

## **Minutes of GMA #2 Joint Planning Meeting July 28, 2006**

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am at the Sandy Land UWCD Office in Plains, Texas. Those attending the meeting were Jim Conkwright, James Mitchell, Ferrell Wheeler, Ken Carver, Jason Coleman, Shelby Elam, Mike McGregor, Harvey Everheart, and Gary Walker. All GMA #2 member districts were present.

The initial discussion concerned the current conditions within the GMA. All members reported pervasive drought conditions and little or no beneficial rainfall this summer. Irrigated farms are quickly approaching cutout, even with average irrigation amounts. Some districts are still issuing a number of drilling permits as producers seek supplemental irrigation water for finishing this crop.

The group moved on to the question of identifying subdivisions of the aquifer(s) within the GMA. All members agreed that the diversity of uses, availability, and geology across the GMA warrants the creation of subdivisions when considering desired future conditions. Several methods of delineating subdivisions included evaluating saturated thickness, irrigation methods, and presence of minor aquifer sediments. The difficulty in this task is compounded by the goal of maintaining some simplicity, so that management is not complicated beyond measure. No specific recommendation or idea for this process was acted upon by the group. Future meetings will allow additional consideration of this matter.

Recently, stakeholder meetings were conducted for both the Edwards-Trinity (High Plains) and Dockum GAMs. Edwards-Trinity (High Plains) underlies a significant portion of GMA #2, and the Dockum underlies nearly all of GMA #2. The group discussed the possible benefits of these GAMs when adopting desired future conditions. Specifically, since the ET-HP will be added as a bottom layer to the existing Southern Ogallala GAM, there will likely be corrections to the base of the Ogallala. Also, the contractor has stated that there will be a recalibration of the Southern Ogallala GAM after the bottom layer is developed. Also, these GAMs may provide better information when identifying subdivisions within the GMA. The group consensus at this time was that the development of minor aquifer GAMs is necessary before defining the desired future conditions.

Strategies discussed for defining the future conditions of the aquifer(s) include several items addressed earlier. These include examining boundaries for subdivisions of the aquifer(s), considering the role of minor aquifer GAMs, and considering future uses. Some discussion ensued regarding future use of groundwater, especially in light of the dairy and ethanol industries. Likewise, the current trend of higher energy prices may curb usage due to increased irrigation costs.

The group considered the areas in GMA #2 that are not in a gcd. There was some discussion about the other GMAs that have a lot of land that is considered "white areas". Ideally, the group agreed that the white area issue would be resolved if those areas either created or joined a gcd. Most members agreed that the legislature is likely to change some provisions in 36.108 that will address this matter. With that in mind, the group agreed that the priority for now should be

working on future conditions for areas within gcds. It is not anticipated that the white area issue will pose many problems for this GMA.

No public comment was offered, as no other interested parties attended the meeting.

The group agreed that future agenda items should include many of the same things discussed at this meeting. No certain date was set for the next meeting, although there was agreement that September or October would be an acceptable time for the next assembly of GMA #2.

Meeting was adjourned at 12pm.