

**Minutes of the  
South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group  
February 5, 2015**

Chairman Con Mims called the meeting to order at 9:30 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.

26 of the 28 voting members, or their alternates, were present.

**Voting Members Present:**

Tim Andruss	Gary Middleton
Donna Balin	Con Mims
Gene Camargo	Robert Puente
Alan Cockrell	Iliana Pena
Will Conley	Steve Ramsey
Don Dietzmann	David Roberts
Art Dohmann	Roland Ruiz
Jeremiah Leibowitz for Blair Fitzsimmons	Dianne Savage
Vic Hilderbran	Steve Raabe for Suzanne Scott
Kevin Janak	Greg Sengelmann
Russell Labus	Thomas Taggart
Doug McGooky	Dianne Wassenich
Dan Meyer	Tommy Hill for Bill West

**Voting Members Absent**

Rey Chavez  
John Kight

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Don McGhee, Region M Liaison  
David Meesey, Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)  
Phyllis Varnon for Ken Weidenfeller, Texas Department of Agriculture

**Non-Voting Members Absent:**

Norman Boyd, Texas Department of Parks & Wildlife  
Ronald Fieseler, Region K Liaison  
Steve Ramos, TCEQ – South Texas Watermaster Specialists  
Charles Wiedenfeld, Region J Liaison

Chairman Mims pulled Agenda Item 18 from the agenda.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: REMARKS FROM TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD  
DIRECTOR KATHLEEN JACKSON**

Director Jackson introduced her staff and made some remarks regarding the regional and state water planning process. She also described a few funding options available for project development.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Mims asked for any public comment. No comments were made.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Mims asked if there were any additions or corrections to the November 6, 2015, meeting minutes. Dianne Wassenich noted one error and made a motion to approve the minutes. Robert Puente seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2015**

Chairman Mims asked for nominations to fill the terms of officers to serve on Executive Committee for the calendar year of 2015 in accordance with the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group's (Region L), bylaws. Dianne Wassenich made a motion to re-elect the current Executive Committee to their same positions. Dianne's motion was seconded. The motion to re-elect the Executive Committee to their current positions passed by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING NOMINATIONS TO FILL VACANT AGRICULTURE VOTING MEMBER (TERM EXPIRES 2016) AND INDUSTRIES VOTING MEMBER (TERM EXPIRES 2018)**

Cole Ruiz, San Antonio River Authority, described vacancies (Agriculture and Industries interest areas) and the nomination process to fill those vacancies. Chairman Mims asked for a motion to authorize SARA, to solicit nominations to fill the vacant Region L voting member seats of Agriculture and Industries. Gary Middleton made the motion. Kevin Janak seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: STATUS OF EDWARDS AQUIFER HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN (HCP) – NATHAN PENCE, EXECUTIE DIRECTOR EAHCP.**

There was no update to provide.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: 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)**

Dianne Wassenich gave a brief update to the planning group regarding recent BBASC activities. She mentioned that the BBASC received updates from the contractors' studies. Dianne mentioned that the next meeting is scheduled for May 22, 2015.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: STATUS OF THE WORKGROUP'S DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHAPTER 8 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AND UNIQUE SITES LANGUAGE FOR INCLUSION IN THE 2016 INITIALLY PREPARED REGIONAL WATER PLAN**

**A. Unique Stream Segment Workgroup**

Will Conley reported on the language added to the Unique Sites section of Chapter 8 of the 2016 Regional Water Plan by the Unique Stream Segment Workgroup.

**B. Policy Workgroup.**

Dianne Wassenich updated the planning group on the Policy Workgroup's efforts to edit Chapter 8. Dianne mentioned that the Policy Workgroup is still working on establishing a clear consensus on language, but they will continue to meet until a draft is ready for the full planning group to consider.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: CHAIR'S REPORT**

Chairman Mims provided the planning group with an update of the legislation relating to certain Unique Stream Segments. House Bill 1016 was filed by Representative Tracy King, and a search of a sponsor to file the bill's companion in the Senate was underway. Chairman Mims also reported that TWDB had approved the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority's (GBRA) Integrated Water Power Project as an amendment to the 2012 State Water Plan.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD (TWDB) COMMUNICATIONS**

David Meesey briefly discussed TWDB's infrastructure and emergency interconnection information report requirement for the 2016 Regional Water Plan. The report is confidential, and requires a review and submission process that is closed to the public.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION DESIGNATING A WORKGROUP TO HOLD A CLOSED MEETING TO DEVELOP AND SUBMIT A CONFIDENTIAL REPORT ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION UTILIZED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2016 REGIONAL WATER PLAN TO THE TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD (TWDB) AS REQUIRED BY 31 TAC §357.45(D)**

Brian Perkins, HDR Engineering, reported the status of their efforts to collect the infrastructure information utilized for the development of the 2016 Regional Water Plan. Mr. Perkins recapped what Mr. Meesey went over previously; noting that the report is confidential due to information regarding emergency interconnections, and thus requires a workgroup to hold a meeting closed to the public. Gary Middleton made a motion to authorize HDR to pull together the required Infrastructure Report, and submit it to TWDB per their requirements. Thomas Taggart seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION DESIGNATING A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION AS ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE FIFTH CYCLE OF REGIONAL WATER PLANNING**

Chairman Mims explained that this agenda item was necessary in order to complete the following agenda item, "Discussion and Appropriate Action Authorizing Political Subdivision to Apply for Funding for the Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Planning and Post the Associated 30-Day Public Notice Prior to TWDB Board Action on the Application." Will Conley made a motion to designate the San Antonio River Authority (SARA) as the administrator for the Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Planning. Gene Camargo second the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION AUTHORIZING POLITICAL SUBDIVISION TO APPLY FOR FUNDING FOR THE FIFTH CYCLE OF REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AND POST THE ASSOCIATED 30-DAY PUBLIC NOTICE PRIOR TO TWDB BOARD ACTION ON THE APPLICATION (TWDB ACTION ANTICIPATED TO TAKE PLACE APRIL 2015)**

Will Conley made a motion to authorize SARA to apply for funding for the Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Planning and to post notice as required by TWDB. Gary Middleton seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING CONSULTANT WORK AND SCHEDULE**

Brian Perkins, HDR Engineering, reported on the schedule for plan development highlighting upcoming Planning Group deadlines and target dates for completed tasks. May 1, 2015, is the deadline for the submission of the 2016 Initially Prepared Plan (IPP). The 2016 Regional Water Planning deadline is

December 1, 2015.

Additionally, Mr. Perkins provided a status update on each chapter of the 2016 Regional Water Plan.

Mr. Perkins also provided an update on the potential issues to the planning process that HDR and the Administrator are tracking. Specifically, Mr. Perkins touched on interregional coordination as it pertains to the San Antonio Water System's (SAWS) Vista Ridge Project and the Hays County Forestar Project, provided an update on the whooping crane litigation, and mentioned that the current legislative session is underway with various bills being passed around and filed.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING THE EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES (TASK 4D)**

Mr. Perkins presented technical evaluations for four potentially feasible water management strategies to the Planning Group, including Brush Management – Gonzales County, Storage Above Canyon Reservoir (ASR), Balancing Storage, and Surface Water Rights water management strategies.

Brian Perkins noted that the City of Victoria is looking at the possibility of an Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Project. The City of Victoria is currently gathering information for this effort. Steve Raabe noted that the Planning Group has some remaining funds to fully evaluate the City of Victoria ASR project once it is ready for evaluation. In order to utilize TWDB funds, the Planning Group needs to authorize SARA to amend its contract with TWDB, and subsequently SARA's contract with HDR, should the City of Victoria develop the necessary information for the project.

Tim Andruss made a motion to authorize SARA to amend its contract with TWDB, and subsequently HDR, should the City of Victoria ASR project become ready for a full technical evaluation. Thomas Taggart seconded the motion. The motion carried by consensus. Brian Perkins clarified that the evaluation should not take much Region L funds from TWDB.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 16: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF POTENTIALLY FEASIBLE WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR INCLUSION INTO THE 2016 INITIALLY PREPARED REGIONAL WATER PLAN**

Mr. Perkins offered a presentation on the 2016 Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies table. Mr. Perkins provided an explanation of the recommended water management strategies, beginning with Conservation and Drought Management water management strategies for municipal water users.

Prior to Mr. Perkins delivering HDR Engineering's presentation on water management strategies, Chairman Mims asked that Mr. Perkins ask for any objections to particular strategies before moving on to the next set of water management strategies. Mr. Perkins agreed that Chairman Mims' suggestion was a good idea and proceeded in this way.

Next, Mr. Perkins provided a review of all recommended water management strategies for each individual wholesale water provider, following each individual strategy with an inquiry to the planning group for any objections. Mr. Perkins presented four projects for Canyon Regional Water Authority (CRWA) and a project for Cibolo Valley Local Government Corporation (MAG limited and with conversions). Dianne Savage objected, stating that there were a number of objection to the Cibolo Valley LGC project in Wilson County. Dianne Wassenich ask whether the MAG (modeled available groundwater) limited project (alluding to Cibolo Valley LGC Carrizo Aquifer project out of Wilson County) would be a recommended strategy. Mr. Perkins said that it would be a recommended strategy even though it yields zero water under the current MAG restrictions. Under the current MAG restrictions, the Cibolo Valley LGC project would have to convert permits from irrigation to municipal use in order to garner a yield (8,800 acre-feet). This option (Cibolo Valley LGC project with conversions) is also currently being presented as a recommended strategy

in the event that the MAG does not change favorably to the project, or that Cibolo Valley LGC is unable to obtain the necessary permits from the Evergreen Underground Water Conservation District (it was noted that Evergreen UWCD permits above the MAG). Mr. Perkins made the point that Cibolo Valley LGC project is the City of Cibolo's primary source of water to meet future water needs. If the project is not included as a recommended water management strategy, the City of Cibolo would have to find a new source prior to finalizing the Regional Water Plan. There was continued discussion of why the Region L Planning Group would recommend a project with zero yield. Steve Raabe, San Antonio River Authority, along with Chairman Mims, recollected that the reason the planning group chose to generally use the MAG limited projects throughout the 2016 Regional Water Plan as recommended strategies, while using the envisioned full-sized projects (which garner more yield) as alternative strategies, was for administrative simplicity for future amendments to the regional water plan. In the event that the MAG changed, or that the project's sponsor was able to obtain the necessary permits (through conversions, leasing, etc...), a simple substitution of the envisioned alternative strategy for the MAG limited recommended strategy could be easily made. The difference between most projects and this particular project, is that Cibolo Valley LGC project has a zero yield. Greg Sengelmann suggested recommending the Cibolo Valley LGC project with conversions (yield of 8,800 acre-feet/ year) as the recommended strategy for Cibolo Valley LGC, and use the MAG limited Cibolo Valley LGC project (yield of zero) as the alternative strategy. Several planning group members concurred. Mr. Perkins said that HDR would clean up the list in that respect. Alan Cockrell suggested that if the Planning Group takes this approach with one project, it ought to be consistent with all projects with a zero yield included in the 2016 Regional Water Plan.

Mr. Perkins reviewed six projects for Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority (GBRA), subsequently asking for any objections. Dianne Wassenich voiced several concerns regarding GBRA's projects. Regarding the Victoria County Steam-Electric Project, Mrs. Wassenich inquired whether the amount of water projected from this project was based on the assumption of new users in either a coal plant or nuclear plant. Mr. Perkins replied, stating that at the beginning at the current planning cycle, the planning group chose to keep or grow the amount of steam-electric demand in Victoria County in anticipation of a nuclear plant or steam-electric plant being built in Victoria County in replacement of the Exelon Project. The Victoria County Steam-Electric Project was evaluated in an attempt to meet those need, which is 50,000 acre-feet/ year. Within their existing water rights, GBRA can achieve nearly 30,000 acre-feet/ year of the 50,000 acre-feet/ year in demand. Mrs. Wassenich asked that if, when GBRA achieves the 30,000 acre-feet/ year with their existing water rights, would GBRA still be able to feed all of their other projects. Mr. Perkins explained that within their existing surface water rights, GBRA delivers the first portion of water, which is currently going to existing supplies. The next portion of the existing surface water rights will be used to firm up the 500 acre Site Lower Basin Storage Project. The final portion of their existing surface water rights will be used toward meeting the Victoria County Steam-Electric Project (nearly acre-feet/ year). On top of their existing surface water rights, GBRA has the new appropriations of the Mid-Basin Project (50,000 acre-feet/ year), the Lower Basin New Appropriations (42,000 acre-feet/ year), and the seawater desalination project (Integrated Water-Power Project [IWPP]– 100,000 acre-feet/ year). Mrs. Wassenich asked for clarity on whether the Mid-Basin Project relied on any existing surface water right. Mr. Perkins stated that GBRA's Mid-Basin Project relies on a whole new water right, as does the Lower Basin New Appropriation, both of which have pending permits with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). Mrs. Wassenich stated that there was a lot of objection to those permits. Mr. Perkins followed, saying that the Mid-Basin permit has been released in draft form and experienced some opposition, but that the Lower Basin permit is still under review. Mrs. Wassenich reminded the group that the BBASC had made recommendations to TCEQ in protecting the stream flows and bays and estuaries. TCEQ did not follow those recommendations. Mrs. Wassenich voiced that she had a great deal of concern about new appropriations, saying that enough damage is being inflicted under the existing water rights. Those rights are very old and were granted when people did not understand the impact those permits would have on the rivers and bays. Adding up all of GBRA's projects far exceeds the projected needs.

---

Mrs. Wassenich asked the planning group how a regional water planning group is supposed to deal with this type of situation. Mr. Perkins expressed that based on the current information, there are needs of about 425,000 acre-feet/ year within the region. The water management strategies evaluated under the current plan

total 650,000 acre-feet/ year (excluding irrigation). While we do have management supply, the supply is at a lower percentage under the current planning effort than it was under the 2011 Region L Regional Water Plan.

Mrs. Wassenich asked David Meesey if the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) had any objections to a plan that supported a laundry list of projects, without a real plan to pick certain recommended strategies over other recommended strategies. Mr. Meesey responded, saying that though TWDB does not support a “laundry list” of projects, the planning group may over-plan. The planning group may recommend more strategies that produce a large volume of water than is required for an individual need for a 50 year period, recognizing that the excess water will eventually be needed. Mr. Meesey also made the point that many of those projects will never materialize for whatever reason. Ultimately, TWDB will approve plans that produce more water than the projected need. Mrs. Wassenich asked if the only real restriction TWDB places on the plan, is that projects must not exceed the MAG. Mr. Meesey clarified, saying TWDB requires plans to stay within the availability of all supplies. Mrs. Wassenich contended that by recommending all of the GBRA projects, which are currently set to be recommended water management strategies in the current planning effort, and considering the cumulative use of water through the implementation of these projects, the planning group is suggesting that the water necessary for these projects is available. Mrs. Wassenich further contended that the planning group does not know if that water is there. Mr. Perkins responded, saying that all projects in the plan are evaluated under all existing water rights and the environmental flows standards set by TCEQ. Within those limits, GBRA’s projects that rely on new appropriations are feasible. Mrs. Wassenich then asked for confirmation that by recommending all five GBRA projects, the planning group is saying that there is enough surface water to supply these projects. Mr. Perkins confirmed, adding that two of the projects are within existing water rights, and are essentially adding extra storage. Two of the projects are new appropriations, and the fifth project is pulling water from the Gulf of Mexico, which is not over-appropriated.

Chairman Mims asked if there were any GBRA projects that a planning group member would like to have removed from the list of recommended water management strategies. Mrs. Wassenich said that she would be in favor of removing the projects that relied on new appropriations until the group is more certain that the necessary water is actually there. Mr. Perkins pointed out that should the planning group decided to remove the Mid-Basin Project, which is a new appropriation, the planning group would not be able to meet the needs in the upper and mid-basin. Ultimately, the planning group would have to decide where GBRA would get water to meet those needs. Tom Taggart pointed out that the IWPP drops 50,000 acre-feet off in Gonzalez County, and asked Mr. Perkins if that could serve to meet the need in upper and mid-basin. Sam Vaughn, HDR, replied, saying that the area served by the Mid-Basin Project has long term projected needs on the order of 85,000 acre-feet a year. The IWPP, as currently evaluated, only drops water off as far as Gonzalez County. Some of the upper and mid-basin needs could be met with the IWPP, but would rely on the facilities to the Mid-Basin Project. As of now, the IWPP is only costed to delivery in Gonzalez County. Mr. Perkins clarified that costs would have to be added to the IWPP for distribution lines.

There was discussion about whether to skip GBRA’s projects and come back to them, but Chairman Mims in concurrence with Mr. Perkins suggested that the planning group decide this now.

Mrs. Wassenich made the point that if the planning group has duplicative projects, then perhaps the planning group should be more specific with which projects are the planning group’s top choices.

Chairman Mims stated that if a public agency goes before their governing body with a master plan to provide water to its customers, the planning group should not be the overreaching entity to blow up that master plan unless something in that master plan is absolutely absurd. Rather, this planning group should give that water provider the benefit of the doubt. By interrupting GBRA’s plan to provide water to its service area, this planning group would be edging toward a slippery slope. When other water providers come to this group to get a project in the plan, the fear of disrupting a decision their governing body has already reached will perpetually loom over that project. If TCEQ decides that there is not enough water to grant the appropriation of new water rights, then TCEQ will not grant those permits.

Chairman Mims asked again if there were any members who would like to see any of GBRA's projects removed from the list of recommended water management strategies, and if there was objection to a project, he wanted to know why. There were no further objections. Chairman Mims asked Mr. Perkins to move on with the rest of the projects.

Mr. Perkins reviewed a project for Hays – Caldwell Public Utility Agency and a project for Lavaca Navidad River Authority (Region P project that serves needs in Region L and Region N),

Mr. Perkins reviewed ten projects for San Antonio Water System (SAWS). When Mr. Perkins discussed the Expanded Brackish Project, which is MAG limited and has a zero yield, the question was raised on whether the project would be moved to the list of alternative water management strategies. Chuck Ahrens, sitting for Robert Puento, argued that this project should remain a recommended strategy. With respect to the planning process, water districts are permitting above the MAG; and there is a very real possibility that water districts may require a project to be a recommended strategy before it even applies for a permit. By moving a recommended water management strategy to the alternative water management strategy list, the planning group could inhibit a water provider from even applying for the permit it needs. Additionally, the MAG could be revised two to three times throughout the life of the plan. Mr. Ahrens said for any project with a zero yield, which is a result of the MAG limitations, the planning group should leave those projects as recommended water management strategies in the event the MAG changes or additional permits are acquired either under the MAG or by negotiations relating to existing permitted water rights.

There was further discussion regarding the recommending of a water management strategy, which yields zero acre-feet of water under the MAG. Several members including Dianne Savage and Greg Sengelmann disagreed that a project with no yield should be a recommended strategy. Alan Cockrell reminded the group of a workgroup created in order to develop solutions to the issues surrounding MAG limitations. The strategy was to include the envisioned unrestricted project, which exceeds the MAG, as an alternative strategy, while keeping the MAG limited strategy, regardless of yield, as the alternative strategy. Mr. Cockrell attempted to clear some of the confusion by referring back to the aforementioned MAG limited Cibolo Valley LGC project with and without conversions. He clarified that though they are listed as two different projects, the two projects are really one project because they used the same facilities and same water supply. The only difference is how Cibolo Valley LGC obtains the water: either through new permits because the MAGs change and/or leasing from existing permit holders, or converting irrigation permits for municipal use.

Brian Perkins clarified that the difference between the SAWS Expanded Brackish Project and the Cibolo Valley LGC Project is that Cibolo Valley LGC currently has no water supply, and has future needs to meet. The planning group had to devise a way to meet those needs. Converting permits for irrigation to permits for municipal use is one possible strategy, leaving Cibolo Valley LGC with the alternative option of leasing from existing permit holders. This way Cibolo Valley LGC maximizes their options for securing long-term water supply to their users. Mr. Perkins reminded the planning group that they adopted the workgroup's recommendation to use the MAG limited strategy, even with strategies projecting zero yield, as the recommended strategy, while keeping the envisioned strategy as the alternative in case the MAGs changed or permits were acquired by other means. There were no further comments. Mr. Perkins reviewed two projects for Schertz-Seguin Local Government Corporation, and two projects for Texas Water Alliance.

Mr. Perkins continued providing a review of water management strategies including two projects for New Braunfels Utilities, two projects for Hays County, a project for Uvalde, three projects for Victoria, and a project for SS Water Supply Corporation. Mr. Perkins asked if there were any questions or objections. There were none.

Other recommended water management strategies included the Facilities Expansions project, Edwards Transfers, and local groundwater projects. Additionally, Mr. Perkins briefly discussed purchases from wholesale water providers. Mr. Perkins asked if there were any questions or objections. There were none.

Lastly, Mr. Perkins concluded the list of recommended water management strategies to be included in the

2016 Region L Regional Water Plan with the Direct Reuse/Recycle, Surface Water Rights, and Balancing Storage strategies. Mr. Perkins asked if there were any questions or objections. There were none.

Kevin Janak made a motion to approve the list of recommended water management strategies provided by HDR Engineering to be included in the 2016 Region L Regional Water Plan as recommended water management strategies. David Roberts seconded the motion. The motion passed by consensus.

Gene Camargo made a motion to approve the list of alternative water management strategies provided by HDR Engineering, with the exception the of Storage Above Canyon (ASR) project, to be included in the 2016 Region L Regional Water Plan as alternative strategies. The Storage Above Canyon project will be included in the other category of projects, which includes projects that received technical evaluations, but were neither recommended, nor alternative. Mr. Camargo's motion was seconded, and passed by consensus.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 17: DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING CHAPTER 6 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS PROCEDURES**

Brian Perkins explained the purpose and procedure involved in developing Chapter 6, the Cumulative Effects of the 2016 Regional Water Plan. Chapter 6 will include an evaluation of stream flows and estuary inflows under two scenarios: a baseline evaluation of surface water supply throughout the regional water planning area; and an evaluation under full implementation of the 2016 Regional Water Plan for Region L. The analysis will also assess environmental impacts and include a comparison to previous plans. The results of the Cumulative Effects analysis will be presented at the next meeting on April 2, 2015.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 18: APPROPRIATE ACTION REGARDING THE ADOPTION OF GUADALUPE-BLANCO RIVER AUTHORITY'S PROPOSED SUBSTITUTION OF THE LOWER BASIN STORAGE 500 ACRE SITE PROJECT FOR THE LOWER BASIN STORAGE 100 ACRE SITE PROJECT IN THE 2011 REGIONAL WATER PLAN AND REQUEST THE TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD (TWDB) TO AMEND THE 2012 STATE WATER PLAN**

Agenda Item No. 18 was removed prior to the meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 19: POSSIBLE AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT SOUTH CENTRAL TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP MEETING**

Chairman Mims instructed the Planning Group to send any agenda items for the next meeting to Cole Ruiz.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 20: PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Mims asked for any public comments. There were none. Mr. Mims adjourned the meeting.

Recommended for approval.



---

GARY MIDDLETON, SECRETARY



Approved by the South Central Texas Regional Water Planning Group at a meeting held on April 2, 2015.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Con Mims". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "C".

---

CON MIMS, CHAIR

