GMA #2 Minutes
Meeting 1:00 PM, March 10, 2016
Board Room, Llano Estacado UWCD, Seminole, TX

Administrative Officer Jason Coleman called the meeting to order at 1:08 PM.

A roll call of the Groundwater Conservation Districts (GCD's) participating in the joint planning meeting was performed. A quorum was present with all GCDs in GMA 2 represented.

The GMA 2 voting representatives in attendance were:

- Ferrell Wheeler, Garza County UWCD.
- Ronnie Hopper, High Plains UWCD.
- Jud Cheuvront, Llano Estacado UWCD.
- Brent Staggs, Mesa UWCD (for Matt Farmer).
- Leatrice Adams, Permian Basin UWCD.
- Ross Hilburn, Sandy Land UWCD.
- Lindy Harris, South Plains UWCD (for Matt Hogue).

Also in attendance were: Lori Barnes, John Boren, Amber Blount, Robert Bradley (TWDB), Ray Brady, Amy Crowell Bush, Jason Coleman (GMA 2 Administrative Officer), Harvey Everheart (GMA 2 Information Coordinator), Technical Consultant Bill Hutchison, TWDB Commissioner Kathleen Jackson, Blaine Middleton, Donna Stringer, Lynn Tate, and Deanya Williams.

The floor was opened for public comment. TWDB Commissioner Kathleen Jackson expressed her appreciation for those participating in the Joint Planning process. She placed special emphasis regarding use of irrigation water for agriculture purposes. She also emphasized the importance of groundwater management on the local level. No other public comments were contributed at this time.

The minutes of the January 6, 2016 meeting were presented to all attendees. Jason Coleman gave the attendees time to review the minutes and then asked for any additions/revisions. There being none, Ronnie Hopper made a motion to accept the minutes as presented. Brent Staggs seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. Deanya Williams will post the approved minutes to the GMA #2 website.

Under Agenda Item #5, Bill Hutchison gave a presentation about the High Plains Groundwater Availability Model (GAM) with the Scenario 16 Results, as well as the preliminary explanatory report and the non-relevant aquifers.

Scenario 16 results included pumping, drawdown, and storage remaining by county, as well as combined results for the GCDs.

Aquifers classified as non-relevant for joint planning purposes in GMA 2 include the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer and Pecos Valley Aquifer. Scenario 16 results are focused upon the Ogallala, Edwards-Trinity (High Plains), and Dockum Aquifers (Ogallala and ETHP are combined).

The results were shown in graphs and tables with all the counties as well as GCD designation.

Scenario 16 has the pumping (acre-feet/year), drawdown from 2012 (feet), and storage remaining (% of 2012 Storage). The GMA #2 average for the planning period ending in 2070 shows groundwater pumping of 1,012,332 acre-feet with an average drawdown of 27 feet and an average remaining storage of 48%. After much discussion, it was the group's consensus that the expression of DFCs should be adopted on a GMA #2 wide scale rather than a county or GCD basis.

Lynn Tate asked for a clarification as to the language that might be used. The language of total average water level decline of 27 feet was discussed, and Ray Brady asked TWDB Representative Bradley if a range of 23-27 feet would be acceptable. The expected range is consistent with Scenario 16 coverage of both drought and "normal" usage periods. Mr. Bradley commented that other GMAs were working with a range of numbers and TWDB would allow that approach in calculations.

Amy Bush asked for additional clarification.

Jason Coleman suggested that the language include Scenario 8 for the "normal" use periods and Scenario 16 for the drought periods.

Harvey Everheart expressed concerns for adopting a DFC that projects Mesa UWCD to have a total average decline of 34 feet, which is greater than the GMA #2 average. The explanation was that the DFC was an average of all counties in GMA #2. It is recommended that county and GCD averages should not be used, due to model limitations.

Furthermore, GMA #2 has recognized during previous meetings that the aquifer is quite diverse, and some areas have more saturated thickness. As a result, there is more available drawdown in some areas than others.

Each of the voting representatives indicated that they were satisfied with the intentions to adopt a DFC using the range of declines from "normal" and drought usage periods as illustrated in Scenario 16.

Bill Hutchison presented the draft preliminary explanatory report. The final report is not due until the final DFC has been adopted. The draft report addresses nine factors the GCDs must consider before the vote to adopt the proposed DFC. The members agreed that this explanation will help interested persons understand the proposed DFCs.

The mid-April meeting will allow members to make any necessary revisions to the revised preliminary explanatory report and vote on the proposed DFC. This portion of the total cost will be $4,000. The current

tasks for the March meeting include Scenario 16 at $4,000, draft explanatory report at $11,000, and non-relevant documentation at $2,000. The same ratio will be billed to the GCDs.

Under Agenda Item #6, the voting members agreed that there was no reason to consider the Edwards Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, Seymour, or any other minor aquifer which must be included in GMA #2. These aquifers are non-relevant for joint planning purposes in GMA #2.

A tentative date of April 19, 2016 was set for the final meeting at which time the GCDs in GMA#2 will vote on a proposal to adopt desired future conditions for the relevant aquifers within their management area. This meeting must occur before the May 1, 2016 deadline to submit proposed DFCs.

Mesa UWCD will host the meeting in Lamesa. Agenda items will be forwarded to the members allowing for the meeting agenda to be legally posted by each district and posted on the website as soon as the agenda items can be determined.

Jud Cheuvront made a motion to adjourn. Leatrice Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Harvey Everheart, Information Coordinator