24, 2013 for comments and receiving no objections, provided to the Executive Committee at the Staff Work Group for their approval. The final Work Group recommendation is as follows:

It is recommended that the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group ask the TWDB to revise the water demand projections in seven of the eight counties (excluding Victoria County). Revision of these water demand projections will account for the transient, short-term residents/workers that aren't included in the TWDB population projections, without revising the population projections and making it necessary to offset the population projections increases in these counties by lowering the population projections in other counties within Region L.

Mr. Dohmann asked Mr. Perkins to include a detailed statement as to why the revisions are requested in certain counties to water demand projections for this planning cycle. Mr. Perkins confirmed the Technical Memorandum and backup data will be included as an Appendix in the Regional Water Plan.

Greg Sengemann, Chair of the Carrizo Aquifer Water Management Strategies (WMS) reported HDR Engineering had received the information required from the majority of the Groundwater Conservation Districts in Region L in regards to groundwater availability from the Carrizo or Wilcox Aquifers. Each Groundwater Conservation District within Region L that have Carrizo or Wilcox groundwater were asked for their Managed Available Groundwater (MAG), amount of groundwater permitted, exempt use amounts and grandfathered amounts, if any.

Mr. Sengemann informed the Planning Group there was one Groundwater District that was unable to provide the permitted information. The Work Group will need to determine how to determine availability of groundwater, if any, for use.

Mr. Mims asked what the next step for the Carrizo Aquifer WMS Work Group would be to complete the Work Group charge, which was to study WMS shown on the WMS list provided at the February 2013 Planning Group meeting that use or propose to use the Carrizo Aquifer as a water source, to identify and describe the interrelationships of each, noting, in particular, how

the use of each strategy affects the use of the others. Mr. Perkins stated he would develop a Technical Memorandum and submit it to the Work Group for their review and recommendation and report at the November Planning Group meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Discussion and Appropriate Action Authorizing Consultant to Work with TWDB to Negotiate/Resolve Any Issues Regarding Final Projections (Municipal and Non-Municipal)

Mr. Perkins reviewed the actions to date by the Planning Group in regards to Municipal and Non-Municipal draft projections received. At the May meeting, the Planning Group authorized HDR Engineering and SARA to package the requested revisions received for submittal to TWDB. However, following the meeting, HDR Engineering received four additional requests to draft population and water demand projections for Planning Group consideration. Mr. Perkins reviewed the requests from Plum Creek Water Company, East Central Special Utility District (SUD), County Line SUD and Buda. Mr. Perkins believed East Central and County Line SUD requests could be handled within Region L planning and Buda's request is being handled by Region K. Plum Creek Water Company's request would require TWDB consideration.

Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group for a motion to authorize the Technical Consultant to work with TWDB to negotiate or resolve any issues regarding final Municipal and Non-Municipal projections, to include previously authorized revision requests, requested revisions to water demand projections from the Eagle Ford Shale Work Group and a request by Plum Creek Water Company as presented today.

Milton Stolte made the motion to authorize HDR Engineering to work with TWDB. Gene Camargo seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

Mr. Perkins also informed the Planning Group the revision requests to draft Municipal Projections have been reviewed by TWDB and forwarded to other State agencies for comment as well. All requests were carried forward with the exception to requested revisions for Mining in Goliad and DeWitt Counties, which were decreased.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Draft Water needs, Initial List of Water Management Strategies, and Drought Response Survey to Water User Groups (WUG) and Discussions with Wholesale Water Providers (WWP) (Tasks 4A & 4B)

Mr. Perkins informed the Planning Group that HDR Engineering is preparing to send out Phase 2 of the online survey to Water User Groups (WUG) and initiate discussions with Wholesale Water Providers. HDR Engineering utilized the information received during Phase 1 of the survey (water demand projections and existing supplies from WUGs) to calculate projected water needs. Mr. Perkins previously presented water user groups per county, reflecting projected water demands and existing supplies to calculate water needs.

Since that initial presentation, HDR Engineering refined the information even more based on additional communications with WUGs and WWPs and will be using the current information for Phase 2 of the survey. A large part of Phase 2 is for WUGs and WWPs to identify and/or confirm, as well as prioritize their water management strategies to meet their projected water needs reflected. The water management strategies listed are from the 2011 RWP, or strategies that HDR Engineering has been informed of by the WUG or WWP.

Mr. Perkins reviewed, by county, projected water needs for municipal and non-municipal water user groups, highlighting any county that may need help planning additional water management strategies. Again, each WUG will have an opportunity to respond to the information reflected via the survey.

Once Phase 2 of the survey is completed and HDR Engineering has compiled the information, Mr. Perkins will report the updated information to the Planning Group.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Evaluation of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies (Task 4B), Draft Scopes of Work and Budgets for Submittal to TWDB and Inclusion into Planning Contract, TWDB Contract No. 1148301323 (Task 4D)

At the May 2, 2013 Planning Group Meeting, HDR Engineering received authorization to begin drafting scopes of work and budgets for twelve WMS: 1) Wells Ranch – Phase 2 (Canyon Regional Water Authority (CRWA) and Others), 2) Brackish Wilcox for the CRWA (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-Wilcox 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).

Mr. West informed the Planning Group that TCEQ issued the draft Mid-Basin permit along with the notice on July 29, 2013, and that there is a 30-day comment period.

Mr. Perkins presented the results to the Planning Group, reviewing each WMS and budget for evaluation. Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there were any objections to the scope and budget of the twelve water management strategies presented by HDR Engineering. There were no objections by the Planning Group. The budgets and scopes were approved by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Authorizing Political Subdivision to Submit Request for Notice-to-Proceed for Evaluation of Twelve Water Management Strategies and Authorize Administrator to Execute Contract Amendment with TWDB

Mr. Mims asked the Planning Group if there was any objection to the San Antonio River Authority, as Administrator, submitting a request for Notice-to-Proceed for the evaluation of the twelve WMS presented by HDR Engineering, authorizing Administrator to execute a contract amendment with TWDB. The Planning Group had no objections and the action was approved by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies (Task 4B), Draft Scopes of Work and Budgets for Consideration at the Next South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group Meeting

Mr. Perkins requested Planning Group authorization to begin drafting scopes of work and budgets for sixteen additional WMS: 1) Edwards Transfers, 2) Purchase from WWP, 3) Water Resources Integration Pipeline (SAWS), 4) Advanced Meter Infrastructure (SAWS), 5) Regional Water Supply Project – RFCSP (SAWS), 6) Regional Brackish Wilcox Project – Alternative (SAWS), 7) Integrated Water-Power Project (GBRA), 8) Luling ASR (GBRA), 9) New Braunfels ASR Project (NBU), 10) New Braunfels Trinity Well Field (NBU), 11) New Braunfels Reuse Project (NBU), 12) Expansion Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, Guadalupe County (SSLGC), 13) Lavaca River Off-Channel Reservoir, 14) Brackish Wilcox Groundwater for SS WSC, 15) Carrizo/Buda/Austin Chalk/Leona & Regional ASR (City of Uvalde), and 16) Texas Water Alliance (Trinity Well Field in Comal).

With Planning Group authorization, HDR Engineering will draft scopes of work and budgets for future technical evaluations. Mr. Mims asked if there were any objections to HDR Engineering beginning to draft scopes of work and budgets for the sixteen water management strategies presented. The Planning Group had no objections. Mr. Perkins' request was approved by consensus.

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

Mr. Mims proposed the following agenda items for the November 7, 2013 Planning Group Meeting:

- EAHCP Update
- Status of SB3, Environmental Flows Process
- Report, Discussion and Appropriate Action from Work Groups
- Presentation on Brush Management as a WMS

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 November 7, 2013.

CON MIMS, CHAIR

AGENDA ITEM 3

Status of Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)

AGENDA ITEM 4

Chair's Report

- Update of RWPG Project Prioritization Committee (HB4)

Agenda Item - Chair's Report

House Bill 4 – Prioritization of Projects in Regional Water Plans

HB 4, passed last legislative session, restructures the Texas Water Development Board (Board/TWDB) and sets up a loan fund, referred to as the State Water Implementation Fund for Texas (SWIFT), to implement the Texas Water Plan. To capitalize the loan fund, \$2 billion is to be transferred from what is commonly known as the Rainy Day Fund, if voters approve a constitutional amendment (Proposition 6) on November 5.

The bill, also, establishes a complex process to set priorities for using the fund. The process involves steps to be taken by regional water planning groups and steps to be taken by TWDB. Regional water planning groups are required to prioritize water management strategies (projects) in their regional plans using “uniform standards” to be developed and the Board is directed to establish a point system to apply in determining if projects qualify for financial assistance from SWIFT.

Because of short deadlines imposed by HB 4, work began on September 17 to organize the chairs of the state’s sixteen regional water planning groups into a HB 4 RWPG Stakeholder Committee (Stakeholder Committee) to develop the uniform standards to be used by the planning groups, as per HB 4. The standards are to be submitted to the Board by December 1, 2013 and will be subject to the Board’s approval.

Once the Stakeholder Committee’s uniform standards are approved by the Board, regional water planning group will need to prioritize projects in their existing 2011 Regional Plan and in their 2016 Plan that is now under development. A draft prioritization of the 2011 Plan is due to the Board by June 1, 2014 and a final prioritization is due by September 1, 2014. Since there is no deadline for the Board to approve the Stakeholder Committee’s recommended uniform standards, due by December 1, it is not known how much time the planning groups will have to complete their draft prioritizations, but it probably will be five months, or less. My inclination is to appoint a committee at our February meeting to prepare a prioritization for planning group consideration at our May meeting.

At this time, based on guidance from TWDB and its staff, we understand that:

- All of a region’s recommended water management strategies are to be prioritized, including such strategies as water conservation, whether a need for state funding is anticipated, or not. This will help ensure that projects not requiring state funding are not viewed as having no priority in the region, which is important from both a public perspective and a permitting standpoint.
- The preference is to apply the uniform standards, statewide, without modification by the planning groups, so that each planning group scores its projects in the same way.
- A “project” is a self-contained facility or activity, proposed independently of and not directly contingent on another facility or project, that is a recommended water management strategy. It would be implemented by an entity over a defined timeline and would have a capital cost.

By Region L’s November 7 meeting, the Stakeholder Committee will have been involved in one webinar, at least one conference call, and three days of meetings. Five more days of meetings are scheduled following the Region L meeting. The meetings are being facilitated by a former TWDB attorney who, now, is with the Center for Public Policy Center for Dispute Resolution at the University of Texas School of Law and are being supported by a number of TWDB personnel.

The first Stakeholder Committee meeting was devoted to organization and establishing ground rules. Following that, one of the first decisions made was to use a scoring template prepared by the Texas Water Conservation Association (TWCA) as a starting point. Two Stakeholder Committee members participated in creating that template, a copy of which is attached. Projects are scored against five (5) Criteria – Decade of Need, Feasibility, Viability, Sustainability and Cost Effectiveness. These are the minimum criteria that planning groups are to consider in prioritizing projects according to HB 4. For each Criteria, the template lists a number of questions designed to more fully evaluate a project and a rating (weighting) for each question.

So, with the TWCA template, each recommended water management strategy in a regional plan would be analyzed based on five criteria, a number of questions within each Criteria, and a weighting of each question – all to arrive at a score for that project. Projects that would be eligible for the 10% of the funds set aside in HB 4 for rural/agricultural and for the 20% allocation for conservation/reuse will need to be identified.

At this time, the Stakeholder Committee is reviewing each question on the TWCA template to decide if it is associated with the right Criteria, if it is properly worded, if it is needed, and if other questions are needed to improve the evaluation. Next, it will consider the weighting of each question, the weighting of the Criteria, and the overall formula for scoring a project. Once the template is fully developed, the Stakeholder Committee will determine if it is sufficient and modify it, as needed.

As noted, HB 4, also, requires TWDB to set up a point system to apply when an application is filed to determine if the project qualifies for financial assistance from the SWIFT fund. There is a long list of criteria that TWDB must consider in developing its point system. But, it must give its highest consideration to projects that “will have a substantial effect”, specifically that will (1) serve a large population, (2) provide assistance to a diverse urban and rural population, (3) provide regionalization, or (4) meet a high percentage of the water supply needs of the water users to be served by the project. The last TWDB consideration listed in HB 4 is the priority given a project by the regional water planning group. This raises the question of just how important will the planning group’s prioritization be in the Board’s point system, and this concerns the Stakeholder Committee.

Work is just beginning, and there are a number of problems remaining to be resolved, such as:

- If a project has to have an associated cost and be recommended in a regional plan, as opposed to just being consistent with a regional plan, how do the small projects found in the County Other category compete?

We will not have time to discuss the TWCA template in much detail at the November 7 Region L meeting. It is difficult enough for just sixteen committee members to discuss. However, I am interested in knowing if you have comments, suggestions, or questions for me to take back to the Stakeholder Committee. We can consider those, very briefly, at our meeting, or you may submit them to me at cmims@nueces-ra.org. The next Stakeholder Committee meeting is on November 4.


Con Mims, Chair
South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group (Region L)

DATE ADOPTED BY RWPG: _____

[illegible]

Criteria	Weighting Factor %	Considerations	YES	NO	Unknown	N/A	Consideration Rating												Criteria Rating (Weight Factor X Avg. Consideration Rating)
							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Criteria 1 (Project Factors) (cont'd)		(f) Does the project address an immediate need, including a need arising from unforeseen invasive species or endangered species, regulatory intervention, or a public health & safety issue? (TWCA Prioritization Factor #10)																	
		(g) Will this project serve as temporary or supplemental supply for the applicant (or its customers) during drought or emergency conditions? (TWCA Prioritization Factor #6)																	
		(h) If ascertainable, will this project require less time to gain approval of all applicable permits relative to other projects of comparable size and complexity? (TWCA Prioritization Factor # 11)																	
		(i) Will the project create a substantial amount of supply relative to unmet needs in the local area or region? (TWCA Prioritization Factor # 13; Water Code 15.437(c)(3))																	
		(j) Will this project serve a large population (within your regional planning group)? (Water Code 15.437(c)(1))																	
		(k) Will this project help defer or eliminate the need for another water development project?																	
		(l) Has the legislature determined that the project is a priority?																	
		(m) Is the project a continuation or phase of an ongoing project?																	
Weighting Factor		Average Consideration Rating												Criteria Rating					
<div></div>		<div></div>												<div></div>					
		X												=					

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
WORKSHEET FOR [STRATEGY NAME], [WATER USER GROUP/PROVIDER]
REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

Criteria	Weighting Factor %	Considerations	YES	NO	Unknown	N/A	Consideration Rating										Criteria Rating (Weight Factor X Avg. Consideration Rating)			
							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10		
(2) Feasibility of Project (Water Code 15.436(a)(2))		(a) Are water rights or contract rights available to support this project? (Water Code 15.975)																		
		(b) Does applicant already hold water rights or contract rights? (Water Code 15.975)																		
		(c) Does recent available hydrological data support project?																		
		(d) Is the project based on sound and proven scientific principals?																		
		(e) Is the project designated as a unique reservoir site by the Legislature? (TWCA Prioritization Factor #7)																		
		(f) Has the project site and necessary rights-of-way been acquired by project applicant?																		
		(g) Does applicant hold all necessary State permits to construct project?																		
		(h) Does applicant hold all Federally required permits for project?																		
Weighting Factor		Average Consideration Rating										Criteria Rating								
<div></div>		<div></div>										<div></div>								
		X										=								

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
WORKSHEET FOR [STRATEGY NAME], [WATER USER GROUP/PROVIDER]
REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

Criteria	Weighting Factor %	Considerations	YES	NO	Unknown	N/A	Consideration Rating											Criteria Rating (Weight Factor X Avg. Consideration Rating)	
							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
(3) Viability of Project (Water Code 15.436(a)(3))		(a) Is this project a comprehensive solution with measureable outcome?																	
		(b) Does the project have performance data collection and management systems to demonstrate its success? (TWCA conservation funding subgroup recommendation)																	
		(c) Does this project make use of a poor or low-quality water source?																	
		(d) Does this project utilize advanced or innovative programs to develop additional water supplies?																	
		(e) Will this project comply with any required environmental flow standards or modeled available groundwater estimates?																	
<div>Weighting Factor<div></div><div>X</div></div> <div>Average Consideration Rating<div></div><div>=</div></div> <div>Criteria Rating<div></div></div>																			

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
WORKSHEET FOR [STRATEGY NAME], [WATER USER GROUP/PROVIDER]
REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

[illegible]

Criteria	Weighting Factor %	Considerations	YES	NO	Unknown	N/A	Consideration Rating												Criteria Rating (Weight Factor X Avg. Consideration Rating)
							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Criteria #4 (Sustainability of Project (Water Code 15.436(a)(4))) (Cont'd)		(f) Does this project leverage available resources or allow better resources capture?																	
		(g) Has the project sponsor/water user group/provider demonstrated a long-term commitment to maintenance of its existing water supply infrastructure?																	
		(h) Will the forecasted revenue stream of the project allow the project sponsor to pay back state funds needed for the project?																	
		(i) Does this project utilize a renewable water resource?																	
	Weighting Factor		Average Consideration Rating												Criteria Rating				
<div></div>		<div></div>												<div></div>					
		X												=					

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
WORKSHEET FOR [STRATEGY NAME], [WATER USER GROUP/PROVIDER]
REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

Criteria	Weighting Factor %	Considerations	YES	NO	Unknown	N/A	Consideration Rating											Criteria Rating (Weight Factor X Avg. Consideration Rating)	
							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
(5) Cost Effectiveness of Project (Water Code 15.436(a)(5))		(a) Is the expected unit cost of water supplied by this project lower than the average unit cost of other feasible alternatives identified in the current regional water plan?																	
		(b) Does this project require a large amount of energy consumption to transport or treat the raw water supply to drinking water standards?																	
		(c) Does this project provide a perpetual water right?																	
		(d) Does this project supply water based on renewable contract rights?																	
		(e) If water is supplied based on renewable contract rights, is escalation of unit price of water involved?																	
		(f) Can the project be phased?																	
Weighting Factor		Average Consideration Rating											Criteria Rating						
<div></div>		<div></div>											<div></div>						
		X											=						

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

WORKSHEET FOR [STRATEGY NAME], [WATER USER GROUP/PROVIDER]

REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

Criteria	Weighting Factor %	Considerations	YES	NO	Unknown	N/A	Consideration Rating										Criteria Rating (Weight Factor X Avg. Consideration Rating)
							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
(6) Other Project Information	N/A						N/A										
		Qualify for 10% Funding for Rural Political Subdivisions?															
		Qualify for 20% Funding for Conservation or Reuse?															
		State funding required for project?															

Note: This information will feed into the overall ranking on "RWPG Ranking Data" worksheet

[illegible]

AGENDA ITEM 5

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)

AGENDA ITEM 6

Review/Approve Administrator's Budget for CY2014

South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group
Statement of Revenues and Expenditures
For the period ended September 30, 2013

Region L Administrative	1/1/09-12/31/09	1/1/10-12/31/10	1/1/11-12/31/11	1/1/12-12/31/12	1/1/13-12/31/13
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Administration Expenditures					
Professional Services	735.00	210.00	577.50	227.5	420
Professional Services-Other				10,354.00	
Communications	948.78	553.26	1,296.04	1,104.77	619.58
Other	318.04	191.37	393.53	144.81	981.52
Advertising	1,371.62	2,632.39	2,389.48	1,071.60	1,230.38
Labor Costs	<u>52,773.54</u>	<u>29,789.69</u>	<u>22,485.08</u>	<u>24,681.47</u>	<u>26,555.96</u>
Total Expenditures	<u><u>56,146.98</u></u>	<u><u>33,376.71</u></u>	<u><u>27,141.63</u></u>	<u><u>37,584.15</u></u>	<u><u>29,807.44</u></u>

* as of 9/30/13

South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group
Statement of Administrative Costs
2014

ADMINISTRATIVE	2012 BUDGET	2013 BUDGET	PROPOSED 2014
Supplies	\$1,950.00	\$1,950.00	\$1,950.00
Professional Services	\$1,250.00	\$1,250.00	\$1,250.00
Communications	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
Travel	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Advertising	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
Labor Costs	\$48,300.00	\$48,300.00	\$48,300.00
TOTAL	\$58,000.00	\$58,000.00	\$58,000.00

Supplies – items that are consumed or deteriorated through use; computer paper, checks, office supplies, and miscellaneous supplies (lunches).

Professional Services – legal fees, etc.

Communications – telephone and postage.

Travel – reimbursement of SCTRWPG member travel and other expenses.

Advertising – publishing notices in newspapers of general circulation within the planning area.

Labor Costs – SARA staff time associated with administration.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) Communications

- TWDB Administrative Update
- New Planning Group Member Presentation

AGENDA ITEM 8

Report, Discussion and Appropriate Action from Work Group

- Carrizo Aquifer Work Group, Greg Sengelmann

AGENDA ITEM 9

Presentation of “Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB) Water Supply Enhancement Program – Enhancing Surface and Ground Water Supplies Through Brush Control in Region L” –
Aaron Wendt, TSSWCB Natural Resources Specialist

AGENDA ITEM 10

Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Consultants Work and Schedule

- Technical Memorandum Update

2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan Proposed Workplan for Development





[illegible]

**Technical
Memorandum:
*August 1, 2014***

**IPP Deadline:
May 1, 2015**

**RWP Deadline:
November 2, 2015**

Legend:

-  ***SCTRWPG Action***
-  ***TWDB Action***
-  ***Scheduled SCTRWPG Meeting***
-  ***Probable SCTRWPG Meeting***

Potential Issues For The 2016 SCTRWP

November 7, 2013

- 1) Carrizo Aquifer Workgroup (Status: Workgroup On-Going)
 - a) Multiple Potentially Feasible Projects Exceed MAG
 - b) TWDB will not allow for over-allocation in the 2016 RWP
- 2) Importing Groundwater from Other Regions (Status: No Action Thus Far)
- 3) Meeting Needs of Formosa (Status: Con Mims has discussed with LNRA)
 - a) Coordination with Regions P and N
- 4) Implementation of TCEQ Estuary Environmental Flow Standards (Status: No documentation from TCEQ; Proceed based on comments with TCEQ)
- 5) Population and/or Water Demand Projections Revisions (Status: Finished)
- 6) Eagle-Ford Shale Demands – Direct, Indirect, and Induced (Status: Finished)
- 7) Whooping Crane Litigation (Status: District Court Decision Stayed Pending Appeal; Oral Arguments heard in August / Awaiting Ruling from Appellate Court)
- 8) Meeting Steam-Electric Needs in Victoria County (Status: No Action Thus Far)
- 9) Inter-Regional Coordination (e.g. SAWS Competitive Sealed Proposals) (Status: Interviews on 10/18; Staff Recommendation to Board in December 2013)
- 10) Legislation (Status: Legislative Session Ended; Responding to legislation adopted in 2013)

AGENDA ITEM 11

Report on TWDB Final Recommendations on Population and Water Demand Projections, Results of Phase 2 Survey to Water User Groups (WUG) and Wholesale Water Providers (WWP) and Draft Needs Analysis Review (Tasks 4A & 4B)

Results of Revision Requests
**Final Municipal Population
and Water Demand
Projections**

***2016 South Central Texas Regional
Water Plan***

November 7, 2013

Timeline

- **August 1, 2013 – Region L Planning Group Mtg;
Requests approved for submittal**
- **August & September 2013 – HDR and TWDB work
together on revision requests**
- **September 23, 2013 – Staff finalizes their
recommendations to the Board**
- **October 17, 2013 – TWDB approves Staff
recommendations**

Eagle Ford Shale Requests

- **County-wide water demand projection revisions:**
 - DeWitt
 - Dimmit
 - Goliad
 - Gonzales
 - Karnes
 - La Salle
 - Refugio
- **HDR worked with TWDB to allocate county-wide revisions to individual WUGs**
- **TWDB accepted all EFS revision requests**

Approved Revision Requests

- **Converse (Population & Water Demand)**
- **Schertz (Population & Water Demand)**
- **Fair Oaks Ranch (Population & Water Demand)**
- **San Marcos (Population & Water Demand)**
- **Plum Creek Water Co (Population & Water Demand)**

Approved Revision Requests – Cont.

- County-Other adjustments made include:
 - Bexar (Population Only)
 - Caldwell (Population Only)
 - Comal (Population Only)
 - Hays (Population Only)
 - Kendall (Population Only)

Partially-Approved Revision Requests

- Cibolo

	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft Population	18,702	22,485	26,356	30,141	33,994	37,777
Requested Population	37,000	54,800	71,200	89,000	106,800	122,800
Final Population	37,000	54,800	64,234	73,459	82,849	92,069

	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft Water Demand (acft/yr)	2,729	3,239	3,776	4,303	4,844	5,379
Requested Water Demand (acft/yr)	5,343	7,823	10,136	12,650	15,167	17,431
Final Water Demand (acft/yr)	5,343	7,823	9,148	10,447	11,773	13,075

Revision Requests Not Approved

- Comal County (Population)
- Cotulla (Population & Water Demand***)
- La Vernia (Population & Water Demand)
- SS WSC (Population & Water Demand)

*** Note: Cotulla water demand projections were increased due to the Eagle Ford Shale revision

Regional Summary

- 17 Revision Requests by Region L
 - 10 Entities + 7 EFS Counties
 - Resulted in 61 WUG Pieces to be considered for revision
- Total Population
 - 2040 - Increased from 3.841 million to 3.920 million (+2.1%)
 - 2070 - Increased from 5.119 million to 5.192 million (+1.5%)
- Total Water Demands
 - 2040 - Increased from 566k acft/yr to 582k acft/yr (+2.9%)
 - 2070 - Increased from 741k acft/yr to 754k acft/yr (+1.8%)

Phase 2 Survey Results

***2016 South Central Texas Regional
Water Plan***

November 7, 2013

Overall Survey Results

- **Survey Sent to 137 Total WUGs**
 - Sent on September 30th with a deadline of October 18th
 - Additionally, HDR has been working with all WWP
- **Survey Seen By 39 WUGs (28.5%)**
 - Along with WWP, represent 76.4% of Population
- **Seven (7) WUGs requested changes or provided information**
 - COUNTY LINE SUD
 - EAST MEDINA COUNTY SUD
 - GREEN VALLEY SUD
 - MCCOY WSC
 - SS WSC
 - SAN MARCOS
 - THE OAKS WSC

WUG Respondents

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASHERTON • BENTON CITY WSC • CASTROVILLE • CIBOLO • COMAL COUNTY-OTHER • COTULLA • COUNTY LINE WSC • CREEDMOOR-MAHA WSC • EAST CENTRAL SUD • EAST MEDINA COUNTY SUD • FAIR OAKS RANCH • GARDEN RIDGE • GREEN VALLEY SUD • KARNES CITY • KENDALL COUNTY WCID #1 • KENEDY • MARION • MARTINDALE • MAXWELL WSC • MCCOY WSC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NATALIA • NEW BERLIN • NEW BRAUNFELS • NIXON • PLEASANTON • PLUM CREEK WATER COMPANY • S S WSC • SAN MARCOS • SANTA CLARA • SCHERTZ • SEGUIN • SOMERSET • ST. HEDWIG • TERRELL HILLS • THE OAKS WSC • UNIVERSAL CITY • VICTORIA • WIMBERLEY WSC • YANCEY WSC |
|--|--|

Revision Requests

- **COUNTY LINE SUD**
 - Asked that their name be corrected.
 - Provided that they are part of HCPUA
- **EAST MEDINA COUNTY SUD**
 - Provided additional information regarding Edwards permits
- **GREEN VALLEY SUD**
 - Provided information regarding existing supplies & WMSs
- **MCCOY WSC**
 - Provided alternative demand projections & information about existing supplies

Revision Requests

- **S S WSC**
 - HDR to follow up
- **SAN MARCOS**
 - Provided additional information to delineate San Marcos from Texas State University
- **THE OAKS WSC**
 - Provided information regarding their Wholesale connection with SAWS (existing supply)

AGENDA ITEM 12

Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Evaluation and Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies (Task 4B), Draft Scopes of Work and Budgets for Submittal to TWDB and Inclusion into Planning Contract, TWDB Contract No. 1148301323 (Task 4D)

TASK 4D
WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES
Scope and Budget #3

Perform Technical Evaluations including Cost Estimates

Perform technical evaluations, including cost estimates and documentation, of the following water management strategies (WMS) to be consistent with current projections of water supply needs and facilities planning pursuant to TWDB rules and guidance. Work effort involves coordination with sponsoring water user group(s), wholesale water provider(s), and/or other resource agencies regarding projected needs, planned facilities, costs of water supply, endangered or threatened species, etc. Work effort includes cost estimates and supporting documentation to reflect the September 2013 cost basis for the 2016 regional water plans pursuant to TWDB guidance.

Water Resources Integration Pipeline (SAWS) \$5,400

Coordinate with the San Antonio Water System (SAWS) in order to be consistent with their Water Supply Plan regarding this WMS with technical focus on available information regarding pipeline route, transmission capacity, and drought operations relevant to the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (EAHCP). Estimate cost of project and document in the technical evaluation. Note: WMS is necessary to bring multiple water supply sources to the city from the Twin Oaks Water Treatment Plant (WTP) and Aquifer Storage & Recovery (ASR) facility, and does not introduce new supply. Budget for technical evaluation does not include Edwards Aquifer simulations.

Advanced Meter Infrastructure (SAWS) \$3,000

Coordinate with SAWS in order to be consistent with their Water Supply Plan regarding this WMS with technical focus on available information regarding number of meters and potential water savings. Estimate cost of project and document in the technical evaluation. Note: WMS is necessary to implement SAWS advanced water conservation strategies.

Integrated Water-Power Project (GBRA) \$11,400

Coordinate with GBRA in order to be consistent with latest plans regarding this WMS. Perform technical evaluation using available information regarding location of desalination WTP, ultimate treatment and transmission capacity, delivery locations, and timeframe for implementation. Estimate cost of project and prepare documentation of technical evaluation.

Luling ASR (GBRA) \$13,500

Coordinate with GBRA in order to be consistent with latest plans regarding this WMS. Perform technical evaluation using available information regarding location of ASR well field, water treatment plant capacity expansion, delivery locations, and timeframe for implementation. Estimate cost of project and prepare documentation of technical evaluation. Budget does not include Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer simulations.

New Braunfels ASR Project (NBU) \$12,200

Coordinate with New Braunfels Utilities (NBU) in order to be consistent with latest plans regarding this WMS. Perform technical evaluation using available information regarding location of ASR well field, water treatment plant capacity expansion, delivery locations, and timeframe for implementation.

Estimate cost of project and prepare documentation of technical evaluation. Budget does not include Trinity or Edwards Aquifer simulations.

New Braunfels Trinity Well Field (NBU) \$10,000

Coordinate with NBU in order to be consistent with latest plans regarding this WMS. Perform technical evaluation using available information regarding location of Trinity Aquifer well field, availability of Trinity Aquifer water relative to approved estimates of Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG), water treatment plant capacity, delivery locations, and timeframe for implementation. Estimate cost of project and prepare documentation of technical evaluation. Budget does not include Trinity Aquifer simulations.

TWA Trinity Well Field/Western Comal Project/Upper Cibolo Valley Project \$10,000

Coordinate with the Texas Water Alliance (TWA) in order to be consistent with latest plans regarding this WMS. Perform technical evaluation using available information regarding location of Trinity Aquifer well field, availability of Trinity Aquifer water relative to approved estimates of MAG, water treatment plant capacity, potential customers and delivery locations, and timeframe for implementation. Estimate cost of project and prepare documentation of technical evaluation. Budget does not include Trinity Aquifer simulations.

Update Technical Evaluation including Cost Estimates

Update technical evaluations, including cost estimates and documentation, of the following water management strategies to be consistent with current projections of water supply needs and facilities planning pursuant to TWDB rules and guidance. Work effort involves coordination with sponsoring water user group(s), wholesale water provider(s), and/or other resource agencies regarding any changed conditions in terms of projected needs, strategy modifications, planned facilities, costs of water supply, endangered or threatened species, etc. Work effort includes research and revision of cost estimation procedures, cost estimates, and supporting documentation to reflect the September 2013 cost basis for the 2016 regional water plans pursuant to TWDB guidance.

Edwards Transfers \$14,400

Acquire latest information regarding transfers of Edwards Aquifer permits through sales and leases. Update technical evaluation integrating effects of EAHCP implementation (i.e. VISPO and SAWS ASR elements). Update estimated cost of project and technical evaluation documentation. Budget does not include assessment of regional economic effects of Edwards Transfers.

Purchase from WWP \$15,000

Coordinate with Wholesale Water Providers (WWPs) and Water User Groups (WUGs) to allocate future amounts of wholesale water supplies available to meet WUG needs. Update technical evaluation and associated summaries using available information regarding amounts, delivery locations, and timeframe for implementation. Update estimated cost of project and technical evaluation documentation.

Expansion Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, Guadalupe Co (SSLGC) \$10,900

Coordinate with the Schertz-Seguin Local Government Corporation (SSLGC) in order to be consistent with latest plans regarding this WMS. Update technical evaluation using available information regarding groundwater permit status with due consideration of Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG), delivery

locations, and timeframe for implementation. Update estimated cost of project and technical evaluation documentation. Budget does not include Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer simulations.

Lavaca River Off-Channel Reservoir \$7,900

Coordinate with the Lavaca-Navidad River Authority (LNRA) in order to be consistent with latest plans regarding this WMS. Update technical evaluation using available information regarding surface water availability, off-channel reservoir size and location, delivery locations, and timeframe for implementation. Update estimated cost of project and technical evaluation documentation.

Brackish Wilcox Groundwater for SS WSC \$10,000

Coordinate with SS Water Supply Corporation (WSC) in order to be consistent with latest plans regarding this WMS. Update technical evaluation using available information regarding groundwater permit status with due consideration of Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG), well field and water treatment plant locations, delivery locations, and timeframe for implementation. Update estimated cost of project and technical evaluation documentation. Budget does not include Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer simulations.

Total = \$123,700

Previously Authorized (May & Aug 2013) = \$251,450

Grand Total = \$375,150

Total Task 4D Budget = \$509,000

Budget Left To Be Allocated = \$133,850

<u>Previously Authorized</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (EA HCP)	\$5,800
Water Conservation	\$8,950
Drought Management	\$8,950
Recycled Water Program Expansion	\$4,200
Local Groundwater	\$19,900
Surface Water Rights	\$4,100
Facilities Expansions	\$4,700
Balancing Storage (ASR and/or Surface)	\$4,100
Wells Ranch – Phase 2 (CRWA and Others)	\$12,200
Brackish Wilcox for CRWA (Formerly Brackish Wilcox for the RWA)	\$12,200
Hays/Caldwell PUA – Phases 1 & 2 (San Marcos, Buda, Kyle, CRWA)	\$21,600
CRWA Siesta Project (CRWA)	\$14,500
Brackish Wilcox for SAWS	\$17,400
Expanded Local Carrizo – Bexar County (SAWS)	\$14,000
Brackish-Wilcox, Gonzales County (SSLGC)	\$13,250
Texas Water Alliance Carrizo Well Field, Gonzales County (TWA)	\$18,100
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, Wilson County (Cibolo Valley Local Government Corporation)	\$18,600
GBRA Mid-Basin Project and Alternatives (GBRA)	\$10,900
GBRA Lower Basin Off-Channel Reservoir (GBRA)	\$18,900
GBRA Lower Basin New Appropriation (GBRA)	\$19,100

AGENDA ITEM 13

Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Authorizing Political Subdivision to Submit Request for Notice-to-Proceed for Evaluation of Twelve Water Management Strategies and Authorize Administrator to Execute Contract Amendment with TWDB

AGENDA ITEM 14

Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies (Task 4B), Draft Scopes of Work and Budgets for Consideration at the Next South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group Meeting

List of Potential Water Management Strategies to Be Scoped for February 2014 SCTRWPG Meeting

Regional Water Supply Project – RFCSP (SAWS) *[Previously Authorized]*

Regional Brackish Wilcox Project – Alternative (SAWS) *[Previously Authorized]*

Carrizo/Buda/Austin Chalk/Leona & Regional ASR (City of Uvalde) *[Previously Authorized]*

Carrizo Transfers

Brush Management

Recycled Water Management Strategy – Amendment

AGENDA. ITEM 15

Set Dates and Times of Regional Water Planning Group Meetings for
2014

DATES AND TIMES OF SCTRWPG MEETINGS 2014

Thursday, February 6, 2014 at 10:00 am

* SWG to be held on Thursday, January 23, 2014

Thursday, May 1, 2014 at 10:00 am

* SWG to be held on Thursday, April 17, 2014

Thursday, August 7, 2014 at 10:00 am

* SWG to be held on Thursday, July 24, 2014

Thursday, November 6, 2014 at 10:00 am

* SWG to be held on Thursday, October 23, 2014

*NOTE: All Planning Group Meetings scheduled to be held at SAWS'
Customer Service Building, Room CR-145