

MINUTES OF MEETING

BRAZOS G REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

June 9, 2004

In accordance with notice sent to each member of the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group and posted in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act (copy attached as **Exhibit A**), a meeting of the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group convened at 10:05a.m., Wednesday, June 9, 2004, in the central office of the Brazos River Authority, 4600 Cobbs Drive, Waco, Texas. Attendance was as follows:

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT

Tony Jones, Chair
Mike Morrison, Vice Chair
Phil Ford, Secretary/Treasurer
David Bell (alternate for Chaunce Thompson)
Mark Bryson
Tom Clark
Scott Diermann
Tim Fambrough
Horace Grace
A.V. Jones
Terry Kelly
Scott Mack
Dale Spurgin
Stephen Stark
Wiley Stem
Kent Watson

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT

Truman Blum
Jon Burrows
Chaunce Thompson

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT

Joan Glass (alternate for Melissa Mullins)
Amador Hernandez
Terry Lopas
Mike McGuire
David Meesey
Joe Simecek (alternate for Paul Zweiacker)

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT

James Clarno
John Grant
Julia Marsden
Susan Morgan
Melissa Mullins
Paul Zweiacker

OTHERS PARTICIPATING

Teresa Clark, Brazos River Authority
David Dunn, HDR Engineering
Kimberly Goolsby, Brazos River Authority
John Rutledge, Freese and Nichols
Lisa Tschirhart, Brazos River Authority
David Wheelock, Brazos River Authority

PUBLIC PRESENT

See attached sign-in sheet (**Exhibit B**)

Invocation – At the request of Chair Jones, Scott Mack gave the invocation.

Notice of Meeting –

Chair Jones noted that each member of the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group received notice of this meeting pursuant to the bylaws (copy of agenda attached as **Exhibit C**). He indicated that the public meeting notice was properly posted as required by the law and confirmations of timely posting were received.

Attendance and Announcements –

Chair Jones called for a roll call and announced that Chaunce Thompson appointed David Bell as alternate who will arrive shortly and Truman Blum and Jon Burrows had meeting conflicts and will not be here today.

Chair Jones noted the presence of a quorum.

Chair Jones noted the availability of a hard copy of the meeting materials for public review. He said that the public can also view and download the meeting materials from the Brazos G website at www.brazosgwater.org.

Consider Approval of Draft Minutes-

Chair Jones stated the minutes should be approved at the next meeting in August because not everyone received them in time and noted the allotted time is not available to review.

Chair Jones also announced how minutes will be recorded for future meetings to provide a better response time for members and the public. The minutes will be transcribed by showing primarily the agenda item and action taken. The audio tape of the meeting will be indexed by the agenda item number and both posted to the website for viewing and listening.

Present Independent Financial Report and Consider Approval -

Chair Jones called on Stephen Stark, Chair of Finance and Cost Committee, to present this report to the group. A copy of the Independent Financial Report is attached as **Exhibit D**.

Mr. Stark noted there were no unusual expenditures incurred in the last 60 days. The revenue amount of \$137,783 was taken from the total grant with the expenditures for the same amount. He also stated that he occasionally takes the opportunity to point out and thank BRA for their administrative expenses of \$17,741 over the last 60 day period. Since there were no questions, the financial report for the quarter-two month period will be submitted.

It was moved by Tom Clark and seconded by Mark Bryson to accept the financials as presented.

The **MOTION CARRIED** with no dissenting votes.

Public Input-

Chair Jones reminded everyone that the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group is limited in its ability to participate in discussions or deliberations by the provisions of the Open Meetings Act. The Group cannot deliberate or discuss issues that are not posted on the meeting agenda.

Chair Jones noted that the public would be given the opportunity to speak on agenda items after they are presented and before any action is taken on the item.

Chair Jones asked if there were any requests from the public to speak and there were none.

PROGRAM-

Featured Educational Briefing -

Brazos River Authority Basin Projects,
West Central Brazos Study and Johnson/Parker Water Study,
Presented by Freese and Nichols, Inc.

Chair Jones called on Tim Jahn, BRA Business Development Manager for the Upper Basin, to introduce the Freese & Nichols guests, Simone Kiel and Gordon Wells.

Tim Jahn noted that he was project manager for two studies in the upper region of the Brazos Basin. The studies were presented briefly at the Brazos G meeting back in March which included the West Central Brazos Study and the Johnson/Parker Water Study. Two representatives from Freese and Nichols will be giving a 15-minute presentation on each study. The first speaker will be Simone Keil and she'll present the Western Central Brazos Study. Simone has been with Freese and Nichols for approximately 11 years in the water resources group. She is a project manager and engineer in the State of Texas. Gordon Wells is new to Freese and Nichols and will be presenting the Johnson/Parker Water Study. Gordon retired from the Core after about 25 years, is a retired Colonel with a recent stint in Iraq and is also the former district engineer in Fort Worth. Mr. Jahn introduced Mr. Ford to make some comments prior to the Freese & Nichols presentations.

Phil Ford stated that BRA briefed the stakeholders on the 3rd of March on the West Texas Study. Abilene had requested an extension of time to comment which will be worked before it is submitted to the Water Development Board (copy of both presentations attached as **Exhibits E & F**).

DISCUSS BYLAW REVISIONS -

Chair Jones called on Teresa Clark to present the bylaw revisions.

Teresa Clark stated that last summer the Group approved a major revision of the bylaws and as promised, there would be a few more areas that would need to be corrected. (copy of draft bylaw revisions attached as **Exhibit G**)

The recommended revisions included the following:

- Article II, Voting Membership; Section 3, Terms of Office
- Article VIII, Meetings; Section 2, Regular Meetings
- Article III, Selection of New Voting Members; Section 5, Vote Required; and,
- Article IX, Making Decisions; Section 4, Decision Making Process for Committees

Chair Jones called upon members for questions on these changes as presented by Teresa Clark and stated he would be open for a motion. The motion requires a 2/3 vote and with the members present it will take at least 10 to pass.

It was moved by Mr. Diermann and seconded by Judge Fambrough to amend the bylaws as presented.

The **MOTION CARRIED** with no dissenting votes.

Consider Recommendations from Executive Committee for Voting Member Vacancies -

Chair Jones announced candidates recommended by the Executive Committee:
(copy of Executive Committee recommendations attached as **Exhibit H**)

1. Dale Spurgin, County Judge in Jones County for Agriculture Interest
2. Wayne Wilson, self-employed ranching/insurance from Robinson County for Agriculture Interest
3. Mike Sutherland, County Judge of Burleson for County
4. Mike McGuire, General Manager of Rolling Plains GCD and a voting member of Region B for County Interest
5. Randy Waclawczyk, an Environmental Superintendent with ALCOA for Industry Interest
6. Alva B. Cox, Assistant Director of Public Works for the City of Granbury for Municipal Interest
7. Kathleen Webster, retired real estate broker and the Chair of the West Central Texas MWD for Water District Interest.

The motion requires a 2/3 vote and with the members present it will take at least 10 to pass.

It was moved by Mr. Diermann and seconded by Judge Fambrough to accept the nominees as presented by the Executive Committee.

The **MOTION CARRIED** with no dissenting votes.

Chair Jones recognized the new members that were present at the meeting.

Report from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Staff Regarding TPWD Activities-

No Report.

Report from Texas Water Development Board staff-

Supplemental Funding Status

David Meesey reminded the members that the RWPG applied for supplemental funding from the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) several months ago. The TWDB internally had 1.6 million dollars with applications from approximately 14 of the RWPG's totaling about twice the funds available which is about normal. Brazos G submitted approximately 11 possible items but put them in a priority rank order so the TWDB would know which items were the most important to the region. The two top priorities for the Brazos G region were funded up to \$150,000 which was more a mathematical decision due to the funding available. The Reuse Study was funded at \$100,000 and \$50,000 was allocated to the Milliken Reservoir as a management strategy. Mr. Meesey clarified for Chair Jones that the scope of work would have to be cut back on both studies somewhat in order to get the work done for the allotted funds. He stated that there were only four, possibly five regions that received \$150,000 each.

Chair Jones asked Mr. Meesey to address the funding of the money because he thought the money had already been allocated but apparently that was not the case.

Mr. Meesey responded by stating the money was not fully allocated. It is a quirk with state government with the budget process in Texas being every two years. The TWDB has enough money allocated to pay for the current work that is in the contract but the supplemental funding is new. The new part is in part based on future appropriations that will be requested from the legislature. Contracts have been written from the beginning such that the TWDB can only guarantee the amount of money that they have in hand because legally that is all they can do. Each contract in the regions have always said "based on funds available". The contract gives a breakdown of money that can be guaranteed for this biennium and assuming future appropriations, so much is available for the next biennium with a total. So in that sense, it is the same way it has always been done. Technically all of the supplemental money is not available until a year from September. Part of the money is in hand from lapsed contracts. Mr. Meesey felt confident in saying that the TWDB has always been able to get the money from the

legislature because they have made it a high enough priority to do so. The TWDB is confident enough to contract for that money again but technically they can't guarantee that it will all be there because it is subject to appropriation.

Chair Jones stated that he did not realize that and if the project was started then the Group would have to share funds that are already in hand until the new money is appropriated. He asked Mr. Meesey if the money by chance was appropriated early, could they move that date up versus waiting until September.

Mr. Meesey had not thought about that angle but said there may be some restrictions due to the start of the fiscal year in September. The way it works is that they do not have to hold the money separately. It is mingled into each of the current ten contract tasks and then into each task budget. You continue to work on the tasks 1 through 10 throughout the planning process. He further said the TWDB would not have all the money to reimburse for the work. They will know before September 2005 if the money will be approved. The contract is structured so that if the money is not approved, then the TWDB has no choice but to issue a stop work order such that the region would need to change and reduce the scope of work based on the funds available. The TWDB has not had to do this but it is in the contract.

Mr. Dunn stated this situation is somewhat different than previous circumstances. The current funds came into two parts because it crossed the biennium. There were sufficient funds in the first biennium to cover all the work needing to be done as well as into part of the next phase of the planning cycle. So even if the second pot of funds was not received, HDR would still be able to work into the next biennium resulting in no risk for all parties. In this case, the initially prepared plan will be submitted in May 2005 and at that point, there will be roughly between \$30,000 to \$50,000 left in reserves to answer all the public comments and finalize the plan due January 2006. The \$150,000 for the new work will need to be spent essentially between now and October 2004 which will come out of the existing pot of money. Assuming the legislature approves the funding, it would get put back into the pot in September 2005 so there is some risk. We would probably know by March/April 2005 if the Legislature intends to fund this which is well in advance of the deadline and at that point work would stop until the scope is modified or cry for help.

Mr. Meesey said that was a fair assessment of the situation.

Chair Jones suggested the Group take action to approve HDR to go ahead and implement the new studies with the funds they already have with the bet that the money will be funded by the Legislature.

It was moved by Mr. Watson and seconded by Mr. Stem that they proceed with the additional supplement funding.

The **MOTION CARRIED** with no dissenting votes.

Lake Alan Henry plan amendment status for Regions G and O-

David Meeseey reported that since the last meeting a conference call took place with the participants concerned. The District is working with the City of Lubbock to authorize a water supply contract but he was not sure if it had been completed. HDR is submitting a grant application to the Texas Water Development Board for approximately \$21, 500 to cover the costs to amend plans in both Regions G and O. Typically a grant is not done this way but Mr. Meeseey recommended that one region take the lead to eliminate duplication. Since it was Region O's project, they took the lead and will work to get the plans, amendment notices published and everything that has to be done short of the individual public hearings by each of the regions. Region G can hold the public hearing in conjunction with a regularly scheduled meeting and will not have to have an extra meeting. Teresa has worked closely with Region O in providing information on getting the notices out, costs, etc. which has been a big help.

Other issues regarding TWDB activities –

David Meeseey announced the upcoming Rule of Capture Conference to be held in Austin, June 15th, 9:00 am at the Capital Extension. Individuals can register online and there should still be some space available. They are expecting a large turnout.

Status Report from David Wheelock on the TWDB Water Conservation Task Force-

Mr. Wheelock noted that the task force has been working diligently toward the November 1st deliverable to the legislature and the TWDB is proceeding ahead with putting together a State Water Awareness Program for water conservation and issued an RFP for a PR consultant. The TWDB will be having an initiative for a State Water Awareness Campaign before the task force ends its work. On the best management practices, it's about a 200-page document with a wide range of best management practices for water conservation which were presented to you last month. The comment period closed on June 1 and he hasn't seen those comments yet. That piece of work, which is primarily the consultant driven with a good bit of input from task force, has been complimented for its breadth and thoroughness, but states that as with all things, there is no good deed that goes unpunished. There's not a significant concern when people see how detailed this best management guide is. It looks like it is just one step away from being mandated so that people have to implement best management practices. That's causing a good bit of concern on the task forces as to how can we communicate clearly to you, to Brazos G, to the public, and to the legislature or TECQ that this should be water conservation at a local initiative and should be voluntary. We're not real sure how to do that, so we're working through that. The targets and goals have had a bit of concern as to whether or not these are going to become mandatory and how they'll be implemented. So far, the recommendations have stood as I presented to you one or two meetings ago on the 1% per year reduction. Floors of 125 gallons per capital day total usage, 50 gallons inside the house, and then the summer use to winter use ratio of 1.6. It's likely that the 1.6 ratio in the summer to winter is probably going to go away. That is

not getting much support, but the other ones will probably stand. It's just going to be how we word the recommendations to the legislature and to others, so that we're working through those issues.

Mr. Diermann commented that Mr. Wheelock said he was working hard so that these become voluntary and not mandated. He asked if they are mandated in other states and how realistic is it.

Mr. Wheelock stated he had two items; one having to do with House Bill 2660, which is enforced and requiring all public water supply entities to file targets and goals for conservation. Item two is expanding your practices you're going to mandate to achieve whatever your goal is.

Mr. Bryson asked if it was somewhere in a document or a preamble that says these are not meant to be mandatory. He said that if they were to be, they need to go through a formal rule making process of an agency in order to get that accomplished.

Mr. Wheelock noted that he did not think they would want to put this into law, but rather they would want to have TECQ go through a rule making process. He commented that TECQ can not accept these without going through a rule making process on each one of the different BMP's and he was not sure TECQ would want to do that in their current form.

Report from Horace Grace on Participation in a Water Conference-

Chair Jones called Horace Jones to present. Mr. Jones noted his representation of Brazos G at a water conference. The subject of the conference was water in Texas. We covered a lot of good subjects such as environmental flow, water banking, which is non-appropriated water put in a bank and held there for the environment leaves and wildlife. We also had a lot of recommendations on water conservation and a lot of environmental people feel that if we use our conservation properly, we make and meet all of our water shortages without building reservoirs.

David Meeseey commented on his attendance at the meeting and said that Region G was represented, Commission Combs represented the Agriculture Department, Executive Administrator Kevin Ward was there and several of the Groundwater Districts.

Susan Kaderka, National Wildlife Federation, reminded everyone that this particular water conference was their fourth annual State Wide Water Conference and was directed in particular at the Regional Water Planning Groups. Our group at the conference is in the process of putting out a series for briefings recommendations and documents that we will be circulating to all the planning groups.

Discuss future reporting from adjacent regions –

Chair Jones said he would like to place an agenda item on each of our future meeting agenda's for a report from a liaison from our bordering regions.

Teresa Clark stated that we were not looking at having a full report of each group's activities, but rather information on activities that relate to Region G for better coordination.

It was moved by Mr. Kelly and seconded Mr. Fambrough that we would have reports as needed from the neighboring region as it directly relates to us and Region G.

The **MOTION CARRIED** with no dissenting votes.

Consider Recommendations from Water Policy Workgroup-

Chair Jones called on Scott Mack to present the recommendations of the Water Policy Workgroup.

Dr. Mack said the TWDB's website has over 40 water policy issues listed that could be discussed with four having summary papers attached. As those summaries become available, the workgroup will send out a questionnaire to prioritize those according to relevance to our regions as well as to find individual members of the workgroup to come up with a summary for each issue. Then as the issues are posted to the website, we can prioritize and come up with recommendations to bring forward to the board. What the board in general does with these is something we discussed. Some of the issues need to be directed back to the TWDB, some of it for our own use and we are open to discussion on what the TWDB chooses to do with the information we present.

Dr. Mack presented to the Group recommendations made by the Workgroup (copy attached as **Exhibit I**). He noted that one issue listed on the website in reference to regional or statewide environmental mitigation system was discussed but no recommendation was made by the Workgroup. The Workgroup felt the issue was very site specific. The mitigation could be combined in certain areas to have one mitigation area satisfying several different projects or done on an individual basis and we didn't feel comfortable making a recommendation on that issue.

It was moved by Dr. Mack and seconded by Mr. Clark to accept the policy recommendations as presented to the Brazos G Regional Planning Group.

Chair Jones stated the motion had been made and asked if anyone had other questions for Dr. Mack.

After some discussion, it was moved by Mr. Clark and seconded by Mr. Grace not to take any action on the water policy recommendation at this time.

The **MOTION CARRIED** with no dissenting votes.

Dr. Mack stated that he will bring back a presentation at a later meeting to share with the Group on how the Workgroup came up with their recommendations and provide a brief summary on each issue.

In response to the letter from the Far West Texas Group, David Meeseey suggested in sending a letter to them in reference to the water policy recommendation that has been suggested by the Workgroup and then getting their response to bring back to the Group. Dr. Mack stressed that was fine but wanted to make everyone aware that the Far West Group issue was one that this group put in our committee that is not on the Water Development website.

Chair Jones calls recess to have lunch, and resume at 12:45.

Chair Jones resumes meeting and calls on David Dunn to present the next agenda item.

David Dunn stated that before they got started with the next presentation, there was a point brought up that he would like to clarify with regard to coordination with the Johnson and Parker County Study and the West Central Study. He said that within the scope of work, we as consultants will coordinate with the studies and any water management strategies or ideas that come. As a result of those, we will incorporate into our recommendations to work with the plan, and it so happens that the Freese and Nichols is one of the sub consultants for the Region G Group and it has been cast in their scope of work to do that coordination.

Update from HDR on Water Availability Estimates and Needs Assessments -

Update on water availability estimates and need assessments

Freese and Nichols, Inc. Update on yield of Lake Mexia

Mr. Dunn said the first item is an updated yield of Lake Mexia. During the last round of planning it was recognized that the yield we had conceded from Mexia might be a little bit high due to height and that really counts for an increased sedimentation or height sedimentation load. We have a very specific item that we have to work to do an updated analysis of future potential sedimentation into Lake Mexia. Then we would have to update preferred yields to Lake Mexia based upon that sedimentation and Freese and Nichols has completed that analysis.

David Dunn called upon John Rutledge to present.

John Rutledge opened his presentation by giving a few facts about Lake Mexia. Lake Mexia was completed back in 1961 and at that time it was authorized to impound 9600

acre feet with a withdrawal of just a little under 3,000 acre feet per year mostly for municipal purposes. Since that time as dated, we have suffered from a pretty significant sedimentation rate. The latest information that we have was a survey that was done by the TWDB in 1996. It would have had 30 some odd years of sedimentation going into that and that showed that the 30 year period basically lost half of its storage, which is a tremendous amount of sedimentation. I really don't know the reasons why they have been subjected to such sedimentation but that is the rate at which it is being impacted. Subsequently it reduces the storage and the available yields. The sedimentation rate works out to about 0.76 acre feet per square mile drainage area which is quite a high rate. That is back calculated from taking the original storage and the last storage calculated from the sedimentation survey done by the board. So the assumption was that this rate would continue on into the future but that rate would tend to decrease over time. As the source gets smaller and smaller the amount that the reservoir could actually supply will tend to go down, more will get spilled, some will actually get stored up above the conservation level, and so that was factored into it. The net results are shown in Table I in the handout on page 2, and again remembering that the permanent withdrawal rate is just under 3,000 acre feet per year (copy of presentation attached as **Exhibit J**). The year 2000 firm yield was estimated to be 1180 acre feet per year, less than half of the permanent amount, and the demand for comparison for the City of Mexia is 1200 acre feet so basically at the current time their demand is essentially equal to the yield, give or take a little bit. The problem that we're seeing is extrapolated out in the future, as the study needs to do. By 2060, we estimated that with that assumption of sedimentation, the firm yield drops down to only 144 acre feet, and for purposes of what we're talking about that is affectively gone. There is technically a positive firm yield but in reality a very slight and realistic different assumption on how the sediment was deposited so by 2060 the firm yield of Lake Mexia will essentially have evaporated. Its demand projection would go up to 1500 acre feet per year, so as David alluded to, the high sedimentation rate is a significant problem for Lake Mexia. The results as we have confirmed are that the yield will tend to in essence be almost completely dissipated by the end of the planning period. That will have to be taken into account when we come up with solutions for Mexia by basically having to replace their entire demand by the end of the study period.

David Bell asked if this was the same general circumstance as Hubbard where the first set of data was the 2060 survey and the second set was TWDB Survey.

Mr. Rutledge said it would be the same sort of deal. Probably the best number we have is the current number because it's only eight years past the last survey and 2000 says the yield is essentially the same as the demand. So with that present number we had the most confidence.

Scott Mack stated that it was his understanding that land use practice has changed significantly in the watershed for going into the Navasota River which flows into Lake Mexia from farming to ranching or grassland. It would seem logical to assume the sedimentation rate over the first part of the life of Lake Mexia would be greater because of farmland practices upstream rather than in the recent past where it was range land.

John Rutledge commented that the supposition is quite likely true. In general, farm practices have reduced sedimentation statewide due to using better practices. These are the kind of details that are beyond our knowledge, in the speculative range, but they're reasonable and until there is another sedimentation survey in another ten years, we're not going to know anymore than we know now. For planning purposes, this is really the best thing we can do right now because with the survey further down the road then we'll have a much better feel for it, and it wouldn't surprise me one bit if the sedimentation rate flattened out and actually projecting that would be a significant lower rate from here on.

David Dunn noted that in terms of sedimentation, it's not a uniform process and in the last eight years, Lake Mexia had been relatively dry so we're not going to see a whole lot of sedimentation because there haven't been flood waters to move the sediment into the reservoir.

Safe yields for reservoirs above Possum Kingdom Lake

David Dunn noted that Mr. Morrison asked us to compute safe yields in addition to firm yields for those reservoirs that are upstream of the Possum Kingdom Reservoir. In the current 2001 plan that was adapted, one of the policy recommendations adopted was to utilize safe yield as opposed to firm yield for specific reservoirs. This is an issue that this planning group has addressed in the past and has actually formulated a policy recommendation on that. At that time in the planning process, I believe the Water Development Board didn't allow use of safe yield, but required a firm yield analysis to water supply. Since then, the TWDB has relaxed that and it allows a reasonable reserve supply left in the reservoir during a critical period or something along those lines if a specific entity requests that for their water supply.

David Meeseey stated it would require approval in advance from the Executive Administrator. There are a couple of exceptions and something like this is one that you can present, request an exception or waiver and we'll look at it and make a decision. It does still say firm yield in the guidance unless you get an Executive Administrator approval for another method, just like we did with some of these others.

David Dunn stated that on April 14th he had presented draft water supply estimates, and the Group directed HDR to compute safe yields for those 11 or 12 upstream of Possum Kingdom. Today we're going to present those safe yields and compare them to the firm yields to be computed (copy of presentation attached as **Exhibit K**). Safe yield is similar to the concept except during that worst month equivocal period, you still have a reserve left, and the general definition of safe yield is that you have one year supply left in the reservoir at that minimum point, so our safe yield number is going to be less than a firm yield number. Some of the rationale behind using safe yield opposed to firm yield, is that it's very variable, and this safe yield concept provides the cushions in case we get a drought of record than what we've experienced historically, which would then decrease our firm yield. Firm yield is what is used statewide and is the standard analysis.

John Rutledge stated that a map of the area near Possum Kingdom Reservoir and other reservoirs had safe yield analysis performed. The draft shows the difference between a safe yield and firm yield operation. The table presents a comparison for each of the reservoirs that an analysis was done. It reduces the supply from that resource for these 11 reservoirs by about 30%, which is a significant difference. In terms of discussion, the ultimate result will increase the needs that need to be planned for and will result in possibly additional water management strategies that need to be considered for this part of the region if we use a safe yield verses a firm yield number.

Mike Morrison pointed out that in the Brazos G area there is wide variation in the region itself and in 2001 there was discussion that the planning done last time was done on the basis of firm yield because there was no latitude to do that planning on any other basis.

David Meeseey commented that the answer may not be what it was in the 2001 plan; it's still not safe yield though, its firm yield but the firm yield values have changed in some lakes.

Update on Water Availability Estimates and Need Assessments

David Dunn presented the information to the Group (copy attached as **Exhibit L**). Discussion and questions followed.

Chair Jones informed the Group that a letter was received from an attorney on behalf of the City of Cleburne requesting that the Group designate reuse as a specific water management strategy to meet identified municipal and industrial needs for the City of Cleburne and Johnson County.

Confirmation of Next Meeting Dates -

Chair Jones addressed the Group on upcoming meetings:

- August 11 & 12, Wednesday and Thursday (August 11 confirmed only)
- September 8 & 9th, Wednesday and Thursday
- October 20 Wednesday (confirmed)
- December 8, Wednesday (confirmed)

It was moved by Mr. Fambrough and seconded by Mr. Clark to accept the meeting dates as presented.

The **MOTION CARRIED** with no dissenting votes.

New Business to be considered at next meeting-

There was none discussed.

Adjournment –

There being no further business before the Group, Chair Jones adjourned the meeting at 1:53 p.m.

PHILLIP J. FORD
Secretary/Treasurer

TONY JONES
Chair

DRAFT