

## Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole Committee Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2020, 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

held via GoToWebinar Videoconference

*Committee decisions bolded and italicized in document*

**Participation: Number of Planning Water Resources Committee Members present 5 of 5:**

H	Mark Evans	C	Kevin Ward	K	David Wheelock
N	Carl Crull	O	Melanie Barnes		

**Senators/Representatives/Other VIPs in Attendance:** Heather Harward, Katherine Thigpen

**TWDB Board Members and Staff:** Temple McKinnon, Matt Nelson, Kevin Smith, Brian McMath

### AGENDA ITEMS

**1. Call to Order and Welcome**

Chair Mark Evans (Region H) opened the meeting and determined that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order.

**2. Public Comment**

No public comments were offered.

**3. Approval of the Minutes of the August 6, 2020 Meeting**

There were no comments. Mr. Kevin Ward (Region C) motioned to approve, Mr. David Wheelock (Region K) seconded. *Minutes of the August 6, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously by the committee.*

**4. Review of Problem Statement and Goal Statement**

Mr. Evans presented Problem Statement and Goal Statement.

**5. Discussion of Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole**

Mr. Kevin Smith discussed the recommendations in the Planning Water Resources committee report to the Interregional Planning Council (IPC) presented by Mr. Evans at the August 12, 2020 IPC meeting, noting that Mr. Jim Thompson (Region D) voiced concern with recommendation to legislature to utilize state agencies to develop a state level vision of planning resources for the state as a whole.

Ms. Melaine Barnes (Region O) stated that her understanding of the recommendation is to use state agencies when regional water planning brought projects forward, then state agencies would take action.

Mr. Carl Crull (Region N) stated that for large-scale and multi-regional projects a group should take a lead role, state agencies could be used to put individual entities into such group. Mr. Evans asked if this recommendation (state level vision) be moved to future IPCs. Mr. Kevin Ward (Region C) stated his understanding that state agencies could be used to get information on large-scale project so regions could develop such projects and that state agencies provide expertise for such projects. Ms. Barnes asked if the RWPGs or IPC needed permission from the legislature to ask agencies for information; she agreed with moving recommendation to Future IPC section. Mr. Ward suggested including "expertise" to recommendation. Mr. Wheelock suggested revising "develop" with "assist." Mr. Evans questioned if "state" should be removed from "state agencies." Mr. Ward commented that federal agencies are not helpful. Ms. Barnes stated that "state agencies" should remain. Committee agreed to move recommendation to future IPC section.

Mr. Evans questioned if legislative recommendation regarding a process amongst state agencies should be removed. Mr. Ward provided an example of TPWD providing comments at the end of a project which is almost complete. Mr. Ward stated that there is a difference between involvement early versus when project alternatives are already developed. Mr. Matt Nelson reminded that there is a requirement in regional water planning process for non-voting members of regional water planning group from some agencies. Mr. Crull replied that these representatives may say one thing, but agencies may say another thing. Ms. Barnes stated that large-scale and multi-regional project need state involvement and coordination. Mr. Ward stated that non-voting member agency representatives to give input at planning meetings. Ms. Barnes replied that it depends on individual representatives and if they are asked to be involved. Committee decided to leave recommendation but revised to include "at the state-level."

Ms. Barnes questioned if committee recommendations were too succinct. Mr. Evans asked if the committee was addressing everything they wanted. Mr. Ward replied that if there were several recommendations, would have to revise a lot. Mr. Crull replied that more length would lose the message.

Mr. Evans asked if the committee was okay with RWPG recommendations; the committee confirmed they were. Mr. Wheelock questioned whether to include the TWDB or state agencies to Future IPC recommendation concerning whether the IPC or RWPGs are the appropriate mechanism for planning for water resources for the state as a whole. Mr. Evans replied that he thinks TWDB is implied in recommendation. Mr. Wheelock asked if IPC recommendations would create more centralized planning. Ms. Barnes replied that planning outside of RWPG is beneficial since RWPG have regional interests and bias. Mr. Evans confirmed if committee was okay with IPC recommendations; committee confirmed yes.

Mr. Smith introduced the Review of Existing Practices and Conditions (with committee observations) section of the IPC report. Mr. Wheelock stated for Existing Regional Water Planning section to remove "adequately" to "was not designed." Ms. Barnes replied that intent is not to redesign the existing regional water planning process. Mr. Ward stated planning process should include needs of others and joint planning, not just looking at local supply/needs with same typical sources. Ms. Barnes stated to include "Interregional Planning Council" to paragraph one introduction.

Mr. Wheelock stated Existing Multi-regional Water Project and Supplies section should include City of Lubbock, Williamson County, and Luce Bayou multi-regional projects. He stated that section should reference number of interbasin transfers. Mr. Ward clarified that 30%, not the majority, of treated effluent to the Trinity River from the Dallas-Fort Worth area is used by the City of Houston.

Mr. Crull stated Previous State Water Planning section should be revised to include “desalinated” seawater.

Mr. Wheelock stated Long-term and Visionary Planning section should be revised from “not feasible” to “difficult and sometimes not feasible.” Mr. Evans stated “large-scale” should be removed. Ms. Barnes stated revision should include “statewide” and “are not a focus.” Mr. Ward stated that large-scale projects are last resort. Recommendation was revised to “are not a focus.” Mr. Evans asked if reference to Region N desalination project should stay. Mr. Ward stated drought proof water supply (desalination) should remain and add reference to megadrought study. Mr. Ward stated that last sentence revised to include “interregional coordination of partnerships” and strike “for industry” and replace with “for the region when it has the potential to involve multiple regions.”

Mr. Evans stated Project Sponsorship section should replace “themselves” with “project sponsors.” Mr. Evans questioned the statement that state participation is not used for multi-regional projects. Mr. Nelson responded that SWIFT program has been used for such projects. Committee discussed the issue of sponsorship for large-scale projects since any sponsor has to consider impact to customer rates. Committee decided to remove reference to “not used for multi-regional projects” and Toledo Bend reservoir, added “SWIFT board participation financing programs.”

Mr. Wheelock stated Existing Laws and Rules section should replace interbasin transfer “rule” with “law” and remove statement from observation that TCEQ rules discourage groundwater supplies stored in surface water supplies. Mr. Ward stated “justified” needs should be replaced with “identified water supply” needs.

Mr. Evans stated Innovated Projects section should replace “such” with “including.”

Mr. Evans stated that Methods to Improve Regional Coordination section has been tasked to another subcommittee. Mr. Ward stated that reference to using state committees to develop state water resources should be removed and clarified this was more in the context of regional conflict, which IPC and RWP process may not be able to resolve. Ms. Barnes stated an observation that planning groups talk earlier in the regional planning process be included. Ms. Temple McKinnon clarified that the Enhancing Interregional Coordination committee is looking at this.

Mr. Smith stated that he was not sure procedurally if the IPC would have comments before the next IPC meeting on 9/15 that would require revisions the to committee’s section of the IPC report.

The committee returned to discussion of Existing Multi-regional Water Project and Supplies section Mr. Smith clarified that this section intended to make the observation that the committee acknowledged existing multi-regional projects and reference materials developed during committee meetings. Mr. Ward asked if the IPC report would include illustrations or reference materials. Mr. Nelson replied that the report could include reference documents if the committee requested. Mr. Wheelock stated that there are many existing interbasin transfers and multi-regional projects. Mr. Ward replied that observation should state that while previously these occurred, there are less of these strategies currently. Ms. Barnes stated committee has addressed multi-regional project but asked if interregional basin transfers have been addressed. Mr. Wheelock questioned if multi-region and interbasin transfers were synonymous? Mr. Ward stated that not all multi-regional project are interbasin transfers. Mr. Wheelock stated to include appendix of interbasin transfers, with caveat they are not necessarily multi-regional. Mr. Nelson replied they are not the same but had overlap. Mr. Wheelock stated that most

projects are single purpose projects for one entity and asked if they involve interbasin transfers and multiple regions, with the project truly is multi-regional. Mr. Evans asked if second sentence related to number of recommended multi-regional water management strategies should be removed. Mr. Ward replied that it is important to note lack of multi-regional projects and IBTs in state water plan. The committee agreed to replace the last four sentences with “The committee noted that historically there was less concentration of multi-regional projects in a single area.” Mr. Wheelock asked if multi-regional projects by definition can be associated with one region (Region C). Language was revised to “involve the Region C planning area.”

#### **6. Discussion and Action, as appropriate – Approval of committee report to Interregional Planning Council**

Mr. Evans asked if motion to approve committee section of IPC report for submittal to IPC with authorization for committee staff and chair to make non-substantive changes. Mr. Crull motioned, Mr. Ward seconded. ***Committee approved motion unanimously.***

#### **7. Discussion of Agenda for Future Meetings**

Mr. Evans asked committee if need to keep scheduled August 27<sup>th</sup> meeting? Committee responded it is the chair’s decision. Mr. Evans proposed that he will look at changes to committee section to IPC report and decide if meeting is warranted.

#### **8. Public Comment**

Ms. Heather Harward commended the IPC, committees and TWDB for work involved. She stated that IBTs used to be charted pre SB1 versus post SB1 and suggested presenting this information with interregional projects. Ms. Harward asked how would the legislature respond to the observation that the regional water planning process is working, but not designed for visionary and interregional projects.

#### **9. Announcements**

Mr. Evans expressed his appreciation for all committee members and staff.

#### **10. Adjourn**

Mr. Evans asked for motion to adjourn. Mr. Crull motioned, Ms. Barnes seconded motion. The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:49 pm.