

Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group Meeting
July 10, 2013
Burnet Community Center
401 East Jackson Street
Burnet, Texas
10:00 a.m.

Members Signing In

Jim Barho, Environmental
Jim Brasher, GMA 15
John Burke, Water Utilities
John Dupnik, GMA 10
Ron Fieseler, GMA 9
Ronald Gertson, Small Business
Karen Haschke, Public
Barbara Johnson, Industries
Teresa Lutes, Municipalities
Bill Neve, Counties
Billy Roeder, Agriculture
Robert Ruggiero, Small Business
Haskell Simon, Agriculture
James Sultemeier, Counties

Byron Theodosios, Counties
Paul Tybor, GMA 7
David Van Dresar, Water Districts
Brandon Wade, Municipalities
Jennifer Walker, Environmental
Brenton Lewis, Alternate, Municipalities
John Hoffman, Alternate, Electric Utilities
David Lindsay, Alternate, Recreation
Charles Shell, Alternate, GMA 8
Jim Totten, Alternate, GMA 12
David Wheelock, Alternate, River Authorities
David Meeseey, Non-voting, TWDB
David Villarreal, Non-voting TDA

Voting Members Absent

Joe Cooper, GMA 12, alternate attended
Joe King, Electric Utilities, alternate attended
Doug Powell, Recreation, alternate attended

Consultants/Support/Visitors/Other

Terry Zrubeh, LCRA
D. Steed, Travis County WCID 17
Mike Williams, City of Meadowlakes
Cindy Rodibayr, FCFWCD
Steven Williams
Tommy Koch, CTK
Ray Whisenant, Jr., Hays County
Charles Hadlin, HCA
Gloria Teague, INTERA
Abhishek Singh, INTERA
Danielle Martin, COA
Jeff Fox, COA
Bill Luedecke, CTGCD
Pat Womack, City of Leander
Gary N Oradat, City of Pflugerville
Linda Raschke, Llano County
James Kowis
Jeavon Ehler, Environment Texas
Tom Ray, LAN
Izzy Neusch, CTWC
Robert Burns, CTWC

Krystal Cantu, LCRA
Cindy Smiley, Smiley Law Firm
Meaghan Bailey
Jo Karr Tedder, CTWC
John Hoffman, STPNOC
Buddy Harris, CTWC
James Walker, Burnet Bulletin
Owen Greenley, CTWC
Karen Bruett, Lakeside Beach and CTWC
Crista Bromley, City of Burnet
Marvin Lewis
Richard Welchen, TC WCID Point Venture
Dorethy Taylor, WOWSC
Christopher Eddy, BPGED
Vicky Kennedy, Travis County
Kodi Sawin, Sawin
Valinda Bolton
Kirk Kennedy, KRC
Paul Freeman
Carole Freeman

Quorum

Quorum: Yes

Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: 25

Number required for quorum per current voting membership of 25: 13

Formal Actions Taken

1. Motion to approve minutes from the April 10, 2013 meeting without changes was passed.
2. Motion made to elect David Wheelock to represent the River Authority interest category passed unanimously.
3. Motion approved to authorize the consultants to send the municipal population and water demand projection revision request to the TWDB staff for consideration, and to authorize the consultants to continue discussions with the TWDB on behalf of the RWPG to determine final projections., (see agenda item 8.b)
4. Motion approved to submit a water use change of 3,000 ac/ft from irrigation to manufacturing for Matagorda County passed. (see item 9.)

Regular Meeting:

1. Call to Order:

Chairman John Burke called the meeting to order.

2. Welcome and Introductions:

Chairman Burke welcomed everyone to the meeting.

3. Attendance Report:

Teresa Lutes called the member's attention to the attendance report included in the packet. Chairman Burke asked members to review a list of members contact information which was prepared by Krystal Cantu of LCRA.

4. Consent Agenda:

- a. Approval of Minutes from the April 10, 2013 meeting:

Chairman Burke asked members to review the minutes. Motion was made to approve them without changes. This motion passed unanimously.

- b. Financial/Budget Report:

David Wheelock reported that there was \$1,833 in the Region K account, and \$186,820 in the grant account. Haskell Simon gave a brief history of where the money in the Region K account came from, including the LCRWPG's effort years ago to collect money from entities and other representatives across the region.

5. Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) Communications – Legislative update:

- David Meesey reported on the legislative session that just concluded which passed a considerable amount of water-related legislation, most notably House Bill 4, House Bill 1025, and Senate Joint Resolution 1. If the constitutional amendment passes in the November 5, 2013 election, a stakeholder committee will be formed to establish standards for regional project prioritization by Dec. 1, 2013 for approval by TWDB.
 - *In 2014* - instructions for using the State Water Implementation Fund for Texas (SWIFT) will be posted on TWDB website by March 1; RWPGs submit draft project prioritization from 2011 plans by June 1, 2014 to TWDB, the final list is due September 1, 2014. The TWDB will provide a report to the Governor and Legislature regarding the use of SWIFT by December 1st of every even numbered year.
 - *In 2015* - by March 1 TWDB will adopt rules for allocating funds. Initially prepared regional plans, including prioritized projects for the 2016 Plan, are due May 1. To be eligible for a loan, a project must be recommended in the plan.
 - *In 2016* – approved regional water plan with prioritized project list will be submitted on Jan. 5.
- If the constitutional amendment does not pass, the legislature could address the issue again in the 2015 session.
- The RWPG must consider the decade a project is needed by, feasibility, viability, sustainability, and cost effectiveness of a project for prioritization. TWDB will rank projects on a statewide basis through a points system that considers population, service of both urban and rural population, provide regionalization, and high percentage of need met. Availability of supplemental funding and capacity of

applicant to repay TWDB, emergency of need, how much preparation for a project has been completed, effects on water conservation, and prioritization of RWPG's will also be considered.

- In the upcoming RWPG Chairs' conference call they will begin creating statewide standards and an outline, which John Burke will send to the group for comments before submitting to TWDB by December 1. Jennifer Walker was appointed Chair of the Strategy Prioritization Committee, which will be formed and meet before the Chairs' conference call. Members include Jennifer Walker, Teresa Lutes, Barbara Johnson, Brandon Wade, David van Dresar, John Dupnik, Doug Powell, Ronald Gertson, David Wheelock, Robert Ruggiero, Karen Haschke, Jim Barho, David Meeseey, and David Bradsby.

6. Discuss and take action on election of voting member representative for the River Authority Interest category member:

Motion made to elect David Wheelock to represent the River Authority interest category passed unanimously.

7. Consultant Status Report:

- Jaime Burke reviewed work progress since the April 10th meeting, including: RWPG Chairs' conference calls held on May 7th and July 2nd; partial Scope of Work for task 4D submitted to TWDB; continued efforts on population and municipal water demand projections (see item # 8); submitted letter and received approval from TWDB for Region K's request to use the Cutoff Model to evaluate water management strategies; Cutoff Model updated to include corrections made to the Colorado River WAM; Water Modeling Committee met on July 8th and will be meeting again in August.
- Schedule: final submittal of municipal demand data due August 16th, may require an August Region K meeting. *For 2014* - task 4D Scope of Work due March 1; Technical Memorandum due May 1. *For 2015* – Initially Prepared Plan due May 1; final adopted Plan due November 2, 2015.
- Upcoming task work: Population and municipal demand data analysis and TWDB request preparation; surface water availability modeling for drought and conservation chapters and water management strategies; survey to collect data on supplies, drought planning, and conservation for each Water User Group (WUG); begin evaluating water management strategies after receiving approval from TWDB.
- Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG): determined through 2060, RWPG must determine 2070 values; three of the Groundwater Management Areas (GMA's) contacted responded to keep 2060 values constant through 2070, the other three did not respond. John Dupnik and Ron Fieseler responded that the values for their GMA's, 10 and 9, respectively, will likely stay the same but need to wait until the next Region K meeting to discuss with their GMA's. David van Dresar noted the difficulty of the GMAs and Groundwater Conservation District (GCDs) to give MAG updated values through 2070 since the next round of Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) are not due until May of 2016. David Meeseey said that it is fine to keep the 2060 values constant through 2070 and revisit it in five years (next planning cycle), which is what most GMA's are doing
- Non-municipal revision request submitted to TWDB in October 2012, updated in April 2013, revisions accepted in June, final TWDB approval expected in fall of 2013.

8. Items related to Draft Population and Municipal Water Demand Projections:

- a. Presentation and discussion of Draft Population and Municipal Demand Projections, including revised projections based on comments received from the Water User Groups and recommended by the Population and Water Demand Committee
 - Ronald Gertson introduced this item by reviewing that these projections represent the demands that need to be met over the future decades through 2070. The revision request numbers presented at this meeting have been vetted by the Population and Water Demand Committee for consideration by the group to submit for review by the TWDB. There was an extensive outreach to WUGs to make recommendations for changes. Because of the recent 2010 census, the TWDB may approve changes that would increase the region's population over the projection amounts.
 - Virginia Wilkinson presented the timeline for this item. *In 2013* – draft projections from TWDB received March 5; corrected data received on April 8; WUG input in late Spring, change requests due Aug 16; TWDB approval expected in early Fall.
 - The methodology for arriving at these projections relies on 2010 census, the State Demographer projects county growth based on births, deaths, and migration to 2040. Migration is calculated for three scenarios; 1.0 assumes migration from previous decade will remain constant, 0.5 assumes that migration will be half the rate of the previous decade, and 0.0 assumes no net migration. The TWDB then takes these projections to 2070, splits them into municipalities, and uses 2011 gallons per capita per day (GPCD) values and projected GPCD decreases based on plumbing code changes to arrive at water demand projections by decade for each WUG.

- 41.7% of the region's WUGs participated in the outreach, 6 WUGS requested a downward revision, and 14 requested an upward revision, although not enough data was provided for some. 20 requested no revisions, and of the 56 unresponsive WUGs, most are assumed to not need revisions.
 - David Lindsay asked what goes in to GPCD regarding business, industrial, and manufacturing use. Virginia replied that much of it is in the non-municipal demand projection category, which is a separate set of projections, and areas with high tourism would have high GPCD without being reflected in the population. Teresa added that commercial is included in the municipal demand category, but not manufacturing, which is separate in the non-municipal demand category.
 - Virginia went through each county and explained the changes from TWDB projections recommended by the Committee. Bastrop County requested a 1.0 migration scenario through 2050, and a .75 migration scenario to 2070, which increased projections for all WUGs. In Burnet County, Marble Falls requested a population increase, which was taken out of the County-Other WUG. In Hays County the population was redistributed between some of the WUGs. In Williamson County, Wells Branch MUD was moved entirely into Region K out of Region G, but the totals for the county stayed the same. Haskell Simon asked why the TWDB projections were so far off for Leander and Virginia explained the information provided by the WUG as support for the proposed changes. Brandon Wade commented that Leander has a large footprint in Travis county and has experienced rapid development. Virginia noted that much of its the population is in Region G, Meesey echoed that it is difficult to estimate due to the fact that it is split by the two regions. Teresa Lutes presented the City of Austin rationale and data to support the recommended change request for the county-level projections for Travis County. Teresa noted that Austin is located in three counties, which is reflected in the projections for those counties. The City of Austin is requesting that the RWPG approve, including: 1) the use of 1.0 migration scenario for Travis county and associated population increases for the main Austin WUG in Travis County, 2) the use of base dry year per capita adjusted for Drought Contingency Plan implementation, and 3) use of revised projected decadal per capita demands incorporating plumbing code and clothes washer savings already achieved.
 - Jim Brasher asked what TWDB is requiring to justify the Region K population increase. Virginia answered that TWDB has not authorized the increase yet, but has shared that they have received feedback from other regions expressing faster growth, and TWDB will need to consider the state-wide totals. Numbers and supporting documentation need to be provided to be considered.
- b. John Dupnik expressed concern over the 140 GPD goal being reached using these projections. Teresa explained that the City's plans reflect reaching this goal by using active conservation and reuse strategies. The baseline water demand projections that the TWDB developed as a baseline for the regional water plans are intended to reflect passive conservation to be achieved over time through plumbing code changes not the active type conservation steps the City is taking over time. These active steps require considerable effort, resources, and funding. Jennifer stated that the first thing the RWPG is supposed to look at for a WUG is that it has a conservation strategy, and we know that Austin will have a management strategy that is conservation-focused. Teresa told the group that what we want to avoid is embedding water conservation strategies that take active investment and policy making so that they are obvious in the water management strategies section of the plan. John Dupnik stated that he would agree if this method is consistent, to which David Meesey responded that they want every group to start with the State-wide methodology, but one size does not fit all and they want the best information that they can get. If what the WUG has is better than the state-wide methodology and the group agrees, they will look at it. In Austin's case, the City started rebate programs and plumbing code changes before the state required them. He cautioned the group not to over-estimate what Austin can do on the demand side since they are farther ahead than most other places. The City and the committee have spent a considerable amount of time delving into the details, and Teresa is confident that these estimates are accurate, Ronald Gertson confirmed that the committee did spend a lot of time on this, and that the committee even declined one part of the City's adjustment request which was not brought to the group, and that an even more detailed report will go to the TWDB for review. David Meesey added that before the committee met, the TWDB staff met one-on-one with City of Austin staff to confirm their methodology and make sure they have all the supporting documentation needed. Jim Brasher asked about the 2011 dry year baseline GPCD. It was explained that the, TWDB makes adjustments for emergency responses such as drought or if a water plant goes down. The base dry year GPCD Austin is proposing includes an adjustment for drought contingency plan implementation during the latter part of 2011. Brandon Wade cautioned the group about comparing GPCD values in cities to towns, stating that they are different in that cities have a higher concentration of hotels and commuters, etc. whereas many smaller towns have a large number of secondary homes. Consider possible action to approve the population and municipal

demand projections and authorize the consultant team to submit the revision request and supporting documentation to TWDB.

- Teresa Lutes made a motion to authorize the consultants to send the municipal population and water demand revision request to the TWDB staff for consideration, including the items discussed at this meeting and captured on the 11X17 hand-out sheet, and to authorize the consultants to continue discussions with the TWDB on behalf of the RWPG to determine final projections, with an addition from Ronald Gertson to include that the consultants would refer to the Population and Demand Committee in case there is a need for TWDB follow-up. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Items related to the draft TWDB Manufacturing Demand Projections for discussion and possible action

Jaime presented manufacturing demand projections. A new manufacturing facility in Matagorda County is expected to open in 2016, Tenaris, which will use about 3,000 acre-feet/year. This amount will be taken from water previously used for irrigation on the site. Ronald Gertson motioned to submit the water use change of 3,000 ac/ft from irrigation to manufacturing; the motion passed unanimously. Haskell asked how precise we need to be in this estimation; David Meeseey responded that the projections do not have to be precise as long as they are an even substitution.

10. Presentation and discussion of draft surface water availability results from the updated Region K Cutoff Model. – John Burke initiated the discussion, Jaime Burke said they met with the Modeling Committee and decided that preliminary draft results will likely be discussed at the next meeting.

11. Other Committee Reports, none

12. Discuss and take possible action regarding Hays County representation

Hays County requested that Ray Whisenant be added to the Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group (LCRWPG). The LCRWPG would have to vote to amend the bylaws by a 2/3rds vote to increase the membership to 26 and advertise for the position. After 45 days the group would need to vote to elect a new member. Ray Whisenant addressed and thanked the group, and stated that he could contribute his experience to the group and be of service to his county by being a direct representative for the County.

13. Discuss and take possible action as appropriate to change by-laws to increase the Region K Planning Group to 26 voting members.

- Haskell Simon asked Mr. Whisenant what water challenges Hays County is facing, to which he responded that they mirror other central Texas counties, including dealing with rapid growth effects. Ron Fieseler gave some background on the representation of Hays County in the RWPG; previous representation has been through residents of the county that were representing groundwater districts. However currently the only representatives in the group are an alternate and a member who has previously lived in Hays County. John Dupnik affirmed that there would be value in having Mr. Whisenant on the group based on his experience. Ron Fieseler made a motion to amend the bylaws to increase membership to 26, with the additional member representing Hays County. The motion was later changed to not include specifying which county the member would represent. The motion was voted on after the following discussion with 10 voting yes, the motion needed a 2/3rds vote, so it did not pass.
- John Burke stated that the only opening right now is Llano County and that the GMA 8 nomination has to come from GMA 8. Barbara Johnson read from bylaws that the only option would be to increase the number of members, without specifying the County. Jennifer suggested taking time to look at how members were elected in the past. Barbara agreed with a suggestion to have the Bylaws Committee present to the group. Ronald Gertson added that there will always be people that could contribute to the group, but that the size of the group has grown considerably and it has been more and more difficult to have in-depth discussion and accommodate such a large group. He suggested assigning a current member as a Hays county representative on the website. Ronald also noted that in other regions, sometimes a person will represent multiple counties. The Bylaws Committee is to review the issue.

14. Presentation and discussion of drought research study done by Intera Geosciences and Engineering, Inc. and commissioned by Central Texas Water Coalition (CTWC)

- David Lindsay introduced the presentation; telling the group that recent changes in inflows into the Highland Lakes led the CTWC to hire Intera to research the topic, and this presentation is a brief overview of their findings.

- Dr. Singh introduced himself and stated that the core of their research was to look at trends in inflows to the Highland Lakes. Dr. Singh highlighted three main conclusions of his research: 1) inflows to the Highland Lakes have decreased by 31% on average when comparing 1999-to-Present with the Pre-1999 period; 2) the current WMP does not protect firm water supplies in the Highland Lakes, at least not without needing emergency orders; and 3) the Firm Yield of the Highland Lakes needs to be re-calculated. The report and data that Intera used is available on request.
- Ron Fieseler asked if population increases since the 1950's were considered in the streamflow calculations. Dr. Singh answered that the flows used were naturalized and may be off by some amount that would be difficult to calculate. John Dupnik commented that there is a need to more strongly link surface water and groundwater management processes, due to the degree to which they impact one another. Jennifer pointed out that the TCEQ WAM goes through 1999, while the WAM Region K uses goes through 2009. David Lindsay commented that TCEQ is updating their water availability model (WAM) to bring naturalized data up to current dates.

15. Discuss and take possible action regarding request by CTWC to consider recreational and other economic impacts when developing water management strategies for the regional water plan.

- Cindy Smiley asked, on behalf of CTWC, that the Highland Lakes be recognized in the Region K Plan for their recreational and economic impacts, and suggested several places in the plan to include the lakes in water management strategies. There was a letter sent to the group on April 6th with suggested language. Jo Karr Tedder addressed the group and said that the counties surrounding the lakes are being economically devastated.
- Jennifer Walker and David Lindsay discussed the specific request. David Lindsay said that an operating level implemented using WAM RUN67 would indicate a level for a stable lake with historically low inflows. It was clarified that CTWC is asking for a 200,000 acre-feet demand to be considered in the plan to address this issue. David Lindsay commented that the presentation by Intera was appropriate today because it illustrated that without a historical average, there is no back-up, and this need should be included in the plan. David Van Dresar suggested that the group should urge voters and legislators of Texas to pass the funding to implement water management strategies. Jennifer Walker suggested that the group encourage all communities to implement their drought contingency plans as the City of Austin has done and aggressively conserve.
- Bill Neve asked if there is a process set up in case someone asks for a new demand category to be added. David Meesey replied that yes, and they have gone through the process and the TWDB responded to the CTWC saying that the RWPG cannot consider it a new demand because it is not consumptive. However, there are several ways to address this item in the water plan. Chairman Burke suggested that if the group would like to bring forward ideas of how to accomplish saving 200,000 ac/ft in the Highland Lakes including a mechanism to pay for it, the RWPG could consider incorporating such a strategy. Jim Barho commented that how the RWPG can spend its funding in its planning efforts is defined by the TWDB and how it is somewhat restrictive. He suggested presenting strategies to the RWPG; the process for which was outlined at the January 9th meeting, and is in the minutes.

16. Agenda items for next meeting

- Ronald Gertson suggested that John Dupnik be recognized as the official Hays County representative and post it on the website accordingly. It was assigned to the Bylaws Committee to research the topic of membership representation before the next meeting and report back on October 9th in Bay City.
- Jennifer Walker asked when a presentation on drought contingency plan requirements and the new drought chapter should be made. Jaime Burke sent out information on a Webinar on this topic, which is still on the TWDB website.
- Meeting dates for next year will be determined.

17. New / Other Business - none

18. Public Comments - none

19. Adjourned at 3:48 p.m.