#### Senate Bill 1 South Central Texas RWPG Staff Workgroup Meeting January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014 at 9:30am

- 1) Region L Carrizo WMS Work Group Update
- 2) Update of Regional Water Planning Project Prioritization
- 3) Status of Technical Consultants Work and Schedule
  - a. Review schedule, budget and list of potential issues
  - b. Review of draft scopes and budgets for 7 WMS:

Carrizo Transfers Brush Management Recycled Water Management Strategy – Amendment Hays County-ForeStar Water Regional Water Supply Project – RFCSP (SAWS) Regional Brackish Wilcox Project – Alternative (SAWS) Carrizo/Buda/Austin Chalk/Leona & Regional ASR (City of Uvalde)

- c. Review list of potentially feasible water management strategies for authorization to begin draft scopes of work and budget at May meeting (if any)
- d. Presentation and review of WMSs for discussion at February RWPG Meeting
- 4) Review Agenda for February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Planning Group Meeting
  - a. Review solicitation documents for Water District vacancy (tentative schedule, nomination form, public notice)
- 5) Other

# AGENDA ITEM 1

Region L Carrizo WMS Work Group Update

## South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group Carrizo Aquifer Workgroup Summary of Activities and Recommendations

#### 1. Introduction

The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) requires that planning groups use the approved Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) values for regional and state water planning purposes. Hence, regional water planning groups cannot explicitly plan on existing supplies or future Water Management Strategies (WMSs) in excess of the approved MAGs for each region, county, and/or aquifer.

The South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group (SCTRWPG) established a Carrizo Aquifer Workgroup with the following charge:

To study water management strategies shown on the WMS list provided by Technical Consultants at February 2013 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 and present a report at the May 2013 meeting.

In addition the Workgroup was asked to "answer the MAG questions", i.e., to what extent may the Planning Group look at the MAG(s) for potential WMS' – how much has already been permitted, what remains for Carrizo Aquifer WMS' and how do we quantify against exempt uses?

In following its charge, the workgroup evaluated the degrees to which current MAG values have been allocated to exempt, grandfathered, and permitted uses in order to assess groundwater available for recommended and/or alternative WMSs to be included in the 2016 regional water plan. Ultimately, the Workgroup is to provide recommendations to the SCTRWPG as to how the development of potentially feasible WMS including groundwater supplies can be reflected in the 2016 regional water plan while respecting the regulatory authority of groundwater conservation districts (GCDs), complying with TWDB guidance for regional water planning, and treating competing interests seeking to use limited groundwater supplies in an equitable manner.

The Carrizo Workgroup met four times (April 15, 2013, May 22, 2013, November 6, 2013, and November 25, 2013) to develop its recommendations and this document summarizes the results of these meetings and the recommendations of the Carrizo Aquifer Workgroup.

#### 2. Data Acquisition

In order to accomplish its charge, the workgroup compiled available information about MAGs, exempt and grandfathered water uses, and production permits by aquifer, county, and groundwater conservation district. MAG values were acquired from the TWDB, as approved by the Groundwater Management Areas (GMAs).

HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR) provided technical support in contacting groundwater conservation districts to acquire permitted, exempt, and grandfathered amounts (where applicable). The sum of permitted, exempt, and grandfathered uses is referenced herein as "allocated" groundwater. Several groundwater conservation

districts were able to promptly provide the information, while others required some time to gather the data. In some cases, groundwater conservation districts could not provide the requested data. Table 1 summarizes the permitted, grandfathered, and produced amounts for the Carrizo and Wilcox Aquifers, respectively. Note that the TWDB considers the Carrizo and Wilcox formations as one aquifer for planning purposes.

Existing permitting information was supplied by the Gonzales County UWCD, the Plum Creek CD, Guadalupe County GCD, Evergreen UWCD, and Medina County GCD. Gonzales County UWCD also provided information regarding grandfathered uses (as it appears they are the only groundwater conservation district to have this category in the region). Uvalde County UWCD stated that they would provide permitting information; however, none has been received to-date. The Wintergarden GCD stated that it did not have permit information in the Carrizo or Wilcox Aquifers. Bexar County does not have a groundwater conservation district, so the latest pumpage projection values are reported.

Table 1. Permitted, Grandfathered and Produced Amounts for the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer by County

Gonzal	es	County	v
GOIIZai	<b>C</b> 3	Count	y.

Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
SSLGC	19,362	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
SAWS	11,688	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
CRWA	7,400	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
TWA	13,846	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
Gonzales Co WSC	712	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
Smiley	730	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
Nixon	3,629	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
Irrigation	4,242	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
Gonzales	5,805	Carrizo	Grandfathered	GCUWCD
Gonzales Co WSC	2,800	Carrizo	Grandfathered	GCUWCD
Smiley	242	Carrizo	Grandfathered	GCUWCD
Warm Springs	403	Carrizo	Grandfathered	GCUWCD
Irrigation	73	Wilcox	Grandfathered	GCUWCD

dwel	Countv
	dwel

Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
HCPUA	10,300	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
TWA	1,154	Carrizo	Permitted	GCUWCD
Aqua WSC	5,000	Carrizo	Grandfathered	GCUWCD
NA	0	Carrizo	Permitted	PCCD
Irrigation	4,078	Wilcox	Grandfathered	GCUWCD
Lockhart	5,475	Wilcox	Permitted	PCCD
Polonia	3,895	Wilcox	Permitted	PCCD
Luling	1,612	Wilcox	Permitted	PCCD
Aqua WSC	625	Wilcox	Permitted	PCCD
Cal-Maine (Ind)	600	Wilcox	Permitted	PCCD
Irrigation	1,758	Wilcox	Permitted	PCCD

Atascosa County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	162,271	Carrizo	Permitted	Evergreen
Unspecified	1,425	Wilcox	Permitted	Evergreen
Frio County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	252,548	Carrizo	Permitted	Evergreen
Unspecified	3,963	Wilcox	Permitted	Evergreen
Karnes County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	140,105	Carrizo	Permitted	Evergreen
Unspecified	0	Wilcox	Permitted	Evergreen
Wilson County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	80,003	Carrizo	Permitted	Evergreen
Unspecified	1,673	Wilcox	Permitted	Evergreen
Guadalupe County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	6,389	Carrizo	Permitted	GCGCD
Unspecified	3,497	Wilcox	Permitted	GCGCD
Dimmit County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	N/A	Carrizo-Wilcox	Allocated	Wintergarden
La Salle County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	N/A	Carrizo-Wilcox	Allocated	Wintergarden
Zavala County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	N/A	Carrizo-Wilcox	Allocated	Wintergarden
Bexar County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	12,819	Carrizo	Produced*	N/A
N/A	0	Wilcox	N/A	N/A

iviedina County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	994	Carrizo-Wilcox	Permitted	MCGCD
Uvalde County				
Owner	Amount (acft/yr)	Aquifer	Туре	GCD
Unspecified	N/A	Carrizo-Wilcox	Allocated	UCGCD

#### 3. Comparison of MAGS and Allocated Groundwater

After evaluating the compiled information, the consensus of the workgroup is that it should be assumed that all allocated groundwater will eventually be used, thus full allocated amounts should be used for planning rather than projected pumpage amounts. If permitted water is not being used by a permit holder, then it can be assumed that someone else may purchase the permit or lease the rights to produce groundwater under the permit.

Exempt water use projections were obtained from the TWDB and are consistent with modeling performed by the TWDB during the GMA process, including calculation of the MAGs. No exempt use amount was available for Bexar County. The only groundwater district providing an alternative exempt use amount to the Workgroup was the Plum Creek CD. The Workgroup discussed whether alternative exempt use amounts provided by GCDs should be used, but ultimately decided to use those provided and approved by the TWDB. If a groundwater conservation district obtains TWDB approval of an alternative exempt use amount, it may be counted against the MAG in this or a future planning cycle.

The exempt water use projections, permitted, grandfathered, and production data (i.e. allocated groundwater) were then compared against the MAGs to identify where allocated groundwater exceeds the MAG (Table 2).

Gonzales County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	62,316	70,317	75,791	75,970	75,970	75,970
Exempt	1215	1025	890	850	863	863
SSLGC	19,362	19,362	19,362	19,362	19,362	19,362
SAWS	11,688	11,688	11,688	11,688	11,688	11,688
CRWA	7,400	7,400	7,400	7,400	7,400	7,400
TWA	3,846	13,846	13,846	13,846	13,846	13,846
Gonzales Co WSC	712	712	712	712	712	712
Smiley	730	730	730	730	730	730
Nixon	3,629	3,629	3,629	3,629	3,629	3,629
Irrigation	4,242	4,242	4,242	4,242	4,242	4,242
Gonzales	5,805	5,805	5,805	5,805	5 <i>,</i> 805	5,805
Gonzales Co WSC	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800

#### Table 2. MAGs, Exempt Use, and Allocations for the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer by County

Smiley	242	242	242	242	242	242
Warm Springs	403	403	403	403	403	403
Irrigation	73	73	73	73	73	73
Totals	62,147	71,957	71,822	71,782	71,795	71,795
Caldwell County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	44,607	44,199	44,199	43,622	43,622	43,622
Exempt	164	148	135	123	112	112
HCPUA	2000	10300	10300	10300	10300	10300
TWA	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154
Aqua WSC	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	4,078	4,078	4,078	4,078	4,078	4,078
Lockhart	5,475	5,475	5,475	5,475	5,475	5,475
Polonia	3,895	3,895	3,895	3,895	3,895	3,895
Luling	1,612	1,612	1,612	1,612	1,612	1,612
Aqua WSC	625	625	625	625	625	625
Cal-Maine (Ind)	600	600	600	600	600	600
Irrigation	1,758	1,758	1,758	1,758	1,758	1,758
Totals	26,361	34,645	34,632	34,620	34,609	34,609
Alexandra Country	ND 2020	VD 2020	VD 2040	VD 2050	VD 2000	VD 2070
Atascosa County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	9R 2020 68,776	70,369	71,947	73,786	75,808	75,808
MAG Exempt	<b>FR 2020</b> <b>68,776</b> 578	<b>70,369</b> 438	<b>71,947</b> 333	<b>73,786</b> 251	75,808 191	<b>75,808</b> 191
MAG Exempt Unspecified	<b>68,776</b> 578 162,271	<b>70,369</b> 438 162,271	<b>71,947</b> 333 162,271	<b>73,786</b> 251 162,271	<b>75,808</b> 191 162,271	<b>75,808</b> 191 162,271
MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified	68,776 578 162,271 1,425	<b>70,369</b> 438 162,271 1,425	<b>71,940</b> 333 162,271 1,425	<b>73,786</b> 251 162,271 1,425	<b>75,808</b> 191 162,271 1,425	<b>75,808</b> 191 162,271 1,425
MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals	68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274	<b>70,369</b> 438 162,271 1,425 <b>164,134</b>	<b>71,947</b> 333 162,271 1,425 <b>164,029</b>	73,786 251 162,271 1,425 163,947	75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887	75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County	9R 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020	<b>70,369</b> 438 162,271 1,425 <b>164,134</b> <b>YR 2030</b>	<b>71,947</b> 333 162,271 1,425 <b>164,029</b> <b>YR 2040</b>	73,786 251 162,271 1,425 163,947 YR 2050	75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2060	75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG	YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089	YR 2030 70,369 438 162,271 1,425 164,134 YR 2030 76,734	YR 2040         71,947         333         162,271         1,425         164,029         YR 2040         74,439	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222	YR 2060 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2060 70,030	75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt	YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645	YR 2030 70,369 438 162,271 1,425 164,134 YR 2030 76,734 719	YR 2040 71,947 333 162,271 1,425 164,029 YR 2040 74,439 781	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826	YR 2060 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2060 70,030 849	YR 2070 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt Unspecified	YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645 252,548	YR 2030 70,369 438 162,271 1,425 164,134 YR 2030 76,734 719 252,548	YR 2040 71,947 333 162,271 1,425 164,029 YR 2040 74,439 781 252,548	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826         252,548	75,808         191         162,271         1,425         163,887         YR 2060         70,030         849         252,548	75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849 252,548
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified	YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645 252,548 3,963	YR 2030         70,369         438         162,271         1,425         164,134         YR 2030         76,734         719         252,548         3,963	YR 2040         71,947         333         162,271         1,425         164,029         YR 2040         74,439         781         252,548         3,963	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826         252,548         3,963	75,808         191         162,271         1,425         163,887         YR 2060         70,030         849         252,548         3,963	YR 2070 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849 252,548 3,963
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals	<pre>YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645 252,548 3,963 257,155</pre>	YR 2030 70,369 438 162,271 1,425 164,134 YR 2030 76,734 719 252,548 3,963 257,229	71,947         333         162,271         1,425         164,029         YR 2040         74,439         781         252,548         3,963         257,291	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826         252,548         3,963         257,336	YR 2060 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2060 70,030 849 252,548 3,963 257,359	YR 2070 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849 252,548 3,963 257,359
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Karnes County	YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645 252,548 3,963 257,155 YR 2020	YR 2030         70,369         438         162,271         1,425         164,134         YR 2030         76,734         719         252,548         3,963         257,229         YR 2030	YR 2040         71,947         333         162,271         1,425         164,029         YR 2040         74,439         781         252,548         3,963         257,291         YR 2040	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826         252,548         3,963         257,336         YR 2050	75,808         191         162,271         1,425         163,887         YR 2060         70,030         849         252,548         3,963         257,359         YR 2060	<pre>YR 2070 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849 252,548 3,963 257,359 YR 2070</pre>
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Unspecified Totals Karnes County MAG	YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645 252,548 3,963 257,155 YR 2020 1,117	YR 2030         70,369         438         162,271         1,425         164,134         YR 2030         76,734         719         252,548         3,963         257,229         YR 2030         1,182	YR 2040         71,947         333         162,271         1,425         164,029         YR 2040         74,439         781         252,548         3,963         257,291         YR 2040         1,425	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826         252,548         3,963         257,336         YR 2050         1,425	75,808         191         162,271         1,425         163,887         YR 2060         70,030         849         252,548         3,963         257,359         YR 2060         1,280	YR 2070 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849 252,548 3,963 257,359 YR 2070 1,280
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Unspecified Totals Karnes County MAG Exempt	YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645 252,548 3,963 257,155 YR 2020 1,117 4	YR 2030         70,369         438         162,271         1,425         164,134         YR 2030         76,734         719         252,548         3,963         257,229         YR 2030         1,182         4	YR 2040         71,947         333         162,271         1,425         164,029         YR 2040         74,439         781         252,548         3,963         257,291         YR 2040         1,231         5	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826         252,548         3,963         257,336         YR 2050         1,259         5	YR 2060 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2060 70,030 849 252,548 3,963 257,359 YR 2060 1,280 5	<pre>YR 2070 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849 252,548 3,963 257,359 YR 2070 1,280 5</pre>
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Karnes County MAG Exempt Unspecified	<pre>YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645 252,548 3,963 257,155 YR 2020 1,117 4 140,105</pre>	YR 2030         70,369         438         162,271         1,425         164,134         YR 2030         76,734         719         252,548         3,963         257,229         YR 2030         1,182         4         140,105	YR 2040         71,947         333         162,271         1,425         164,029         YR 2040         74,439         781         252,548         3,963         257,291         YR 2040         1,231         5         140,105	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826         252,548         3,963         257,336         YR 2050         1,259         5         140,105	75,808         191         162,271         1,425         163,887         YR 2060         70,030         849         252,548         3,963         257,359         YR 2060         1,280         5         140,105	YR 2070 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849 252,548 3,963 257,359 YR 2070 1,280 5 140,105
Atascosa County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Frio County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Totals Karnes County MAG Exempt Unspecified Unspecified Unspecified Unspecified Unspecified	YR 2020 68,776 578 162,271 1,425 164,274 YR 2020 79,089 645 252,548 3,963 257,155 YR 2020 1,117 4 140,105 0	YR 2030         70,369         438         162,271         1,425         164,134         YR 2030         76,734         719         252,548         3,963         257,229         YR 2030         1,182         4         140,105         0	YR 2040         71,947         333         162,271         1,425         164,029         YR 2040         74,439         781         252,548         3,963         257,291         YR 2040         1,231         5         140,105         0	73,786         251         162,271         1,425         163,947         YR 2050         72,222         826         252,548         3,963         257,336         YR 2050         1,259         5         140,105         0	75,808         191         162,271         1,425         163,887         YR 2060         70,030         849         252,548         3,963         257,359         YR 2060         1,280         5         140,105         0	<pre>YR 2070 75,808 191 162,271 1,425 163,887 YR 2070 70,030 849 252,548 3,963 257,359 YR 2070 1,280 5 140,105 0</pre>

Wilson County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	36,986	38,717	40,486	42,531	44,794	44,794
Exempt	850	1,144	1,429	1,724	2,029	2,029
Unspecified	80,003	80,003	80,003	80,003	80,003	80,003
Unspecified	1,673	1,673	1,673	1,673	1,673	1,673
Totals	82,526	82,820	83,105	83,400	83,705	83,705
Guadalupe County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	10,833	11,283	13,021	13,541	14,041	14,041
Exempt	264	198	127	73	17	17
Unspecified	6,389	6,389	6,389	6,389	6,389	6,389
Unspecified	3,497	3,497	3,497	3,497	3,497	3,497
Totals	10,150	10,084	10,013	9,959	9,903	9,903
Dimmit County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359
Exempt	509	527	529	519	493	493
Unspecified	2,850	2,832	2,830	2,840	2,866	2,866
Totals	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359
La Salle County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454
Exempt	278	303	322	334	341	341
Unspecified	6,176	6,151	6,132	6,120	6,113	6,113
Totals	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454
Zavala County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	35,859	35,521	35,388	35,288	34,969	34,969
Exempt	696	780	864	931	961	961
Unspecified	35,163	34,741	34,524	34,357	34,008	34,008
Totals	35,859	35,521	35,388	35,288	34,969	34,969
Bexar County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	26,278	26,278	26,278	26,278	26,107	26,107
Exempt	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unspecified	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819
Medina County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	2,545	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533
Exempt	549	648	734	817	892	892
Unspecified	994	994	994	994	994	994
Totals	1,543	1,642	1,728	1,811	1,886	1,886

Moore 1-18-2014 Edits Accepted

Uvalde County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	1,230	828	828	828	828	828
Exempt	43	49	54	58	60	60
Unspecified	1,187	779	774	770	768	768
Totals	1,230	828	828	828	828	828

Considering the sums of permitted, grandfathered (where applicable), and exempt uses (i.e. allocated groundwater) in each county shows that there are four counties in which the combined Carrizo-Wilcox allocated amounts through the entire 2020 to 2070 planning cycle decades are greater than the MAG: Atascosa, Frio, Karnes, and Wilson Counties. In Gonzales County, the combined Carrizo-Wilcox allocated amounts are greater than the MAG in the 2030 decade only.

#### 4. Key Questions Considered

For aquifers in counties in which allocated groundwater is less than the MAG, Region L may rely on the full permit amounts for existing uses and potentially feasible WMSs. Additionally, the MAG amount less the allocated groundwater amount can be available for WMSs to the extent they require new permits. However, for the counties in which allocated groundwater exceeds the MAG, the Workgroup addressed the four key questions below. Recommendations (i.e. responses to these questions) are summarized in Section 4.

- 1. How to address allocated groundwater use in excess of the MAG when determining existing supplies?
- 2. How to plan for potentially feasible WMSs where allocated groundwater exceeds the MAG?
- 3. How to plan for potentially feasible WMSs where allocated groundwater is less than the MAG, but allocated groundwater plus WMSs exceeds the MAG?
- 4. How to present the technical evaluations of potentially feasible WMSs with firm supplies proportionately reduced or shown as zero for MAG compliance?

#### 5. Carrizo Aquifer Workgroup Recommendations

Following are the recommendations of the Carrizo Aquifer Workgroup for South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group consideration:

- When allocated groundwater exceeds the MAG in any decade, the Workgroup recommends that exempt use be maintained at the full estimated amount, while the permitted and grandfathered use amounts are reduced proportionately for planning purposes so that the total firm supply equals the MAG.
- 2. Where potentially feasible WMSs are contemplated that require new permits and allocated groundwater exceeds the MAG, show a firm supply of zero in the plan for the WMSs for planning purposes, but explain that groundwater for the WMSs may be obtained under existing permits through the Carrizo/Wilcox Transfers WMS or under new permits issued in accordance with GCD rules.

- 3. Where potentially feasible WMSs are contemplated that require new permits and allocated groundwater is less than the MAG, but allocated groundwater plus WMSs exceeds the MAG, show firm supplies of no more than the difference between allocated groundwater and the MAG in the plan for planning purposes, but explain that supplemental groundwater for the WMSs may be obtained under existing permits through the Carrizo/Wilcox Transfers WMS or under new permits issued in accordance with GCD rules.
- 4. For potentially feasible WMSs with firm supplies proportionately reduced or shown as zero for MAG compliance, evaluate facilities and costs for WMSs at both the reduced firm supply value associated with MAG compliance without transfers <u>and</u> at the supply amount that the sponsor seeks to develop.
- 5. For existing groundwater supplies that are fully permitted, or grandfathered, by a GCD and are proportionately reduced in quantity for planning purposes in this Plan for MAG compliance, include the following explanatory note in the regional water plan document and database at appropriate locations:

For each aquifer in the region, the GCDs have adopted desired future conditions (DFCs). In some GCDs, full use of all groundwater supplies (permitted, grandfathered and exempt) may result in non-achievement of the DFCs for an aquifer. To ensure consistency with the DFCs, TWDB currently requires that aroundwater availability for each aquifer be limited for planning purposes to the modeled available groundwater (MAG) for the aguifer. This has resulted, for planning purposes only, in adjustments to supply amounts in this plan for some areas for certain time periods. This should not be construed as recommending or requiring that GCDs make these adjustments. SCTRWPG recognizes and supports the ability of permit holders to exercise their rights to groundwater use in accordance with their permits and it recognizes and supports the GCDs' discretion to issue permits and grandfather historical users for amounts in excess of the MAG. SCTRWPG may not modify groundwater permits that GCDs have already issued or limit future permits that GCDs may issue. If the MAG is increased during or after this planning cycle, SCTRWPG may amend this Plan to adjust groundwater supply numbers that are affected by the new MAG amount.

6. For potentially feasible WMSs that have GCD permits for a portion of the needed supply and the remainder is not yet permitted, include the following explanatory note in the regional water plan document and database at appropriate locations:

For each aquifer in the region, the GCDs have adopted desired future conditions (DFCs). In some GCDs, full use of all groundwater supplies (permitted, grandfathered and exempt) may result in non-achievement of the DFCs for an aquifer. To ensure consistency with the DFCs, TWDB currently requires that groundwater availability for each aquifer be limited for planning purposes to the modeled available groundwater (MAG) for the aquifer. This has resulted, for planning purposes only, in adjustments to permit amounts, and a lack of firm water available for future permits in this plan for some areas for certain time periods. This should not be construed as recommending or requiring that GCDs make these adjustments, or deny future permit applications. SCTRWPG recognizes and supports the ability of permit holders to exercise their rights to groundwater use in accordance with their permits and it recognizes and supports the GCDs discretion to issue permits and grandfather historical users for amounts in excess of the MAG. SCTRWPG may not

modify groundwater permits that GCDs have already issued or limit future permits that GCDs may issue. If the MAG is increased during or after this planning cycle, SCTRWPG may amend this Plan to adjust groundwater supply numbers that are affected by the new MAG amount.

Based on these recommendations, remaining water amounts available for potentially feasible WMSs in the combined Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers for the 2016 Region L water plan are shown in Table 3.

#### Table 3. Supply for Regional Water Planning (based on MAG proration)

Gonzales County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	62,316	70,317	75,791	75,970	75,970	75,970
Exempt	1215	1025	890	850	863	863
SSLGC	19,362	18,914	19,362	19,362	19,362	19,362
SAWS	11,688	11,418	11,688	11,688	11,688	11,688
CRWA	7,400	7,229	7,400	7,400	7,400	7,400
TWA	3,846	13,526	13,846	13,846	13,846	13,846
Gonzales Co WSC	712	696	712	712	712	712
Smiley	730	713	730	730	730	730
Nixon	3,629	3,545	3,629	3,629	3,629	3,629
Irrigation	4,242	4,144	4,242	4,242	4,242	4,242
Gonzales	5,805	5,671	5 <i>,</i> 805	5,805	5,805	5,805
Gonzales Co WSC	2,800	2,735	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800
Smiley	242	236	242	242	242	242
Warm Springs	403	394	403	403	403	403
Irrigation	73	71	73	73	73	73
Totals	62,147	70,317	71,822	71,782	71,795	71,795
Remaining	169	0	3,969	4,188	4,175	4,175
Caldwell County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	44,607	44,199	44,199	43,622	43,622	43,622
Exempt	164	148	135	123	112	112
НСРИА	2000	10300	10300	10300	10300	10300
TWA	1,154	1.154	1 154	1.154	1,154	1,154
Aqua WSC		/ -	1,104	_,	_)_0 .	1)101
•	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
NA	5000 0	5000 0	5000 0	5000 0	5000 0	5000 0
NA Irrigation	5000 0 4,078	5000 0 4,078	5000 0 4,078	5000 0 4,078	5000 0 4,078	5000 0 4,078
NA Irrigation Lockhart	5000 0 4,078 5,475	5000 0 4,078 5,475	5000 0 4,078 5,475	5000 0 4,078 5,475	5000 0 4,078 5,475	5,475
NA Irrigation Lockhart Polonia	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895
NA Irrigation Lockhart Polonia Luling	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612	5,475 3,895 1,612
NA Irrigation Lockhart Polonia Luling Aqua WSC	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625
NA Irrigation Lockhart Polonia Luling Aqua WSC Cal-Maine (Ind)	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600	5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600
NA Irrigation Lockhart Polonia Luling Aqua WSC Cal-Maine (Ind) Irrigation	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758
NA Irrigation Lockhart Polonia Luling Aqua WSC Cal-Maine (Ind) Irrigation <b>Totals</b>	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758 <b>26,361</b>	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758 <b>34,645</b>	5,000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758 <b>34,632</b>	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758 <b>34,620</b>	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758 <b>34,609</b>	5000 0 4,078 5,475 3,895 1,612 625 600 1,758 <b>34,609</b>

Atascosa County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	68,776	70,369	71,947	73,786	75,808	75,808
Exempt	578	438	333	251	191	191
Unspecified	67,604	69,322	70,991	72,895	74,959	74,959
Unspecified	594	609	623	640	658	658
Totals	68,776	70,369	71,947	73,786	75,808	75,808
Remaining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frio County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	79,089	76,734	74,439	72,222	70,030	70,030
Exempt	645	719	781	826	849	849
Unspecified	77,232	74,841	72,520	70,293	68,112	68,112
Unspecified	1,212	1,174	1,138	1,103	1,069	1,069
Totals	79,089	76,734	74,439	72,222	70,030	70,030
Remaining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Karnes County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	1,117	1,182	1,231	1,259	1,280	1,280
Exempt	4	4	5	5	5	5
Unspecified	1,113	1,178	1,226	1,254	1,275	1,275
Unspecified	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	1,117	1,182	1,231	1,259	1,280	1,280
Remaining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wilson County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	36,986	38,717	40,486	42,531	44,794	44,794
Exempt	850	1,144	1,429	1,724	2,029	2,029
Unspecified	35,396	36,803	38,257	39,971	41,889	41,889
Unspecified	740	770	800	836	876	876
Totals	36,986	38,717	40,486	42,531	44,794	44,794
Remaining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guadalupe County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	10,833	11,283	13,021	13,541	14,041	14,041
Exempt	264	198	127	73	17	17
Unspecified	6,389	6,389	6,389	6,389	6,389	6,389
Unspecified	3,497	3,497	3,497	3,497	3,497	3,497
Totals	10,150	10,084	10,013	9,959	9,903	9,903
Remaining	683	1,199	3,008	3,582	4,138	4,138
Dimmit County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359	3,359
Exempt	509	527	529	519	493	493
Unspecified	2,850	2,832	2,830	2,840	2,866	2,866
Totala	2 259	3,359	3,359	3.359	3.359	3.359

Remaining	0	0	0	0	0	0
La Salle County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454
Exempt	278	303	322	334	341	341
Unspecified	6,176	6,151	6,132	6,120	6,113	6,113
Totals	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454	6,454
Remaining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zavala County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	35,859	35,521	35,388	35,288	34,969	34,969
Exempt	696	780	864	931	961	961
Unspecified	35,163	34,741	34,524	34,357	34,008	34,008
Totals	35,859	35,521	35,388	35,288	34,969	34,969
Remaining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bexar County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	26,278	26,278	26,278	26,278	26,107	26,107
Exempt	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unspecified	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819	12,819
Remaining	13,459	13,459	13,459	13,459	13,288	13,288
Medina County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	2,545	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533
Exempt	549	648	734	817	892	892
Unspecified	994	994	994	994	994	994
Totals	1,543	1,642	1,728	1,811	1,886	1,886
Remaining	1,002	891	805	722	647	647
Uvalde County	YR 2020	YR 2030	YR 2040	YR 2050	YR 2060	YR 2070
MAG	1,230	828	828	828	828	828
Exempt	43	49	54	58	60	60
Unspecified	1,187	779	774	770	768	768
Totals	1,230	828	828	828	828	828
Remaining	0	0	0	0	0	0

While Region L considers the MAGs on a county by county basis, GCDs manage groundwater resources by aquifer. Aquifers are not separated by county boundaries and the effects of pumpage from an aquifer extend across county lines. In addition, GCDs in GMA13 manage the Carrizo and Wilcox Aquifers separately and do not consider the aquifers connected. However, for the purposes of this plan, the MAGs for the Carrizo Aquifer and Wilcox Aquifer are combined into a single available groundwater amount. This should not be construed

as recommending or requiring that GMA 13 modify the DFCs, or that the GCDs modify their rules and management plans, to treat the Carrizo Aquifer and Wilcox Aquifer as a singular formation. Although some counties show permitted and exempt use as less than the MAG, this does not necessarily mean that water will be available for permitting.

# Water for Texas

#### What is Modeled Available Groundwater?

Groundwater is regulated locally by groundwater conservation districts except in locations that do not have a district. Districts may issue permits that regulate pumping of groundwater and spacing of wells within their jurisdictions. Multiple districts within a single groundwater management area determine the desired future conditions of relevant aquifers within that area. (Desired future conditions are the desired, quantified conditions of groundwater resources, such as water levels, water quality, spring flows, or volumes, at a specified time or times in the future or in perpetuity.) TWDB staff then translate those desired future conditions into modeled available groundwater values using the groundwater availability models (or other approaches if a groundwater availability model is not applicable). A modeled available groundwater value is the amount of groundwater production, on an average annual basis, that will achieve a desired future condition. The desired future condition in a specific location may not be achieved if pumping quanitities exceed the modeled available groundwater volume over a long term.

#### How Are Modeled Available Groundwater Volumes Used in the Regional Water Plans?

Regional water plans consider the volume of groundwater that is anticipated to be actually pumped during a drought in any planning decade. Texas Water Code requires that regional water plans be "consistent with the desired future conditions..." (Texas Water Code Section 16.053(e)(2-a)). Water planning rules require that regional water planning groups "shall use Modeled Available Groundwater volumes for groundwater availability" unless there is no modeled available groundwater volume (Title 31 Texas Administrative Code Section 357.32(d)).

The Role of Modeled Available Groundwater in Regional Water Planning

Regional water planning requirements <u>do</u> mean that:

- the regional water planning process focuses on anticipated pumping volumes in each planning decade rather than on permit volumes;
- the total anticipated pumping volume in any planning decade may not exceed the modeled available groundwater volume in any countyaquifer location (total pumping volume includes the quantities both from existing water supplies and from any recommended water management strategies);
- planning groups may not recommend water management strategy supply volumes that result in exceeding (e.g., "overdrafting") the modeled available groundwater volumes; and
- in the absence of specific information about how groundwater will be managed to meet desired future conditions in a particular location, planning groups may have to develop their own planning basis for allocating the modeled available groundwater volume to complete their regional water plans. The allocation of groundwater may impact the identified water needs and/or the strategy options available to meet needs.

Regional water planning requirements <u>do not</u> mean that:

 planning groups may modify groundwater permits that districts have already issued or limit future permits that districts may issue;



- districts must consider whether a project is in an adopted regional water plan when determining whether to issue a groundwater permit; or
- planning groups may modify the desired future conditions (or modeled available groundwater volume) within their planning area through the regional water planning process.

Only districts in groundwater management areas can modify desired future conditions.





# AGENDA ITEM 2

Update of Regional Water Planning Project Prioritization

#### 10-9-13

#### Answers to Questions Received from the House Bill 4 Prioritization Stakeholder Committee Members as of October 7, 2013

1. Q: Is the Stakeholder Committee prioritizing in rank-order from one to the total number of projects, or groups?

A: We think that to satisfy the legislative intent regional water planning groups will have to prioritize with a rank order from one downward through the total number of projects in their plans.

2. Q: Is the Stakeholder Committee expected to prioritize all 3,089 water management strategies or just the 274 that indicated financial need?

A: We think that to satisfy the legislative intent regional water planning groups will have to prioritize all projects, including those with no capital costs.

- **3. Q: Can water management strategies/projects be bundled into a package for ranking?**  *A:* They cannot be bundled if they are considered separate projects and are presented as such in the regional plans and will or can be implemented separately. For example, two groundwater well projects that would serve two different entities and are entirely separate physically shouldn't be prioritized together. The reason for this is that each project could be built independently and there would not be a single borrower to implement those two projects. Moreover, with separate entities, the projects may receive different scoring under the criteria specified by House Bill (HB) 4 due to entity-specific circumstances (e.g., decade of need, availability of water rights, cost-effectiveness, taking into consideration the expected unit cost).
- 4. Q: How flexible and subjective might the standards be? For example, "scientific practicality" can be viewed in different ways by different entities.

A: TWDB's interpretation is that the standards for "scientific practicality" that the Stakeholder Committee develops will need to precisely prescribe the level or degree of "scientific practicality" applicable to the various, specific criteria and fact circumstances (e.g., desalination, conservation, well field production). The standard must also be sufficient to allow consistent and "standardized" application across a variety of strategies.

5. Q: How will the regional water planning group prioritization fit into the state prioritization product?

A: The prioritization developed by regional water planning groups is one of the criteria under HB 4 that will be considered by TWDB when prioritizing projects at the state level. There are a number of other criteria.

#### 10-9-13

#### 6. Q: What is a "project"?

A: At this point, we consider a "project" to be 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. The strategy would be implemented by a single entity (or team of entities as co-borrowers) over a defined timeline and would be characterized by a discrete capital cost to be borne by the borrower/co-borrowers. For the purpose of HB 4, most "projects" will probably be defined as recommended water management strategies in a regional plan at the sponsor-water management strategy level of detail since that is the level at which the vast majority of water management strategies will be implemented as a "project." Examples of a project might include: one facility built by multiple sponsors, a single pipeline sponsored by a single entity, or a conservation strategy that would involve a regional entity reducing irrigation water distribution losses.

7. Q: Does the TWDB plan to allow the regional water planning groups to assign their own, unique weightings to each of the overall HB4 criteria or will the Stakeholder Committee need to assign a single weighting to each criteria to be applied by all 16 regional water planning groups in order to achieve another level of standardization?

A: The Stakeholder Committee will need to consider whether allowing variations in the criteria weightings will achieve "uniform standards." On the face of it, it is hard for us to see how that could be the case.

8. Q: How much weight does the TWDB anticipate assigning to the regional water planning group's ranking?

A: We do not know at this time. The particular manner in which a regional water planning group's ranking affects a project's prioritization by the TWDB will be worked out through a rulemaking process. That process will consider the criterion in concert with the other criteria specified for the agency's prioritization. The rulemaking will also need to consider public comment, including comment from members of the Stakeholder Committee, and recommendations from the SWIFT Advisory Committee.

9. Q: What about projects that are typically determined to be "consistent" with rather than being specifically recommended projects because they fall into the broad "County-Other" water user category that has historically represented numerous rural entities? Will this hinder the ability of these small or rural entities to obtain SWIFT financing (as directed by the legislature in HB 4 for rural entities) since these County-Other projects won't be specifically prioritized? For example, wells, pumps, storage tanks might fall into this category. Would these be eligible for funding from the SWIFT, and how will these be prioritized?

A: HB 4 makes it clear that the legislature's intent "is that the SWIFT will never be used for a purpose other than the support of projects in the state water plan." TWDB is currently reviewing ways of addressing these types of projects. Addressing the water needs of rural Texas has been and will continue to be a priority for the TWDB.

#### 10-9-13

# 10. Q: Can SWIFT funds go to projects that are only "consistent" with the 2011 Regional Water Plans (e.g., to projects that are not specifically included in the plan along with associated capital costs)?

A: In general, no. HB 4 makes it clear that the legislature's intent "is that the SWIFT will never be used for a purpose other than the support of projects in the state water plan." However, TWDB is currently reviewing ways of addressing smaller rural projects that may fall into this category as a project under "County-Other." (see previous question)

# 11. Q: What about urban projects "masquerading" as a rural project – those with a primary purpose of providing urban water supply? What if these projects attempt to utilize rural funding? Reservoirs might fall into this category. Need to give full access to the rural funding.

A: If a project would serve both rural and urban users, the share of the project that would serve rural entities may be eligible for rural funds depending on how rural is defined and applied under the SWIFT allocations. Although HB 4 provides some clear direction on what is included in the "rural" category and how the associated funding will be accounted for, the particulars will depend on the SWIFT Advisory Committee recommendations and stakeholder input during the rulemaking.

# 12. Q: What if a project has no capital cost listed in the plan but then a sponsor comes in for SWIFT funds, will it be eligible? What if the funds were in the plan but they did not indicate a need for financial assistance?

A: As was the case with Water Implementation Fund (WIF) appropriations, HB 4 makes clear the intent of the legislature to apply SWIFT funds only toward projects that are recommended in the regional and state water plans. That means that a project and the dollars associated with it should be specifically included in the regional water plan to be eligible. Whether a project must expressly indicate a need for financial assistance in the plan has not been decided.

13. Q: Are water management strategies going to be prioritized by regional water planning groups? For example, if a City has five water management strategies, does the City prioritize them for themselves? Or do those five water management strategies all go into one big list by region, which are then prioritized by the regional water planning group? *A:* The latter. All projects in a region will be prioritized together into a single list for that region.

#### Proposition 6 Implementation Timeline September 1, 2013 through March 1, 2015

# Texas Water Development Board

November 2013



# **AGENDA ITEM 3**

Status of Technical Consultants Work and Schedule

- a. Review schedule, budget and list of potential issues
- b. Review of draft scopes and budgets for 7 WMS:

Carrizo Transfers Brush Management Recycled Water Management Strategy – Amendment Hays County – Forestar Water Regional Water Supply Project – RFCSP (SAWS) Regional Brackish Wilcox Project – Alternative (SAWS) Carrizo/Buda/Austin Chalk/Leona & Regional ASR (City of Uvalde)

- c. Review list of potentially feasible water management strategies for authorization to begin draft scopes of work and budget at May meeting (if any)
- d. Presentation and review of WMS' for discussion at February meeting

## 2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan

**Proposed Workplan for Development** 



Legend:

SCTRWPG Action TWDB Action

Scheduled SCTRWPG Meeting

Probable SCTRWPG Meeting

### DRAFT 2014-01-23

## **Potential Issues For The 2016 SCTRWP**

## February 6, 2014

- 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 March 2014)
- 10) Legislation (Status: Legislative Session Ended; Responding to legislation adopted in 2013)

### TASK 4D WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES Scope and Budget #4

#### 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.

#### Carrizo Transfers

Acquire readily available information regarding permits by use type in the Carrizo Aquifer for source counties. Develop technical evaluation, including estimated cost of project and documentation. Budget does not include assessment of regional economic effects of Carrizo Transfers.

#### Brush Management

Incorporate results of Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board study on Brush Management over the Carrizo Outcrop affecting recharge to the Carrizo Aquifer MAG in Gonzales County. Develop technical evaluation, including estimated cost of project and documentation. Technical evaluation may include updates of the modeling and costs associated with Brush Management above Canyon Reservoir.

#### Direct Recycled Water Management Strategy – Amendment

Incorporate specific subsections in the Direct Recycled Water Management Strategy to describe direct (i.e. "flange-to-flange") recycled water plans for New Braunfels Utilities, City of San Marcos, and City of Kyle.

#### Hays County-Forestar Water

Coordinate with the Hays County Commissioners and representatives from Forestar in order to be consistent with their latest plans regarding this WMS with technical focus on available information regarding pipeline route, transmission capacity, and source water availability. Estimate cost of project and document in the technical evaluation. Budget for technical evaluation does not include groundwater simulations.

#### Regional Water Supply Project – RFCSP (SAWS)

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 source water availability. Estimate cost of project and document in the technical evaluation. Budget for technical evaluation does not include groundwater simulations.

#### <u>\$10,600</u>

## \$11,500

\$2,500

#### <u>\$9,300</u>

## <u>\$3,500</u>

#### Regional Brackish Wilcox Project – Alternative WMS (SAWS)

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 treatment, pipeline route, transmission capacity, and source water quality and availability. Estimate cost of project and document in the technical evaluation. Budget for technical evaluation does not include groundwater simulations.

#### Carrizo/Buda/Austin Chalk/Leona & Regional ASR (City of Uvalde)

Coordinate with the City of Uvalde and their consultant(s) in order to be consistent with the available studies regarding this WMS with technical focus on available information regarding treatment, pipeline route, transmission capacity, and source water quality and availability. Develop basic ASR mass balance accounting model. Estimate cost of project and document in the technical evaluation. Budget for technical evaluation does not include groundwater simulations.

Total = \$54,700 Previously Authorized (May, Aug, & Nov 2013) = <u>\$375,150</u> Grand Total = \$429,850

> Total Task 4D Budget = \$509,000 Budget Left To Be Allocated = \$79,150

<u>\$7,800</u>

\$9,500

Previously Authorized	<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
Water Resources Integration Pipeline (SAWS)	\$5,400
Advanced Meter Infrastructure (SAWS)	\$3,000
Integrated Water-Power Project (GBRA)	\$11,400
Luling ASR (GBRA)	\$13,500
New Braunfels ASR Project (NBU)	\$12,200
New Braunfels Trinity Well Field (NBU)	\$10,000
TWA Trinity Well Field/Western Comal Project/Upper Cibolo Valley Project	\$10,000
Edwards Transfers	\$14,400
Purchase from WWP	\$15,000
Expansion Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, Guadalupe Co (SSLGC)	\$10,900
Lavaca River Off-Channel Reservoir	\$7,900
Brackish Wilcox Groundwater for SS WSC	\$10,000

2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan

Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan Water Management Strategy

> South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group

> > February 6, 2014



## Recommendation of the Region L EAHCP Workgroup Approved by Region L on 3/14/2013

The Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (EAHCP) Workgroup recommends that the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group include the EAHCP as a recommended Water Management Strategy in the 2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan and use the spring flows associated with EAHCP implementation<sup>[1]</sup> as an hydrologic modeling assumption for computation of existing surface water supplies and technical evaluation of water management strategies. The EAHCP Workgroup further recommends that existing water supplies from the Edwards Aquifer in the 2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan be those associated with EAHCP implementation and in specific amounts to be determined in consultation with the Edwards Aquifer Authority.

III RECON Environmental, Inc., Hicks & Company, Zara Environmental LLC, & BIO-WEST, "Edwards Aquifer Recovery Implementation Program Habitat Conservation Plan, Appendix K," Edwards Aquifer Recovery Implementation Program, November 2012.

DRAFT (1/21/2014)







## **EAHCP WMS Implementation Costs**

- Based on Table 7.1 in the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan, annual implementation costs are expected to average \$17,460,530/year.
- Based on an increase of about 51,875 acft/yr in firm Edwards municipal and industrial supplies, the unit cost of the EAHCP WMS may be estimated at \$337/acft/yr.

DRAFT (1/21/2014)





2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan

Edwards Transfers Water Management Strategy

South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group

**February 6, 2014** 

## **Edwards Transfers & Remaining Potential**

Row	Description	Units = kacft/yr	Mun.	Ind.	Irr.	Total
1	EAA Initial Regular I	Permits	239.2	72.6	262.4	574.2
2	Unrestricted Transfe	er Potential	239.2	72.6	131.2	443.0
3	EAA Current Regula	r Permits w/o EAHCP Transfers	359.3	37.3	175.0	571.6
4	Apparent Non-EAH	CP Transfers	120.1	-35.3	-87.4	-2.6
5	EAHCP ASR Leases T	o-Date			4.7	
6	Planned Future EAH	CP ASR Leases			45.3	
7	<b>Remaining Unrestri</b>	cted Transfer Potential			-6.2	

- 1) As of March 2013, permits totaling approximately 120 kacft/yr have been transferred from irrigation and industrial to municipal uses.
- 2) EAHCP VISPO leases are generally associated with base (restricted) irrigation permits while EAHCP ASR leases are associated with unrestricted irrigation permits.
- 3) Given existing non-EAHCP irrigation transfers and EAHCP ASR leases (current & planned), there is effectively no remaining unrestricted irrigation transfer potential.

DRAFT (1/22/2014)

### WUGs w/ Planned Edwards Transfers

- 1) The following Water User Groups (WUGs) are seeking Edwards Transfers as a recommended water management strategy (WMS) to meet their projected needs for additional water supply:
  - a) Uvalde Co. (2.6 kacft/yr @ 2070) Sabinal & Uvalde
  - b) Medina Co. (2.1 kacft/yr @ 2070) Castroville, East Medina SUD, Hondo, La Coste, Natalia, Yancey WSC, & County Other
  - c) Bexar Co. (11.7 kacft/yr @ 2070) Alamo Heights, Atascosa Rural WSC, Kirby, Leon Valley, SAWS, Shavano Park, & Windcrest
  - d) Atascosa Co. (0.6 kacft/yr @ 2070) Lytle
- Total <u>firm</u> supply sought through Edwards Transfers is 17.0 kacft/yr. The estimated regular permit equivalent (prior to 40-44% critical period reductions) is 28.9 kacft/yr.
- 3) A significant portion of the planned Edwards Transfers for these WUGs will likely come from Edwards municipal users that are developing, or have surplus, non-Edwards supplies and are willing to lease some of their Edwards supplies.

DRAFT (1/22/2014)



# Municipal Water Conservation

**Objective:** reduce the per capita water use without adversely affecting quality of life

- Use of low flow plumbing fixtures (Plumbing Retrofits)
- More efficient water-using appliances (Passive Clothes Washers)
- Modifying and/or installing less water intensive landscaping (Landscape Design)
- Repair of plumbing and water-using appliances to reduce leaks (Water Audits)
- Modification of personal behavior (Education / Water Conservation Pricing)

Draft 1/23/2014



			Population		Water Use		
Per Capita Water Use in 2011 (gpcd)	Number of WUGs	Percent of WUGs	2011	Percent of	2011	Percent of	
			2011	Total	(acft)	Total	
Less than 140	66	47.1%	660,166	26.1%	85,475	20.36%	
140 and Greater	74	52.9%	1,866,460 73.9%		334,239	79.6%	
Totals	140	100.0%	2,526,626 100.0%		419,714	100.0%	
Total Us	e Redu	uction (ac	Neede :ft-yr)	ed to N	/leet	Goals	
Total Us	e Redu 2030	uction (ac 2040	Neede ft-yr) 2050	ed to N	∕leet ₅₀	Goals 2070	

	Costs									
Reduction	ns Include	e: res								
Clothe	Clothes Washers Retrofit									
• Lawn I	rrigation	Conserva	ition							
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070				
Implementation Cost	\$4,832,482	\$9,861,858	\$13,224,600	\$19,112,293	\$29,112,536	\$38,529,032				
Reduction (acft/yr)	6,701	13,952	18,840	27,935	43,923	58,853				
Unit Cost (\$/acft)	\$721	\$707	\$702	\$684	\$662	\$655				
	Unit Cost (\$/acft) \$721 \$707 \$702 \$684 \$662 \$655									
Draft 1/23/2014										





# Advanced Meter Infrastructure (SAWS) – Potential Revenue Gain

- Improved reporting will lead to additional revenue
- Study shows 304 gallon/month increase
- Estimate of \$20.06 annually/customer
- Intended for 500,000 customers, 100,000 a yr for 5 years

	Year	Active Meters	Yearly Revenue Gain
	2016	100,000	\$ 2,006,000
	2017	200,000	\$ 4,012,000
	2018	300,000	\$ 6,018,000
	2019	400,000	\$ 8,024,000
	2020	500,000	\$ 10,030,000
Draft 1/23/2014			





DRAFT (1-23-2014)

	Γ	[
Scenario #	Treatment	Distribution
1	Existing WWTP is achieving treatment that meets the Type 1 effluent requirements. Treatment upgrade includes only the addition of chlorine for distribution.	Treated wastewater is supplied to demand location(s) from central WWTP by addition of piping and pump station.
2	Existing WWTP is nearly achieving treatment that meets the Type 1 effluent requirements. Treatment upgrade includes tertiary treatment and chlorine.	Treated wastewater is supplied to demand location(s) from central WWTP by addition of piping and pump station.

## Direct Recycled Water Programs

• Potential Environmental Issues

Implementation Measures	Development of additional wastewater treatment plant facilities, distribution pipelines, and pump stations.
Environmental Water Needs / Instream Flows	Potential low impacts on instream flows due to decreased effluent/return flows; possible increased water quality.
Bays and Estuaries	Potential low negative impact due to reduced freshwater inflow and nutrient loading.
Localized Fish and Wildlife Habitat	Variable impacts depending on changes in volume of effluent return flows; in the case of substantially reduced stream flows, potential high negative impact to fish and wildlife habitat.
Cultural Resources	None anticipated.
Threatened and Endangered Species	None anticipated with recommended WMSs.

DRAFT (1-23-2014)



## **City of San Marcos**

- Existing Recycled Water Program:
  - Existing users include a power generating plant and a cement manufacturing plant (224 acft)
  - Reclaimed water pump station located at the San Marcos WWTP
  - No additional treatment needed (Existing = Type 1)
  - 18-inch pipeline that extends approximately 8.5 miles
  - A contract for proposed golf course at Paso Robles
- Potential Demand estimated to be ~2,100 acft/yr
- Project costs are approximately \$22.1 million
- Unit Cost = \$1,032/acft/yr

DRAFT (1-23-2014)

City of San Marcos

## New Braunfels Utilities

- Existing Recycled Water Program:
  - Sundance Park (up to 2 MG/month)
  - 10-inch pipeline extends approximately 0.75 miles
  - Recycled water from Gruene WWTP
- Approximately 173 acres of potential irrigated parkland
- Proposed expanded system to rely on South Kuehler WWTP
- Potential Demand estimated to be 904 acft/yr
- Potential reduction in potable water use for irrigation
- Project costs are approximately \$5.2 million
- Unit Cost = \$566/acft/yr

DRAFT (1-23-2014)

 

 New Braunfels Utilities
 Image: Construction particulation particulati particulati particulation particulation particulati pa



DRAFT (1-23-2014)



## 1/27/2014



CRWA Siesta Project
Source and Supply:
<ul> <li>Total Project Size = 5,042 acft/yr</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Amendment to existing CRWA's Siesta Water Right (42 acft/yr) on Cibolo Creek</li> </ul>
Consolidation (and potentially additional acquisitions) of other existing water rights on Cibolo Creek
<ul> <li>Currently own or lease 3 additional water rights totalling 238 acft/yr</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Amendment to add additional 4,762 acft/yr of diversion*</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Purchase of reuse make-up water from upstream WWTPs (CCMA)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Alternate backup is Brackish Wilcox GW</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Potential Customers are Existing CRWA Members</li> </ul>
*Modeled with TCEQ Environmental Flow Standards on Cibolo Creek using FRAT
DRAFT (1-23-2014)

# **CRWA Siesta Project**

- Facilities:
  - Intake and Pump Station on Cibolo Creek
  - 23-mile, 20-inch Diameter Transmission Pipeline
  - 1 Booster Station
  - 7 MGD WTP
  - Delivery point is FM1518 Elevated Tank
  - Sized for Peak Monthly Delivery on Municipal Pattern
- Costs (Sept 2013 Dollars):
  - Capital Cost = \$47,915,000
  - Project Cost = \$68,798,000
  - Annual Cost = \$9,507,000/yr
  - Unit Cost = \$1,886/acft/yr

DRAFT (1-23-2014)

### New Braunfels Utilities ASR Project

- Purposes and Objectives
  - Long-term supply during Drought of Record (DOR) conditions
  - Defer construction of second Water Treatment Plant
  - Meet seasonal demands when restrictions are active
  - Meet demands at ends of distribution system
  - Emergency supply
- Current Potential Target Aquifers and Estimated Well Capacities (based on preliminary Phase 1 feasibility study)
  - Trinity Aquifer
    - Lower Glen Rose: 500 gpm
    - Hosston-Sligo: 500 gpm
  - Brackish Edwards Aquifer: 750 gpm



DRAFT (1-23-2014)









#### **Current ASR Legal and Regulatory Issues Groundwater Related** - TCEQ: • Underground Injection Control (UIC), Class V Injection Well Permit • Edwards Aquifer can be only source water for ASR well that transect the Edwards to underlying formation or terminates in Edwards - EAA: · Current Rules oriented toward natural recharge along streams in outcrop and recovery from remote wells in freshwater section of Edwards • Source Water Restrictions: - All waters except surface water being recharged through "natural recharge features" - No groundwater sources other than Edwards · Prior approval to authorize submitting recharge/recovery application to EAA • Natural recharge must be withdrawn within following 12-month period, and must account for losses unless permittee can document water still in storage · Separate Recharge and Recovery Permits are required · Rules provide for interlocal agreements between EAA and applicants Surface Water Related - Amend run-of-river water rights for ASR as purpose of use 7

<ul> <li>Provides multiple benefits including: long term storage, seasonal storage/peaking, emergency supply, etc</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Provides opportunity to fully utilize existing NBU permits, which postpones the acquisition of new water supplies</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Provides opportunity to store water when available</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Allows NBU to use existing infrastructure</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Eventually, all sources of municipal drinking water can be stored using the NBU distribution system</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Has minimum environmental impacts compared to other options</li> </ul>
Concerns
<ul> <li>Rule waivers or changes with EAA and/or TCEQ are required.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Faulting and aquifer properties are not fully understood at this time</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Long-term storage may result in loss of some injected water</li> </ul>
Summary
<ul> <li>Demonstration wells and additional studies will confirm hydrogeology and storage locations within overall NBU study area</li> </ul>



## **GBRA New Appropriation (Lower Basin)**

• Source and Supply:

- Up to 189,484 acft/yr of New Diversion from Guadalupe River via Calhoun County Canal System, Maximum Diversion Rate of up to 500 cfs
- Off-Channel Storage of up to 200,000 acft (Assumed 25-foot depth)
- Diversions subject to TCEQ Adopted SB3 Environmental Flow Standards and full authorized use of existing water rights
- Firm Yield of ~21,000 to ~43,000 acft/yr Municipal/Industrial Delivery

• Facilities:

- Main Pump Station and Canal Upgrades (from 355 cfs to 500 cfs)
- New Intake and Pump Station from Main Canal (~250 cfs)
- 10-mile, 96-inch diameter Diversion Pipeline
- Off-Channel Storage between 25,000 acft and 200,000 acft
- Integration

DRAFT (1-23-2014)

Off-Channel Reservoir Size	25,000 acft	50,000 acft	100,000 acft	150,000 acft	200,000 acft
Firm Yield (acft/yr)	20,900	26,100	34,300	42,000	43,000
Capital Facilities Cost (\$)	\$109,114,000	128,965,000	\$159,743,000	\$189,773,000	\$214,250,000
Total Project Cost (\$)	\$156,788,000	190,298,000	\$245,200,000	\$298,355,000	\$344,102,000
Annual Cost (\$/yr)	\$13,918,000	16,597,000	\$20,806,000	\$24,839,000	\$28,080,000
Unit Cost (\$/acft/yr)	\$666	\$636	\$607	\$591	\$653







Mi	Mid-Basin Water Supply Project (MBWSP Engineering Feasibility Study									P)		
	Ę	٥.	×	e r	nced arge		annel /oir	Ava	ilable Sup	oply (acft	/yr)	
	Optic	Carri	Wilco	Surfa Wate	Enha Rech	ASR	Off-Ch Reserv	15,000	25,000	35,000	Max	
	0	х						Х			20,000	
	1A	х		х					х	х	40,000	
	1B	х		х	х				х	х	46,000	
	2A			х			OCR1		х	х	40,000	
	2B			х			OCR2		х	х	40,000	
	ЗA	Х		х		TWA			Х	Х	42,000	
	ЗB	х		х		Remote			х	х	50,000	
	3C			Х		Remote			Х	Х	50,000	
	4A		х								7,000	
	4B		х	х							9,000	
	4C	х	х	х					х	х	35,000	
DRAFT (1,	/22/2	014)										2



2B

MBWSP Option

2A

3A

**Options including ASR** 

3B

**4C** 

3

Л

3C

# GBRA MBWSP in the 2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan (SCTRWP)

As more information becomes available, GBRA will likely propose that one of the following options from the MBWSP Feasibility Study be a Recommended water management strategy (WMS) and that the others be Alternative WMSs in the 2016 SCTRWP.

- Carrizo Groundwater (Option 0)
- Surface Water w/ Off-Channel Reservoir (Option 2A)
- Conjunctive Use w/ ASR (Option 3A)
- Surface Water w/ ASR (Option 3C)

DRAFT (1/22/2014)

\$1,000

DRAFT (1/22/2014)

0

**1A** 

1B



















![](_page_58_Figure_2.jpeg)

# GBRA MBWSP in the 2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan (SCTRWP)

As more information becomes available, GBRA will likely propose that one of the following options from the MBWSP Feasibility Study be a Recommended water management strategy (WMS) and that the others be Alternative WMSs in the 2016 SCTRWP.

- Carrizo Groundwater (Option 0)
- Surface Water w/ Off-Channel Reservoir (Option 2A)
- Conjunctive Use w/ ASR (Option 3A)
- Surface Water w/ ASR (Option 3C)

DRAFT (1/22/2014)

![](_page_60_Picture_0.jpeg)

January 22, 2014

<u>Via e-mail only to:</u> Mr. Con Mims Chair, Region L Water Planning Group c/o San Antonio River Authority 100 E. Guenther Street San Antonio, TX 78283

Re: Consideration of a New Joint HCPUA-TWA Water Management Strategy

Dear Mr. Mims:

The Hays Caldwell Public Utility Agency (HCPUA) and Texas Water Alliance (TWA) respectfully request the addition of a new Water Management Strategy (WMS) to the 2016 South Central Texas Regional Water Plan. The WMS would combine the HCPUA and TWA groundwater well fields in Caldwell and Gonzales County into a single water supply. Attached is a conceptual map of the primary infrastructure associated with the project.

Please note that this new joint project would be in addition to the individual strategies already being considered for the HCPUA and TWA projects. We understand that the funding for analyzing strategies may be fully allocated. Please inform us of any additional funds required to analyze this new WMS.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Graham at (512) 294-3214 or at <u>gmmoore@trcsolutions.com</u> or Mark at (408) 621-9031 at <u>Mark\_Janay@sjwater.com</u>.

Sincerely,

Graham Moore

Agency Manager, HCPUA

Mark Janay President, Texas Water Alliance

cc: Erin Newberry – San Antonio River Authority Sam Vaugh, PE – HDR Brian Perkins, PE - HDR

# **HCPUA-TWA Joint Project Map**

![](_page_61_Picture_1.jpeg)

1/21/2014

# AGENDA ITEM 4

Review Agenda for November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Planning Group Meeting

a. Review solicitation documents for Water District vacancy

#### **DRAFT** 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, February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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. Election of Officers for Calendar Year 2014
- 4. Status of Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) Nathan Pence, Executive Director, EA HCP
- 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. Chair's Report
  - Report on Uniform Standards to be used by Regional Water Planning Groups to Prioritize Projects
  - Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Creation of Work Group to Begin Draft Prioritization Projects from 2011 RWP
- Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Authorizing Administrator to Begin Soliciting Nominations for SCTRWPG Water District Vacancy (Term Expires August 2016)
- 8. Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) Communications, David Meesey (TWDB Member, Bech Bruun ?)
- 9. Report, Discussion and Appropriate Action from Carrizo Aquifer Water Management Strategies Work Group - Greg Sengelmann, Chair
- 10. Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Consultants Work and Schedule

- 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
- 12. Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Authorizing Political Subdivision to Submit Request for Notice-to-Proceed for Evaluation of Seven Water Management Strategies and Authorize Administrator to Execute Contract Amendment with TWDB
- 13. 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
- 14. Discussion and Appropriate Action Regarding Evaluation of Water Management Strategies (WMSs) (Task 4D)
- 15. Possible Agenda Items for the Next South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group Meeting
- 16. 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

# DRAFT SCHEDULE FOR REPLACEMENT OF SCTRWPG MEMBERS

# February 6, 2014

## DATE:

## **DESCRIPTION:**

Sunday, February 16, 2014	Publish Notice in the San Antonio Express News & Victoria Advocate Thursday paper		
Monday, February 17, 2014	Mail notice of vacancy to each respective Interest within the Planning Area (Water District)		
Friday, March 28, 2014	Deadline for submitting nominations (40 days notice)		
Thursday, April 17, 2014 (TENTATIVE)	Executive Committee to interview and recommend nominees (1 - 4 pm)		
Thursday, May 8, 2014	SCTRWPG to consider Executive Committee's recommendation and appointment of voting member(s)		

![](_page_66_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

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

#### 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 Gená 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 Sengelmann Water Districts Milton Stolte Agriculture Thomas Taggart Municipalities **Dianne Wassenich** Public Bill West **River Authorities** 

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

DRAFT

February 16, 2014

#### **NOTICE TO PUBLIC**

The South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group (Region L), as established by the Texas Water Development Board in accordance with 31 TAC 357, is soliciting nominations to fill a vacancy as a voting member on the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group in the following interest area: Water Districts. The vacancy will be filled to complete a term expiring in 2016. Persons interested in Water District's interest area must be nominated by the governing board or chief executive officer of an entity within the respective interest area.

A nomination form must be completed and submitted for each nominee to be considered. For specific definitions and eligibility requirements in each of the areas of interest and to obtain a nomination form, please contact Erin Newberry, (210) 302-3293 or <u>enewberry@sara-tx.org</u>.

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.

Nominations must be received by 5:00 pm, Friday, March 28, 2014 addressed to Con Mims, Chair, South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group, c/o San Antonio River Authority, Attn: Erin Newberry, P.O. Box 839980, San Antonio, Texas 78283-9980, faxed to (210) 302-3692 or emailed to <u>enewberry@sara-tx.org</u>.

#### SOUTH CENTRAL TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP Nomination for Interest Group (check one): Agriculture, Counties, Electric Generating Utilities, Environmental, Industries, Municipalities, River Authority, Water Districts

		NOMINATOR		
NAME:			-	
ADDRESS:				
PHONE:	FAX:		EMAIL:	
OCCUPATION				
		NOMINEE		
NAME:				
ADDRESS:				
PHONE:	FAX:		EMAIL:	
INTEREST AREA:				
COUNTY:				
OCCUPATION:				
PLEASE GIVE A BRI QUALIFY HIM/HER FO	EF DESCRIPTION R THE POSITION:	N OF THE NOMIN	NEE'S EXPERIENCE T	HAT WOULD
PLEASE LIST ANY PER	RTINENT AFFILIA	TIONS:		

DATE SUBMITTED:\_\_\_\_\_

#### PLEASE ATTACH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF DESIRED

Nominations must be received by **5:00 p.m., Friday, March 28, 2014** addressed to Con Mims, Chair, South Central Texas RWPG, c/o San Antonio River Authority, Attn: Erin Newberry, P.O. 839980, San Antonio, Texas 78283-9980: Faxed to (210) 302-3692 or email to enewberry@sara-tx.org