

**August 20, 2020 Meeting Materials for the  
Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole Committee of the  
Interregional Planning Council**

1. Agenda
2. Meeting presentation
3. Draft August 6, 2020 meeting minutes
4. Committee report content for IPC report to TWDB

## 1. Agenda

**Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole Committee of the  
Interregional Planning Council**

AUGUST 20, 2020, 1:30PM

**Meeting will be conducted via GoToWebinar and can be accessed with the link below.**

**<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/6833279357460132624>**

**Webinar ID: 799-184-115**

**PLEASE SEE: <http://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/rwp/ipc/committees.asp>**

*\*The Chairman of this Committee may choose to address the items identified in this agenda in an order outside of the pre-arranged numbering.*

1. Call to order and welcome
2. Public comment
3. Discussion and Action, as appropriate – Approval of the minutes of the August 6, 2020 meeting
4. Review of Problem Statement and Goal Statement
5. Discussion and Action, as appropriate – Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole
6. Discussion and Action, as appropriate – Approval of committee report to Interregional Planning Council
7. Discussion of agenda for future meetings
8. Public comment
9. Announcements
10. Adjourn

Persons with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who may need auxiliary aids or services such as interpreters for persons who are deaf or hearing impaired, readers, large print or Braille, are requested to contact Melinda Smith at [melinda.smith@twdb.texas.gov](mailto:melinda.smith@twdb.texas.gov) or at (512) 463-6478 two (2) work days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

**Direct links to this information can be found on our website at  
<http://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/rwp/ipc/committees.asp>**

**To view/listen to the Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole Committee Meeting on Thursday, August 20, 2020, please use GoToWebinar. If you are a visitor for this meeting and wish to address the Committee, you will have an opportunity to do so under agenda items number 2 and 8 through the GoToWebinar application.**

Additional Information may be obtained from: Kevin Smith, Regional Water Planner, Texas Water Development Board, 512/475-1561 [kevin.smith@twdb.texas.gov](mailto:kevin.smith@twdb.texas.gov)

Emergency Mtg: No

## 2. Meeting presentation

Interregional Planning Council  
Planning Water Resources for the  
State as a Whole Committee

August 20, 2020

## I. CALL TO ORDER

- Call to order and welcome

## 2. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Those on video Go To Webinar – Click “raise hand” on your screen.
- Those with telephone access – The organizer will unmute phone attendees to provide public comment.
- Limit comments to 3 minutes each.

### 3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes of the August 6, 2020 committee meeting



## 4. REVIEW OF PROBLEM AND GOAL STATEMENT

### Council Problem Statement:

Planning Water Resources for Texas as a whole is hindered by the varied and unique characteristics of different regions of the state, land use patterns and trends, the costs of such planning, the protective nature of regions and states over their natural resources, the ownership of water supplies and the impacts of water development, constraints of existing laws and rules, and the many competing needs for the water.

### Council Goal Statement:

Texas' water needs will best be addressed through cooperative development of innovative and multi-benefit projects that benefit the state as a whole, while meeting the mandated requirements of the regional water planning process, including protecting the agricultural and natural resources of the state.

## 5. DISCUSSION OF PLANNING WATER RESOURCES

- Discussion of committee recommendations to IPC
- Discussion of committee observations to IPC

## 6. FINAL REPORT

- Discussion and action, as appropriate of final committee report to IPC

## 7. AGENDA FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

- Public comment
- Approval of the minutes of the August 20, 2020 meeting
- Discussion and action, as appropriate of Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole
- Discussion and action, as appropriate of committee report to the Council

## 8. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Those on video Go To Webinar – Click “raise hand” on your screen.
- Those with telephone access – The organizer will unmute phone attendees to provide public comment.
- Limit comments to 3 minutes each.

## 9. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Planning Water Resources committee meeting dates
- Interregional Planning Council meeting dates

ADJOURN

### 3. Draft August 6, 2020 meeting minutes



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

August 6, 2020, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 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

**TWDB Board Members and Staff:** Sarah Backhouse, Kevin Smith, Claire Boyer, Lann Bookout

### AGENDA ITEMS

**1. Call to Order and Welcome**

Chair Mark Evans (Region H) called the meeting to order 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 July 28, 2020 Meeting**

There was a comment to revise attendance list for TWDB staff. Mr. Evans asked for motion to approve minutes. Mr. David Wheelock (Region K) motioned to approve, Ms. Melaine Barnes (Region O) seconded. ***Minutes of the July 28, 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 presented the recommendations in the Planning Water Resources committee report to the Interregional Planning Council (IPC) to be presented at the August 12,2020 IPC meeting. Recommendations in report were as follows: 1) Long range and visionary planning and 2) Planning from state perspective.

The committee stated that Recommendation 1,b., i. (Legislative recommendations) should be specific that the legislature provide funding to implement recommendations. Mr. David Wheelock (Region K) stated that the order of the TWDB recommendation and Legislative recommendation should be switched. Mr. Carl Crull (Region N) stated funding is limited and currently Region N only has funds to address areas of supply shortage. Mr. Crull stated that they rely on project sponsors to justify and provide information for the plan. Mr. Evans agreed that new tasks must be funded.

Mr. Wheelock stated that planning beyond 50-year horizon and planning for droughts worse than the drought of record (DOR) is significant. He pointed out that low growth regions have suggested doing simplified planning and questioned how these recommendations would effect these regions. Mr. Wheelock suggested revising the TWDB recommendation so that the proposed new planning tasks were “authorized” rather than “required”. removing language “consider” when addressing legislature.

Ms. Sarah Backhouse asked the committee if current 50-year planning horizon would remain with long range and visionary planning. Mr. Mark Evans (Region H) replied 50-year planning horizon should stay and suggested that revisions to the planning horizon could be addressed by future IPCs. Ms. Melaine Barnes (Region O) stated state level involvement would help some of the RWPGs. She stated that 50-year planning horizon limits imaginative thinking for state as a whole. Mr. Crull stated that 50-year planning horizon should remain but the regional water plans would include an additional chapter to consider beyond 50-year planning horizon to consider statewide and multi-regional projects. Mr. Evans agreed. Mr. Kevin Ward (Region C) asked if the issue isn't 50-year planning but long-term megadroughts.

Mr. Evans asked if projects are to be considered without regard to the lowest cost;, should the state be the project sponsor. Mr. Ward responded that Toledo Bend reservoir is still owned by the state and that funding is not the issue and provided an example of TWDB funding billions of dollars to projects. Mr. Ward added that Lake Conroe was also funded and owned by the state, later bought back by a local entity.

Mr. Ward agreed that the order of the Legislative and TWDB recommendations should be switched. Ms. Barnes stated legislature recommendations should be first since the state would need to allow this visionary planning to occur.

The title of Recommendation 1 was agreed by the committee to be revised to include “regional water planning process.” Mr. Evans stated important that recommendations are tied to the regional water planning process since that is currently in use. Ms. Barnes stated that recommended tasks should occur at beginning of the process. The committee discussed the language in the Brief Observation for Recommendation 1 and revised the observation to include obstacle of project sponsorship and state that obstacles do not facilitate the consideration of inter-regional and statewide water planning projects. Committee agreed to switch order of Legislative and TWDB recommendations.

The committee discussed Recommendation 1 language to the TWDB. Mr. Wheelock questioned if the 50-year planning horizon was broadened, is it implicit that the TWDB would develop guidelines. Ms. Backhouse stated that guidelines are revised with rule changes, doesn't think needs stating in recommendation. The recommendation language was revised to clarify potential water needs as potential water shortages and clarify that feasible projects should be evaluated without limitations to sponsorship or costs.

Recommendation 1 to the legislature was revised to capture that the state returning to initial sponsorship of projects without guarantees from local sponsors.

Recommendation 1 to RWPGs received one minor grammatical revision.

Recommendation related to RWPG liaison was removed since recommendation was assigned to the Interregional Coordination Committee.

Recommendation to future Interregional Planning Council's was added to consider whether the IPC is the appropriate mechanism for planning for water resources for the state.

The committee discussed Recommendation 2 and agreed to remove Recommendation 2 and move some of the proposed items to Recommendation 1. The legislative recommendations related to state agencies under Recommendation 2 were moved to Recommendation 1. The RWPG recommendation regarding Chairs conference calls under Recommendation 2 was moved to the TWBB recommendation under Recommendation 1. Remaining Recommendation 2 was removed. The Brief Benefits from Recommendation 1 and 2 were combined.

#### **6. Discussion of August 6, 2020 Interim Report**

Kevin Smith noted that the committee initially planned to review the draft Council report at this meeting and discussed the schedule for report development. The committee section of the draft IPC report will now be reviewed at the August 20 meeting.

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

Mr. Evans discussed plan to approve committee report to IPC at August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

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

No public comments were offered.

#### **9. Announcements**

Mr. Evans discussed dates for future committee and IPC meetings.

#### **10. Adjourn**

Mr. Evans asked for motion to adjourn. Mr. Crull motioned, Ms. Barnes seconded motion. The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:07 pm.

#### 4. Committee report content for IPC report to TWDB

## A. Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole

### 1. Review of Existing Practices/Conditions (Council member general observations from deliberations)

The Planning Water Resources for the State as a Whole committee held four committee meetings to accomplish their charge. The committee reviewed planning water resources for the state as a whole issues identified at the April 29, June 22, and June 29 meetings of the Council, in addition to new issues identified by members of the committee. The committee narrowed their focus of planning water resources for the state to the following items: long-range and visionary planning, project sponsorship and cost, and methods to improve regional coordination. The committee identified the following existing practices and observations associated with these topics.

**Existing Regional Water Planning:** Existing regional water planning as intended with Senate Bill 1 is a regional, “bottom up” process. Together the individual planning regions make up the state water plan. This process has worked at the regional level, however, does not adequately address planning water resources for the state as a whole. The committee recommendations focused on working within the framework of the existing regional water planning process. The committee therefore did not try to establish new criteria for defining multi-regional projects. It was intended by the committee that the TWDB would establish guidance to implement recommended changes to TWDB rules. It was not the committee’s intention to recommend specific multi-regional projects or identify specific large-scale projects for state sponsorship.

**Existing Multi-regional Water Projects and Supplies:** The committee reviewed existing data provided by TWDB on multi-regional projects and interregional basin transfers. The committee noted the lack of multi-regional projects throughout the state, citing that of the thirty-two (32) recommended water management strategies serving multiple regions in the 2021 Initially Prepared Plans, twenty-two are associated with one region (Region C). The committee acknowledged existing supplies that include multiple regions. The majority of treated effluent to the Trinity River from the Dallas-Fort Worth area is used by the City of Houston. The City of Corpus Christi does not solely rely on the Nueces River basin, but has diversified also to the Lavaca River and Colorado River basins. These examples address local water needs, but do not consider state water resources.

**Previous State Water Planning:** The committee observed that state water planning prior to Senate Bill 1 attempted to address state water resources, citing the Trans-Texas Water Program, created in the 1992 State Water Plan to meet long-term future water demands in the South Central and South Texas regions as an example. The committee discussed previously studied multi-regional projects that focused on the state as a whole: moving water from the Sabine River in East Texas to areas of West Texas, a transmission line from the coast to bring seawater inland, and a state water grid system.

**Long-term and visionary planning:** Multi-regional and large-scale projects are not feasible within the existing regional water planning process. The committee observed that large water needs are not shown when planning for just a 50-year horizon or using recorded drought of record. The committee acknowledged the recent study which describes future multi-year droughts (“megadrought”) as an example of the need for longer range planning. Region N’s development of seawater desalination strategies to provide a drought-proof supply for industry also represents long range planning.

**Project Sponsorship:** Obstacles observed by the committee to multi-regional and large-scale projects are associated with sponsorship of potential projects. A primary factor for project sponsors is lowest project cost. Project sponsors have a responsibility to keep rates affordable for their customers. The current state participation process is only used by sponsors to gain future water reserves for themselves while deferring costs; state participation is not used to create multi-regional projects. An example discussed by the committee was the Toledo Bend reservoir project.

**Existing Laws and Rules:** The committee observed several obstacles associated with existing laws and rules to multi-regional projects including, interbasin transfer rules, land condemnation process, environmental flow requirements, environmental and endangered/threatened species requirements, TCEQ rules which discourage groundwater supplies stored in surface water supply, and reservoir permitting for only justified needs.

**Innovative Projects:** The committee noted obstacles hindering development of innovative projects such as high project costs, negative public perception and acceptance of reuse and seawater desalination projects, and greater risk of things going wrong with sophisticated projects. Flood control projects related to water supply were understood by the committee to be considered by the new regional flood planning process. Noted obstacles to development of flood control projects for water supply use included off-channel flood storage being land-intensive, flood control in urban areas going downstream to rural areas without proper flood control mitigation, and high project cost if stored floodwater was pumped into the ground. The committee observed obstacles to ASR projects regarding water supply ownership, noting right-of-capture issues with regard to access and protection of injected water, as well as concern that without a groundwater conservation district, entities could be restricted on what can be pumped out of ASR.

**Methods to Improve Regional Coordination:** The committee discussed several methods to improve regional coordination towards multi-regional and large-scale projects including consideration of projects during regional water planning group chairs conference calls, larger roles for regional water planning group liaisons, meeting amongst major water providers, establishing a process for coordination amongst state agencies related to installation of infrastructure during planning and construction, and using state committees to develop state water resources.

## 2. Problem Statement

Planning Water Resources for Texas as a whole is hindered by the varied and unique characteristics of different regions of the state, land use patterns and trends, the costs of such planning, the protective nature of regions and states over their natural resources, the ownership of water supplies and the impacts of water development, constraints of existing laws and rules, and the many competing needs for the water.

## 3. Goal Statement

Texas' water needs will best be addressed through cooperative development of innovative and multi-benefit projects that benefit the state as a whole, while meeting the mandated requirements of the regional water planning process, including protecting the agricultural and natural resources of the state.

#### 4. Recommendations (including benefits that could result)

##### 4.1 Long range and visionary planning

The Committee/Council makes the following recommendations on long range and visionary planning.

###### *a) Texas Water Development Board*

1. Revise Texas Administrative Code Chapters 357 and 358 as appropriate, and include a new, specific task in the regional water planning group's contracted scope of work to authorize:
  - a. Long-range, visionary planning effort, beyond current 50-year planning horizon, to identify projected statewide water needs (potential water shortages) and multi-regional projects to address these needs;
  - b. Long-range, visionary planning to consider longer-term droughts greater than recorded drought of record (e.g., mega-droughts); and
  - c. Evaluation of identified feasible projects without limitation of sponsorship or costs.
2. Utilize RWPG chairs conference calls to consider multi-regional projects.

###### *b) Legislature*

1. Returning to providing initial sponsorship of projects without guarantees from local sponsors;
2. Providing financial incentives for local sponsorship;
3. Providing additional funding for the regional water planning process to accommodate tasks associated with long range, visionary planning;
4. Utilizing state agencies to develop a state level vision of planning resources for the state as a whole; and
5. Establishing a process for coordination amongst state agencies related to installation of infrastructure during planning and construction of large-scale projects.

###### *c) Regional Water Planning Groups*

1. The RWPGs should find new ways to meet and collaborate with other RWPGs early in the planning process to identify and develop opportunities for multi-regional projects within the current regional planning framework and requirements. This could be established in the form of a new scope of work planning task and chapter.

###### *d) Future Interregional Planning Councils*

1. Future Interregional Planning Councils should consider whether the Interregional Planning Council or RWPGs are the appropriate mechanism for planning for water resources for the state as a whole.