

LOWER COLORADO REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP
MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 9, 2005 REGULAR MEETING
McKINNEY ROUGHS

These are the minutes approved by motion at the March 9, 2005 LCRWPG meeting.

Members Signing In:

Jim Barho, Environment
John Burke, Water Utilities
Floyd Cooley, Alternate for James Sultemeier
Ron Fieseler, Environment
Rick Gangluff, Electric Generating Utilities
Ronald Gertson, Small Business
Ronny Hibler, Alternate for Bill Neve
Barbara Johnson, Industries
Dennis Jones, Municipalities
Mark Jordan, River Authorities
Chris King, Counties
Teresa Lutes, Municipalities
Julia Marsden, Public
Bob Pickens, Other
Stanley Reinhard, Water Districts
Billy Roeder, Counties
Haskell Simon, Agriculture
Harold Streicher, Small Business
Paul Tybor, Water Districts
Jennifer Walker, Environment
Del Waters, Recreation

David Bradsby, TPWD, Non-Voting Member
David Meesey, TWDB, Non-Voting Member

Voting Members Absent:

Bill Miller, Agriculture
Bill Neve, Counties
James Sultemeier, Counties

Consultants/Support

Mark Lowry, TC&B
Rebeka Lien, TC&B

Cynthia Braendle, Aqua Water Supply
Randy Williams, TC&B

Visitors/Others:

Rod Willis, FCGCD
Dave Scholler
Laura Marbury, LWV
Leah Manning, LCRA
Ron Anderson, LCRA

Lyn Dean, LCRA
Calvin Ransleben
Richard Hoffpauir, Consultant for City of Austin
Nadira Kabir, LCRA
Richard Eystem, TDA

Quorum: Yes

Number of present voting members including designated alternates, representing absent voting members: 21.
Number required for quorum based on current voting membership of 22: 12.

FORMAL ACTIONS TAKEN:

- 1) Approved minutes as amended from January 12, 2005 regular meeting.
- 2) Approved Chapter 1 as amended.
- 3) Approved Chapter 2 pending resolution of the Williamson County Other figure discrepancy brought up by the City of Austin.
- 4) Approved Chapter 3 Revised Tables (distributed Tables 3.1, 3.2 3.3, 3.22 3.23, and 3.25) and Region K Current Water Supply Sources (Appendix 3B) water supply figures as presented.
- 5) Approved the five (5) policy items as presented with clarified by Ronald Gertson during the meeting as to which versions were being acted on including handouts at the meeting.

ADDITIONAL DECISIONS MADE:

- 1) None.

ASSIGNMENTS FOR FUTURE ACTION:

- 1) None.

MEETING MINUTES:

1) Call to Order – John Burke

2) Welcome and Introductions – John Burke

3) Attendance Report – Teresa Lutes

Teresa Lutes summarized the attendance report, noting that there were no members in violation of the attendance policies.

4) Consent Agenda

a. Approval of Minutes for the January 12th Region K Regular Meeting

Motion to approve the minutes as amended was seconded and passed.

Jim Barho thanked the City of Austin and especially Dan Strub for preparing the LCRWPG's meeting minutes. The rest of the group agreed and there was clapping.

b. Financial/Budget Report

Mark Jordan distributed a budget report. The agreements for supplemental funding have been signed.

5) Committee Reports

(a) Environmental Flows

None.

(b) Groundwater Management Plan Review

None

(c) Legislative

Deferred until agenda item 11.

(d) Liaison Reports

Ronald Fieseler attended the Region L meeting. The Region L group is adopting policies. They have also adopted a per capacity target of 140 gpcpd (water management strategy), based on outcome of Water Conservation Task Force work. John Burke noted that issues were argued during the Task Force's process about a number of aspects of the figures including: what data should be used to determine the figure (e.g., water pumped, etc.) and what to include and exclude (e.g., exclude industrial use, business use, etc.). Also, there is so much variation across the state in terms of climate, uses, etc. that a single figure is difficult to

apply state-wide. John was a member of the Water Conservation Task Force and noted that the issues are complex and to be cautious of setting hard numbers. There may be further legislative activities in this area now that the Task Force has completed its initial charge. John noted that conservation is good and important and so is water for growth and development.

Haskell Simon inquired about how grey water system figures were handled. John said the calculation is an overall average figure with the total water pumped divided by total number of residents with reuse credited out. David Meeseey noted that the Task Force process was beneficial and professional. Also, a public awareness program was developed.

(e) Public Information

Julia Marsden said that there is a Public Information Committee meeting scheduled for the upcoming Friday, February 11, 2005. With TWDB and TC&B's help and the group will be putting together a timeline of deadlines for hearing, etc. to assist in visualizing where we are going and when. The outcome will be available for the March LCRWPG regular meeting.

(f) Unique Stream Segments

None. Work of this committee has been concluded.

(g) Water Modeling Committee

None.

6) Consider and take action on Chapter 1 Report

Rebeka Lien presented Chapter 1 for approval. The revised draft include the meeting packet reflects changes made based on comments received. Rebeka expressed that she hoped that all comments were reflected. Ron Fieseler provided typo errors to Rebeka. Ronald Gertson suggested that groundwater be added to the list of irrigation water sources referred to in the first paragraph of section 1.2.4.2 Threats Due to Water Quantity Issues (page 1-43).

Motion to approve Chapter 1 as amended was seconded and passed.

7) Consider and take action on Chapter 2 Report - Population & Water Demands

Rebeka Lien presented Chapter 2 for approval. The draft includes revised Table 2.20 and Appendix 2B (handed out in meeting). Teresa Lutes noted that the figures the City of Austin thought were approved for the Williamson County Other category were slightly highly (approx. 1,000 AF) than the figures presented in Table 2.18. TC&B will double check the Williamson County Other demand figures. Rick Gangluff pointed out that certain figures in Ch. 2 are derived from water availability figures (Ch. 3) so there may need to be some final adjustments made pending water availability figures not yet finalized.

Motion to approve Chapter 2 pending resolution of the Williamson County Other figure discrepancy brought up by the City of Austin was seconded and passed.

8) Present Revised Supply Numbers and Supply by Source Comparison (Last planning cycle versus this planning cycle)

The revised supply source comparison table (2001 plan to 2006 plan) was handed out and presented by Rebeka Lien. Appendix 3C, also handed out, has a detailed table on the differences in assumptions, etc. between the two models, Response (2001) and WAM (2006). The tables include revised figures based on the WAM model, which has been updated based on comments by LCRA, City of Austin, and STP. Rebeka led the review of the table figures.

Ron Fieseler noted that he thought that Blanco had 600 AF/yr of water rights from the Blanco Reservoir. The table includes the Blanco Reservoir value of 300 AF/yr across the board. He would like to have TC&B to check this. This may firm yield vs. the overall water right. Rebeka noted that this value was not remodeled from the 2001 planning cycle. TC&B will verify the information used.

It was noted that LCRA irrigation rights (run-of-river) figures are significantly different in the two models. Rebeka referred to Appendix 3C, which has documentation on the differences between the two models. Ronald Gertson noted that the differences are huge. Mark Lowery said that there is some concern on the part of LCRA that the irrigation numbers are over-estimating the amount of water availability and that there have been discussions on this issue. He said that LCRA is concerned about that water truly being there. Mark Jordan echoed that there are concerns. Mark said that there are concerns about the hydrological assumptions and the use of WAM Run 3 model assumptions, which are separate issues. The inflows are a critical component of the differences between the model results sets. Nadira Kabir of LCRA said that there are significant differences in the inflows and cannot comment at this point on which is better.

Ronald Gertson posed the question whether the LCRA/SAWS water sharing project is even needed if the water available to the irrigation rights is 200,000 AF/yr more than was thought last planning round. Ronald expressed concern that we do not have confidence in the numbers and yet we are going to plan the future of the basin on those numbers. Mark Jordan said that the upper and lower basin issue has been raised by John Grant (Region F chair and General Manager of the Colorado River Municipal Water District). This outstanding issue may not have a quick answer. Jennifer Walker said that confidence in the numbers is important and that it might not be a good idea to move forward until the issue is resolved.

Mark Lowery noted that we are at a point in the planning process that water supply numbers have to be decided on today to meet the schedule and proceed with the shortage analysis. The vast majority of the shortage analysis should not be impacted by this issue. Those lower basin rights can be flagged and, potentially, a water management strategy can still be included to meet those needs given that LCRA/SAWS agreement is moving forward and being studied. It can still be included in the plan in the event that the concerns about the lower basin rights prove to be correct. The other firm water rights figures are fairly similar to those used in the last planning round. If figures are not decided on today then the planning process will need to shut down and the schedule cannot be met.

Ron Fieseler suggested addition of text to the plan to address the differences in the chapters. Mark Lowery said there is text and additional text can be added. Ron suggested that as explanation is needed to clarify that there is an issue and that it may be resolved in the next planning cycle, or whatever is needed to explain the situation. The text needs a qualifying statement.

Mark Jordan expressed that the concern of John Grant that Region F may go dry using WAM modeling assumptions. Mark said that there has been discussion of approaching senior water rights holders to seek subordination agreements to not exercise a priority call on available water. Last round it was assumed that more water would remain in Region F. Mark Jordan said that Joe Beal is seeking input from others on this issue, which is a huge issue for the basin.

Rebeka Lien suggested that the plan can include the LCRA/SAWS project as a water management strategy and note that the irrigation supply has increased greatly since the last planning round and Region K wants to continue with the strategies that were put forth last time.

Mark Lowery noted that the Board directs use of WAM Run 3 assumptions including no return flows. Return flows can be brought back in as a management strategy. Mark noted that the Run 3 assumptions are so conservative they were surprised by the magnitude of the additional irrigation water this planning round. David Bradsby commented that the City of Austin and LCRA have both pending permit applications for return flows at TCEQ, and is not sure how that will be reflected in the discussion. David was also curious how these numbers compare to numbers TCEQ may have gotten with the WAM model. Mark Lowery said they are the same, after a large amount of work to refine the model. Also, David asked how Region F's plan is going to handle this issue and if this is going to be conflict between the two regions, meaning the TWBD would be the final decider. Mark Lowery said that Region F is required to use the same model as Region K. They cannot allocate the water without some other means or way of proving that water really is there. David also asked what model Region F used in the first round of planning. Nadira Kabir responded that separate assumptions were made last planning

round. The two areas were essentially looked at separately.

Mark Jordan noted that WAM Run 3 is the most conservative set of assumptions for modeling and that it is a modeling run that is used for permitting. He noted that there is concern about the use of the WAM Run 3 assumptions, which full use of water rights including no return flows, as being overly conservative.

Teresa Lutes said that the conservative approach on identifying potential areas of need based on full use of water rights is a good first planning step to identify potential areas of need. Then in the water management strategy portion of the process the method allows for projection of conditions out into the future, 2060 for example. This is the heart of the planning process. Teresa said that there is still value in the WAM Run 3 approach. These are the same assumptions, full use of water rights including no return flows, used for the water availability determination last planning round so any differences seen in the 2001 to 2006 comparison figures are not attributable to return flow assumptions. The inflow figures represent the most significant differences seen including water passing from Region F to Region K to meet downstream priority water rights.

Teresa Lutes noted that options need to be explored on how best to handle the increased inflow/priority call by senior water rights issue. It is too early to determine a method on how to handle this issue. More needs to be known and understood about the problem and how the basin may be impacted.

David Meeseey noted that it is possible for planning groups to use different models and methods if the Board agrees that they are better. TCEQ requested that TWDB use Run 3 for the water availability numbers for the planning process. TWDB will be conferring with concern stakeholders as to what assumptions to use for the development of water availability numbers for next planning round. The planning figures are conservative now, including hypothetical drought assumptions and consumptive use of water rights. The assumptions may change next time.

Barbara Johnson noted that coordination with Region L, including the water sharing plan assumptions used in both regions, is also needed.

9) Review and discuss Chapter 3 comments and possibly consider and take action on Chapter 3 Report – Water Supply Analysis

Julia Marsden said that the figures for the Goldthwaite and Mill Co. area may need to be discussed and revisited when a representative from Mills County is elected to the planning group to fill Dale Henry's vacated spot.

Rick Gangluff noted that the WAM results never add to 102,000 AF/yr for STP. The WAM includes a note that LCRA is supposed to release up to 102,000 AF/yr to STP. However, the figures only add to 86,000 AF/yr. This relates back to Chapter 2 numbers. There needs to be a checking function to square figures in Ch. 2 and Ch. 3 and text to explain and clarify the figures.

Lyn Dean of LCRA noted that the figures through 2060 in Table 3.1 for Highland Lakes include interruptible triggers from the approved LCRA Water Management Plan. A note should be added to the table to indicate that the figures reflect the 1999 Water Management Plan.

Local supplies in the supply comparison those figures have stayed the same since the last planning cycle, there has been no better information developed since last planning round. Bob Pickens asked what was included in this and TC&B said they are primary stock tanks for livestock and irrigation.

For the aquifer supplies the figures have been revised based on input from conservation districts and the GAM. Attached tables on these supplies are included in the handout. Haskell Simon asked about the assumptions for the "other aquifers". TC&B has taken the "other aquifer" amounts out of those counties that have requested TC&B to do that. Mark Lowery said that TC&B is still summing up the demand on other aquifers as shown, including alluvium based aquifers. TC&B used the TCEQ database for alluvial aquifer information.

Teresa Lutes asked for additional clarification to be added to the water supply tables to clarify and understand the

total of the City of Austin's rights and contracts. More detail and footnote are needed. TC&B said these can be added. Haskell Simon suggested that the total drought of record amount column should be titled "firm yield".

Rick Gangluff said that the 2001 to 2006 comparison was very good. Jim Barho and others echoed that it was helpful and appreciated.

Motion to approve Chapter 3 Revised Tables (distributed Tables 3.1, 3.2 3.3, 3.22 3.23, and 3.25) and Region K Current Water Supply Sources (Appendix 3B) water supply figures as presented was seconded and passed.

The Chapter 3 text, etc. will be subject of a future motion. The "Methodology and Assumptions for Use of the Colorado WAM November 2004 Revision Run 3" was distributed.

10) Present Revised Schedule

The group needs locations for the April, May, and June meetings. The Public Information Committee will be meeting on February 11, 2005 to discuss planning and scheduling for the upcoming meetings.

The Shortage Analysis is well underway (handed out in draft form at the meeting), however, it remains to be reviewed (QA/QC) and finalized, now that the supply figures have been adopted. TC&B will start the Water Management Strategy analysis tomorrow.

11) Discuss and possibly take action on policy statements

Drafts of the following new policy statements were presented:

- Groundwater
- Public Involvement
- Education

Changes were presented to the previously approved policy items for the following (substance remained largely the same):

- Management of Surface Water Resources: Inter-Basin Transfers, Model Linking, and Conjunctive Use
- Environmental – Sustainable Growth, Including Impacts of Growth

In all five (5) items were presented for consideration. Motion to approve the five (5) policy items as presented with clarified by Ronald Gertson during the meeting as to which versions were being acted on including handouts at the meeting, was seconded and passed.

It was expressed that the committee had done a good job of developing the policy items adopted. It was also expressed that support of funding for the Water IQ program, as recommended in the Environmental Sustainability policy item, is a good item and education on water issues is important.

It was noted by Harold Streicher that on the "groundwater" policy item, the word "of" in the 4th line of text from the bottom of page 1 should be deleted. Also, an "s" should be added to the word "district" in the 5th line of text in the 1st paragraph.

12) New/Other Business

Jennifer Walker announced that the Environmental Defense conference on water is coming up March 4th at the Wildflower Center in Austin. Flyers were provided.

Julia Marsden reminded members to fill out public speaking events reporting form, included in packet, as part of the ongoing public participation component of the plan.

Mark Lowery offered that TC&B can provide presentation materials to members on the Region K planning proceeds items, as needed.

David Bradsby offered to try to get copies for members of the PBS Texas Water TV program recently shown.

13) Calendar

March 9, 2005, McKinney Roughs – Regular Meeting – Chairman Burke will not be at the March 9th meeting, Haskell Simon, Vice Chair, will lead the meeting in Chairman Burke’s absence.

April 13, 2005, Regular Meeting

There will be two meetings in May: May 11th and May 25th. There will be an agenda item on the May 25th meeting agenda to adopt the draft water plan.

14) Agenda for next meeting

Agenda items for next meeting include:

- (a) Discuss and possibly take action on outstanding Policy Items
- (b) Turner, Collie, and Braden plan status items

15) Public Comments

None.

Thank you to Lissie Flying Service (Ronald Gertson) for providing lunch.

Meeting minutes prepared by Teresa Lutes, Secretary, Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group (3/1/05). The group expressed that Dan Strub was missed (Dan was out this meeting). These minutes of the Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group February 9, 2005 meeting were approved in a motion passed at the March 9, 2005 Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group meeting.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| <u>Signature on File</u> | <u>3/9/2005</u> |
| TERESA LUTES, SECRETARY | DATE |
| Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group | |