



Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan

Report of the 2014 Regional Water Conservation Program
Work Group

DRAFT #5
December 9, 2014

Table of Contents

Introduction.....

Tier I Recommendations

Recommendation 1 – Implement an Outreach Program to Ensure all Permit Holders are Informed about the RWCP.....

Recommendation 2 – Build Flexibility in the Participant Agreements with Municipal and Industrial Users

Recommendation 3 – Offer Incentives to Specific Business and Industries for their Excess Capacity

Recommendation 4- Pooling of Surplus Water from Municipal, Industrial and Irrigation Permits.....

Recommendation 5 – Provide Settlement Opportunity for Permit Holders who Over-Pump their Permit

Recommendation 6 – Offer Incentives and Assistance to Encourage Municipalities to Promote Landscape Conservation, Especially During Peak Demand

Tier II Recommendations

Recommendation 7 – Create a Conservation Incentive Program for Exempt Well Owners

Recommendation 8 - Explore Partnerships with Land Trusts

Recommendation 9 - Target Conservation Measures to Producers that Use Flood Irrigation

Appendix

Charge.....

Agendas.....

Minutes.....

To: Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan Implementing Committee

From: Regional Water Conservation Program Work Group

Date: January 15, 2015

At their September 18, 2014 meeting, the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (EAHCP) Implementing Committee created the Regional Water Conservation Program (RWCP) Work Group appointing Colette Barron Bradsby, Tyson Broad, Karen Guz, Charlie Hickman, Rick Illgner, Randy Luensmann, Richard Szecsy, and Dianne Wassenich as its members. The Work Group held five meetings from October through December 2014 and elected Ms. Barron Bradsby as Chair and Ms. Wassenich as Vice-chair. Meetings were held as open meetings where attendees actively participated in the discussion and provided valuable input. The agendas and minutes from each meeting are included in the Appendix.

The EAHCP calls for the Regional Water Conservation Program (RWCP) to conserve 20,000 acre-feet of permitted or exempt Edwards Aquifer withdrawals, where one-half or 10,000 acre-feet of the conserved water is to remain in the Aquifer, un-pumped, for 15 years as part of the Groundwater Trust. The purpose of the RWCP Work Group was to make recommendations on additional ideas and methods to secure this 10,000 acre-feet of permitted or exempt Edwards Aquifer water to meet the requirements of the EAHCP and the Incidental Take Permit (ITP).

Throughout their discussions, the Work Group identified problems in the RWCP that are barriers to participation. These problems include:

1. Drought Conditions and Required Commitment: Municipal water providers are pressured to maintain supply to meet peak demand during drought conditions. Because of these pressures, municipalities are reluctant to commit any water saved through conservation efforts to the RWCP for the full 15-years.
2. Lack of Administrative Resources in Small Municipalities: Many small municipalities have expressed that they lacked the necessary administrative resources to support their involvement in the program.
3. Finite Program Budget and Payment for Participation: The 15-year budget for the RWCP is approximately \$19 million. Based upon a 20,000 acre-feet goal of conserved water, this budget results in any participant receiving a one-time fixed payment of approximately \$950/acre-feet for the amount of water they conserved. Municipal, industrial, or agricultural permit holders may be reluctant to participate for this amount.
4. Lack of Knowledge about the RWCP: Many permit holders - municipal, industrial, and agricultural - are not familiar with the RWCP. Understanding the complexities of the RWCP is a barrier to the program.

Overall, the Work Group recommended opening up participation in the RWCP to all Edwards Aquifer users – municipal, industrial and agricultural users. With broadening the Program, the Work Group recognized the importance to understanding the users’ perspectives, such as being sensitive to preferences in terminology.

With the problems and barriers identified, the Work Group developed nine recommendations, dividing them into two groups: Tier I - recommendations to implement in the short term because they will provide an immediate benefit to the program, and Tier II - recommendations to implement longer term. Tier I recommendations include developing a comprehensive outreach and education campaign and adding flexibility into the program, such as flexibility in a participant’s length of commitment and their amount of compensation. The Work Group also recommended providing non-financial incentives to a participant, such as receiving an EAHCP award or being nominated for a national or statewide water conservation or environmental stewardship award.

Finally, the Work Group recognized two key points in developing its recommendations: one - the USFWS must be assured that these recommendations will lead an Edwards permit holder to enroll their permitted water into the Groundwater Trust and two – the budget for this program is finite and that to fund these recommendations, the EAHCP will need to adjust the RWCP budget to accommodate any additional expenses. With that said, the Work Group believes that all recommendations, when implemented, will be beneficial to EAHCP and the ITP.

Ultimately, with Implementing Committee approval, these recommendations developed by the Work Group will be provided to the Edwards Aquifer Authority for final consideration and potential implementation.

Sincerely,

Colette Barron Bradsby, Chair
2014 Regional Water Conservation Program Work Group

TIER I RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Implement an Outreach Program to Ensure all Permit Holders are Informed about the RWCP

This recommendation was identified by the Work Group as a priority for all concepts that follow in this report. They commented that the Regional Water Conservation Program (RWCP), as it stands, has not provided widespread education on the opportunities available for participation. Thus, the Work Group strongly recommends further investment in reaching out to not only municipal water purveyors, but all permit holders in the region by providing specific participation options for each unique party and market the incentives they may identify as appropriate for their unique position. Additionally, it needs to be clear that any financial investment into an outreach effort will be funded by the funds allocated for the RWCP. This will negatively affect the overall amount the program will be able to pay for committed water.

Summary:

The Work Group recommends the development of an education and outreach program to inform potential participants (irrigators, municipalities and businesses) on the RWCP and its role in the springflow protection measures identified in the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (EAHCP) program.

This recommendation was identified by the Work Group as an easy, low-cost solution, to help gain interest in the benefits of the RWCP. Additionally, an education and outreach program could avoid misunderstandings about the benefits of conservation.

Strategies Include:

1. Participant Profile Webpage: This strategy could provide a detailed profile of a RWCP participant and the volume of water conserved and committed into the Groundwater Trust.
2. Produce a regional mail-out to profile participants of the program: This strategy will provide a regional brochure/pamphlet to permit holders in the region to initiate interest and inform them of participation options. These mail-outs could be monthly, quarterly, or annually and would provide a more accurate understanding of the goals of the RWCP and how specific aspects of the agreements can satisfy each permit holder's personal needs. Mail-outs could also help avoid misunderstanding of financial disincentives to conservation that may arise. This includes a "take or pay" attitude that may deter conservation. By informing permit holders of the reduction of Aquifer Management Fees (AMF) on enrolled water, much of this misunderstanding could be avoided.
3. Hold informational workshops for permit holders: Regular workshops (annually or quarterly) would be designed to educate permit holders of the opportunities available in the RWCP. Through this effort the program would build an email list of interested participants of the program.
4. Partnership Award: Creating an EAHCP/RWCP Award that identifies permit holders that have enrolled in the program and have gone above and beyond in conservation

goals would not only create positive public relations for participant and the RWCP but also help create an ethic of conservation in the Edwards Aquifer region.

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- This low-cost recommendation could make the RWCP better known and ultimately provide the EAHCP with more water in the Groundwater Trust.
- A non-monetary incentive for participation, such as positive public relations, could benefit many permit holders, especially industrial/commercial users which increases the diversity of the program to access otherwise unreached permit holders.
- Much of the public outreach and education would not only help highlight potential benefits to each permit holder but also provide a common ethic of conservation throughout the region.

Challenges to Implementation:

- Expenditure of funds associated with this recommendation will not directly equal water into the Groundwater Trust.
- This recommendation may require local news media partial participation to make awards more “prestigious” and ultimately more coveted.

Recommendation 2 – Build Flexibility in the Participant Agreements with Municipal and Industrial Users

The Work Group identified early on fundamental issues with the program’s requirements and funding and was concerned that these requirements manifest as barriers to participation.

Summary:

The current requirements of the RWCP include committing one-half of the conserved water in the Groundwater trust for 15 years at a value of \$950/ac-ft. Through this recommendation, the RWCP would offer shorter term agreements with funding in proportion to the term. Full funding is achieved with a 15-year term.

Term (years)	\$/ac-ft.
3	\$190
5	\$317
7	\$443
10	\$633
15	\$950

Also, through this recommendation, the RWCP would seek sources of additional funding, such as state funding, for a permit holder to supplement its resources for conservation measures. For a commitment of water, the RWCP could assist a municipality in their application for TWDB funds, such as the State Water Implementation Funds of Texas, (SWIFT) - low-interest rate loan program that supports projects in the state water plan.

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- A decrease in term lengths could be perceived as a decrease in risk to municipal and industrial permit holders.
- Flexibility in terms could result in more agreements with municipal and industrial permit holders.

Challenges to Implementation:

- If shorter-term agreements are made with a new participant, EAA could potentially need to amend the Initial Commitment Contracts with SAWS, City of San Marcos, and Texas State University.
- While the TWDB SWIFT funds are earmarked for water conservation and reuse projects, only political subdivisions and nonprofit water purveyors can apply for them. With that said, the RWCP would need to find other sources of additional funding, such as a grant program.

Recommendation 3 – Offer Incentives to Specific Business and Industries for their Excess Capacity

The Work Group identified that some permit holders, such as concrete manufacturers, currently reuse their Edwards water to make their product, which results in excess water capacity. To enroll these permit holders into the RWCP, the Work Group recognized that non-monetary incentives should be offered to garner their participation.

Summary:

This recommendation would assist businesses and industries that have Edwards's permits in identifying their existing and potential excess water capacity – (water loss evaluations). Initial efforts, such as informational presentations, would focus on specific industry trade associations, including:

- Texas Aggregates and Concrete Association (www.tx-taca.org)
- San Antonio Hotel and Lodging Association (www.sahla.org)
- San Antonio Manufacturers Association (www.sama-tx.org)
- St. Mary's University, University of the Incarnate Word
- Various Chambers of Commerce

Additionally, participating businesses and industries and their trade associations would be offered positive public relations assistance, such as nominating the participating business for a nationwide or statewide conservation award, such as the Texas Water Development Board's Blue Legacy Award. Participating businesses would also receive a reduction in their aquifer management fees on the amount of enrolled conserved water.

Steps to Implementation:

- Make presentations to interested trade associations to inform them of the EAHCP program.
- Once a business agrees to participate, the RWCP would develop an agreement with the participant that includes details about the following:
 - Determining existing excess water capacity that would be committed to the Groundwater Trust,
 - Conducting a water loss evaluation to identify potential excess water capacity, (if needed),
 - Determining when and how much potential excess water capacity can be committed to the Groundwater Trust,
 - Determining the positive public relations for both the business and trade association.

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- Since industrial water permit holders do not increase their use in drought conditions, they would be inclined to place one-half of their water conservation savings in the Groundwater Trust.

- Non-monetary incentives are preferred to monetary compensation for some businesses.

Challenges to Implementation:

- Difficult to quantify water saved; not all individual permit holders have meters.
- Evaluations by themselves do not equal conserved water. Infrastructure repairs or installation of new meters are needed for savings.
- Businesses would limit their participation according to the growth in their business plans.
- RWCP staff may need to negotiate with each business one on one.

Recommendation 4- Pooling Surplus Water from Municipal, Industrial, and Irrigation Permits

In addition to working with businesses with their excess water capacity, the Work Group recognized an opportunity in pooling surplus water from other Edwards permit holders, primarily municipal utilities. This recommendation provides permit holders the opportunity to enroll an estimated amount of water into the Groundwater Trust.

The Work Group recognized that this recommendation could be criticized as a “Free Rider” recommendation, in that permit holders would obtain a benefit – financial compensation – for no conservation measures. To address this issue, the Work Group recommended a two-option approach for pooling surplus water.

Summary:

This recommendation would work with permit holders that historically have surplus water and are willing to participate in the RWCP for 15 years through two options. The first option would work with the permit holder to establish an estimate of a potential surplus in their permit for each of the 15 years. Each year, when the permit holder submits its Annual Use Report, EAA would pay, pro rata, the program participant for their surplus water that achieves the required 10,000 acre-feet into the Groundwater Trust.

The second option of this recommendation would include the first option benefits, but would also include an opportunity for a program participant to obtain a higher financial compensation for their surplus water if they also participate in a water conservation activity, such as a high efficiency plumbing distribution.

As a requirement in their participation, permit holders would report back on the amount that they conserve every year.

Steps to Implementation:

- Every January, all potential participants file their Annual Use Reports.
- EAA establishes agreement with the participant to determine their level of participation - Option 1 or Option 2.
- Throughout the year, the participant implements conservation activities.
- Every December, the program participant reports on the amount of water they conserved.
- In January, EAA compensates the participant for surplus water and/or conserved water.

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- Would provide a permit holder a good incentive to participate in the RWCP.
- Would provide an incentive to more conserve water.

Challenges to Implementation:

- Difficult to identify the appropriate amount to pay for conservation activities.

- Is similar and competitive to the ASR pooling program.
- Knowing how much to pay back to the Initial Commitments as the amount will vary year to year.

Recommendation 5 – Provide Settlement Opportunity for Permit Holders who Over-Pump their Permit

In identifying possible candidates for participation in the RWCP, the Work Group quickly identified that the EAHCP would more appropriately target those whom tend to exceed their permitted amount and are in threat of enforcement action by the EAA.

Through conversations with the members of the Work Group, as well as EAA staff, this recommendation may provide increased benefits to both permit holders and the Edwards region by elevating excess pumping and reducing the burden of possible fines associated with over-pumping.

Summary:

In this recommendation, permit holders who have been identified by the EAA as exceeding their permitted usage from the Edwards Aquifer would be approached with a settlement opportunity in lieu of their associated fines.

These permit holders could be prime candidates for increased capacity-building, potentially through conservation, and may be interested in funds associated with the RWCP. Therefore, the EAA should determine in the Annual Use Reports, which users have over-pumped their permit by a pre-specified amount, then approach them with an opportunity to enroll in the RWCP the following year. This settlement opportunity would be an upfront commitment to the Groundwater Trust to mitigate for their over-pumping.

As mitigation, the permit holder would be offered the choice of placing an initial commitment of water that is reflective of the over-pumped amount, into the Groundwater Trust in lieu of following the normal EAA enforcement process. This effort will be a way for a struggling community to reallocate funds into their current Groundwater Conservation efforts, required by EAA. The RWCP's role would be to identify where extra efforts could be made in strengthening their conservation programs.

Steps to Implementation:

1. In the beginning of the year a list of permit holders who have exceeded their authorized withdrawal amount will be contacted.
2. The over-pumper will be offered the choice to either pay the designated fine associated with the volume in which they have over-pumped calculated by normal EAA enforcement action, or they could keep the money they would have otherwise been fined, and commit that to conservation infrastructure. The realized savings from that investment would be divided between the permit holder and the Groundwater Trust.
3. RWCP participation can include, but are not limited to: leak detection, high-efficiency toilet distribution, and water efficient landscape rebate programs, and/or enforcement and staff assistance to monitor conservation initiative. Any decision on level of conservation will be made on a case-by-case basis and determined based on the permit holder's current

EAA Groundwater Conservation Plan Best Management Practices¹ and where the permit holder may need assistance in fulfilling their implementation goals.

4. If the permit holder still exceeds their authorized withdrawal amount in the following year, enforcement action from EAA will continue for the current and past year, and all moneys will be refunded to the RWCP, with potential additional enforcement action by the EAA Board for a repeat offender.

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- In implementing this recommendation the RWCP would be simultaneously providing access into the program for otherwise uninterested parties as well as providing a positive public relations opportunity for a permit holder that just over-pumped turning a negative situation into a positive.
- Identifying conservation opportunities for those who may be more vulnerable to exceeding their permitted volume could provide more benefit than those whom historically under-pump their permit.
- This recommendation satisfies the goals of regional water conservation and can provide a permit holder with a permanent way to not over-pump in future years.

Challenges to Implementation:

- Some challenges to implementing this strategy would include overall reluctance to commit water into the Groundwater Trust when threatened with limited supply.
- This recommendation may be difficult to commit water to the Groundwater Trust.
- This recommendation would require change in EAA rules and Board approval and would need to move quickly in order to implement in 2015.

¹ The Edwards Aquifer Authority (Authority) requires certain groundwater withdrawal permit holders to develop and implement individual groundwater conservation plans as specified in Ch. 715 (Comprehensive Water Management), subch. C (Groundwater Conservation and Reuse) of the EDWARDS AQUIFER AUTHORITY RULES and in accordance with the Aquifer Authority Act (Act).

Recommendation 6 – Offer Incentives and Assistance to Encourage Municipalities to Promote Landscape Conservation

The Work Group identified that water use during peak demand is mainly attributed to outdoor water use and weather patterns (drought). In order to curb water use, this recommendation explores specific conservation practices that are geared towards outdoor water use. Outdoor water use can be quantified by the amount of increased water use in comparison to the winter average.

This recommendation also differs from the existing RWCP conservation measures described in the EAHCP because it focuses on outdoor water use.

The Work Group identified that many of the strategies that follow are not viable with the budget the RWCP currently has available. Yet, it was decided that all concepts would remain in the report to provide various options for successful fulfillment of the Program’s goals.

Summary:

Through conversations with municipalities throughout the region, one major deterrent for participation was either the fear of not meeting customer demand, or not having the proper staff necessary. This recommendation addresses these concerns and explores all options for limiting outdoor water use during peak demand by exploring how the RWCP could negotiate incentives for participation into the program.

This recommendation works in conjunction with landscape design professionals, municipal utilities, and other permit holders to encourage conservation practices for existing and future landscapes. This would be focused on commercial (or large residential property) participation within the distribution area of any municipal water supplier or a commercial or industrial permit holder.

A two-step process would be required for “non-permit-holding” participants. The RWCP will provide the permit holder (municipal utility) funds to sponsor all, or part, of a specified rebate program based on an assumed savings for the conservation effort identified. The rebate funds would be provided to the customer of water purveyor and realized savings would be split between the permit holder and the Groundwater Trust. This would ultimately provide the permit holder with additional water with no cost.

Strategies Include:

1. Negotiations: EAHCP staff will negotiate with municipalities willing to commit water into the Groundwater Trust for conservation efforts provided for their customers.
2. Offer administrative and enforcement assistance: The RWCP could fund staff to patrol for drought restriction violators (there would have to be cooperation by the courts to follow up with citations) and/or manage the administration of enforcement of citations, which requires additional record keeping and an ability to answer phone calls during the

peak periods. With the financial assistance the RWCP commits to fund appropriate positions, a negotiated volume of water (to not exceed \$950/acre-foot) be committed into the Groundwater Trust.

3. Offer conservation education and infrastructure to reduce demand: This strategy is intended to work with a municipality concerned about staying their permit compliance due to peak demand. The EAHCP would provide assistance in identifying and installing BMP's that reduce outdoor water usage on private land and municipal land (parks, sports fields, etc.). These BMP's can be identified in the EAA's Groundwater Conservation Plan Best Management Practices and be funded fully, or in-part, by funds associated with committed water into the RWCP (not to exceed \$950/acre-foot).
4. Encourage conservation during peak demand periods: This strategy provides assistance through incentives, rebates, and alternate water sources for large scale users. Incentives could include developing practices that reduce landscape and turf areas. Such strategies could include landscape and athletic field irrigation system-checks and/or assessments of recreational water use facilities in order to find problems and improve irrigation efficiency and offer conservation incentives. This could include golf course and commercial landscaped areas.

Some of the most successful water conservation strategies for outdoor use are analyzed in the table below. Rainwater Harvesting, installing of "Smart" Rain Sensors, and the instillation of xeriscaping rather than a traditional lawn all have long-term realized water savings. The RWCP can assist permit holders with incentives that encourage use of these savings opportunities. But, the issues described in this recommendation are apparent in the estimated first year cost of instillation (\$/acre-foot) compared to the \$950/acre-foot the program has available.

Conservation Measure²	Estimated Water Conserved Annually (Acre-Ft per participant)	Estimated First Year Cost (\$ Per Acre-Ft)
Rainwater Harvesting	.55	\$45,500
"Smart" Rain Sensors	.49	\$4,100 – \$12,250
Xeriscaping	.46	\$20,400 - \$86,950

**Information gathered from TWDB, U.S. National Climate Data Center, and Papers of the 2008 Applied Geography Conference*

It is important to understand that the Work Group identified this recommendation as difficult due to economic constraints but realize every potential participant may have different needs and the opportunity to utilize this strategy should remain as a potential option.

² Estimate water conserved and costs are based upon information from references above and assumed amounts of landscaped property.

Ultimately the water conservation measures implemented in this recommendation will result in water committed by a permit holder into the Groundwater Trust. The agreement projects the amount of water estimated to be conserved and committed into the Trust.

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- This strategy can drastically reduce outdoor irrigation use.

Challenges to Implementation:

- Landscape conservation measures are expensive and often require dual negotiations with end user and permit holder, meaning many of the individuals, or businesses, implementing these conservation measures do not hold permits.
- The following are identified as fundamental issues with realized savings with each conservation measure:
 - Rain Sensors- They are a good investment but cannot guarantee savings during the worst drought.
 - Rainwater Harvesting- Rainwater harvesting has an excessive payback time and if there is any potable water back up to the systems, there is a very small chance of actual savings. Recommended for exempt permit sites only.
 - Xeriscaping – Currently, coupons are aimed at people with irrigation systems and require them to cap the irrigation heads. With xeriscaping, any instillation must also be accompanied by education and/or removal of irrigation systems. Xeriscaping should require little to no irrigation but if the irrigation method stays the same, water use is not likely to change much, if at all. Also, the removal of grass in lawns or commercial shopping centers can reduce the scope of spray irrigation by providing point-source irrigation on individual plants and trees.

TIER II RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 7 – Create a Conservation Incentive Program for Exempt Well Owners

The Work Group recognized the importance of targeting exempt well owners because the RWCP would obtain a one-to-one benefit of water into the Groundwater Trust. The Work Group has placed this initiative as a Tier II recommendation – it is important, but it will take some time to design and implement this program.

The total exempt well count is currently 2,633 in EAA’s Master database. However, this comes from a database that currently being updated. Therefore, there are likely many errors with the data set and only represents the wells EAA knows about. The total exempt wells in our area are estimated to be approximately 10,000.

Summary:

This recommendation includes a grass roots, community based marketing initiative to encourage exempt well owner participation in water conservation programs by utilizing shared networks of people and well-regarded organizations.

San Antonio Water System (SAWS) utilized a community based marketing initiative called “Season to Save” to double the participation in toilet retrofit programs. Non-profit organizations signed simple participation agreements that authorized them to market the program to the target audience of homeowners. The nonprofit organizations that participated in the marketing initiative included the Girl Scouts, 4-H clubs, churches, and homeowner associations. These organizations were offered a defined incentive payment for each individual who applied for and completed the process of replacing a high flow toilet.

The budget for the incentive payments would be part of the expense of implementing the conservation measures. The expenses could be capped for each time period by limiting the time frame or total applicant pool to the target established.

Steps to Implementation:

- Utilize the EAA data base to build a mailing and/or email contact list of exempt well owners.
- Develop a package deal that includes a number of conservation measures, such as bathroom kits, grey water catchment/use, rain sensors, or rainwater harvesting systems.
- The package deal would be marketed through nonprofit organization, such as youth organizations, similar to the SAWS “Season to Save” program. These groups receive a payment for every exempt well owner they get to participate in the program.
- Develop a program specifically for exempt well owners, targeting Hays and Comal counties.
- May be able to partner with AgriLife Extension to build relationships with rural landowners and educate them about the RWCP

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- Exempt well owners do not give up any of their water.

- The Season to save program doubled the toilet distribution for SAWS during the years when a marketing boost was needed. It was more cost-effective and had a better result than straight advertising. It was also very well received in the community.
- This public relations benefit is particularly important for the EAHCP implementation and the EAA while starting relationships with exempt well owners, resulting in excellent public relations for the EAHCP.
- May provide new information on water use by exempt well owners

Challenges to Implementation:

- Getting active participation from exempt well owners is challenging since there is not a current list of how many exempt wells exist and no contact information for those who own them.

Recommendation 8 - Explore Partnerships with Land Trusts

Summary:

“Land Trusts” operating in the Edwards Aquifer region are currently obtaining development rights and/or actual property in the Contributing, Recharge, and Artesian Zones of the Edwards Aquifer. These properties may have water rights associated, that either have been deeded or leased with the land (thus property of the Land Trust) or remain operational (used by landowner).

The following is a possible list of Land Trusts to contact:

- City of San Antonio: Edwards Aquifer Protection Program Conservation Easement – Water rights stay with the property and can only be used in direct support of grantor activities related to the easement.
- Texas Agricultural Land Trust
- Texas Land Conservancy
- Guadalupe Blanco River Authority Land Trust
- Texas Nature Conservancy

Steps to Implementation:

1. Contact currently operating Land Trusts to inform them about the RWCP and explore opportunities to partner.
2. Request a meeting with the City of San Antonio (COSA) Conservation Advisory Board (CAB) to discuss partnership opportunities (the CAB administers the COSA conservation program and Prop 1 funds).
3. Request that a Land Trust with deeded/leased Edwards water permits consider placing water in the RWCP, either at no cost (but perhaps with non-monetary benefits) or with funding from the EAHCP.
4. Request that a Land Trust currently obtaining property with Edwards permits consider utilizing RWCP funding to obtain the water permit at the same time as the development rights and place all or a portion of the water in the RWCP.
5. Contact land owners with property in Trusts that have retained their water permits, and explore their willingness to enroll water into the RWCP.
6. Offer to plug abandoned exempt wells, in exchange for agreement that no new wells will be drilled on the conservation property.

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- In initial research with the City of San Antonio, implementing this recommendation would not present any conflicts with their existing conservation easements.
- Land Trusts may share EAHCP conservation goals and be amenable to placing water in the RWCP.
- RWCP may help achieve conservation goals of Trusts and help manage water conjunctively with land.

Challenges to Implementation:

- Difficulty in documenting amount of water available for the Groundwater Trust.
- Difficult to identify which conservation easements have Edwards Aquifer wells.

Recommendation 9 - Target Conservation Measures to Producers that Use Flood Irrigation or Any Other Antiquated Irrigation Method

Summary:

Within the Edwards Aquifer region, 65 Irrigators reported furrow/flood irrigation in the San Antonio Pool (5,592 acres) and 8 Irrigators reported flood/furrow irrigation in Uvalde Pool (783 acres). Furrow/flood irrigation methods are only approximately 60% effective and an upgrade to Low Elevation Spray Application (LESA), Low Pressure in Canopy (LPIC), Low Energy Precision Application (LEPA), subsurface drip irrigation, Center Pivots or linear type sprinkler irrigation systems can demonstrate an irrigation efficiency of 90%-95%.

LEPA is the most efficient option, but it requires some specific farming practices (circular area) and removes some functionality from the system. For these reasons, LEPA is generally an unpopular choice among farmers in the Edwards Region.

LPIC sprinkler drops as high as 5 feet from the ground, which would be inefficient in the climate.

LESA is the system that is most popular in the region. It has sprinkler drops roughly 18 inches from the soil surface. It is not as efficient as LEPA, but it is more efficient than LPIC.

Subsurface drip irrigation is the most efficient irrigation method. One of the advantages of drip irrigation is that it can be installed on irregularly shaped fields. This is an issue for some farmers with more antiquated irrigation systems.

Background Data:

- 700 Irrigators total; 415 pumped water.
- 478 in the San Antonio Pool; 222 in the Uvalde Pool.
- 383 Irrigators pumped and are subject to Critical Period Management rules (32 irrigators not subject to CPM).

Steps to Implementation:

The RWCP should contact permit holders still utilizing flood/furrow irrigation and offer to provide funding to install Low Elevation Spray Application (LESA), Low Pressure in Canopy (LPIC), Low Energy Precision Application (LEPA), subsurface drip irrigation, Center Pivots or linear type sprinkler irrigation systems, in exchange for water being committed to the groundwater trust. Permit holders with the largest amount of acres irrigated by flood/furrow methods should be contacted first.

Additionally, the RWCP may need to find matching funds to match EAHCP funds and install additional irrigation methods that increase water efficiency on the farms. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) has funding opportunities available for irrigators and governmental entities that assist in conserving natural resources. This strategy will require EAHCP staff to work closely with NRCS because they will approve the systems and ensure that they do, in fact, conform to specification and provide the desired level of efficiency.

Targeting irrigators with various irrigation systems will provide a larger number of potential participants. Irrigators with old, inefficient high-pressure irrigation systems could include old pivots that would benefit from a retrofit to a more efficient, modern improvements. Efficiency gains would not be as great as going from flood to LESA, but the costs would be a lot less, because of the infrastructure like pipelines and electric lines being currently in place.

Benefits of this Recommendation:

- Reduces irrigators' energy cost and labor while saving water
- With EAHCP matching other grant funds, some irrigators may be able to participate in cost-share water conservation programs that were previously unaffordable to them

Challenges to Implementation:

- 142 acre linear Irrigation System (Low Pressure in Canopy) costs approximately \$131,400 (\$925 per acre). At budget limit of \$950 per acre-foot the return must be 138 acre-ft. into the Groundwater Trust.
- 162 acre center pivot costs \$71,115 (\$440 per acre). At a budget limit of \$950 per acre-foot the return must be 75 acre-ft. into the Groundwater Trust.
- EAA has a base conversion program for irrigators, which allows them to convert base water rights unto unrestricted after the installation of a center pivot, or any other water conservation equipment. After the conversion process an irrigator can place unrestricted water rights into the water market if they choose to do so.
- Reasons for not having a center pivot may vary due to irregular shape of field or possible utility line obstructions.
- There may not be many irrigators using these methods and exact incentives to increase efficiency have not yet been identified

APPENDIX

**Work Group
Charge**

2014 Implementing Committee
Regional Water Conservation Program Work Group

Charge:

The Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan (EAHCP) calls for the Regional Water Conservation Program to conserve 20,000 acre-feet of permitted or exempt Edwards Aquifer withdrawals. In exchange for technical assistance and incentives for implementing the various measures, one-half of the conserved water (10,000 acre-feet) will be committed to remain in the Aquifer un-pumped, but still owned by participating permit-holders, for 15 years to benefit springflow levels and to contribute to species protection. The other one-half of the conserved water will remain available to the participating entity for use.

To ensure that the benefit from this program was reasonably certain to be realized, the San Antonio Water System (SAWS), City of San Marcos, and Texas State University provided a loan of 8,400 acre-feet through the use of initial commitment contracts.

The purpose of the 2014 Implementing Committee Regional Water Conservation Program (RWCP) Work Group is to make recommendations to the Implementing Committee for ultimate consideration by the Edwards Aquifer Authority on additional ideas and methods to secure the 10,000 acre-feet of permitted or exempt Edwards Aquifer water to the groundwater trust in order to meet the requirement of the Incidental Take Permit.

Organization:

Members include the following: an EAA representative (*Rick Illgner/ Javier Hernandez*), a Large Municipality representative (*Karen Guz, SAWS*), Small Municipality representatives (*Randy Luensmann, Universal City*), an Environmental Group representative (*Dianne Wassenich*), an Industrial representative (*Dr. Richard Szecsy, Texas Aggregate and Concrete Association*), a representative from another non-profit organization (*Tyson Broad – Sierra Club*), and at-large representatives, (*Colette Barron Bradsby – Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and Charlie Hickman, Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority*).

Chair and Vice-chair will be selected by Work Group members.

First Meeting and Meeting Frequency:

The Work Group shall hold its first meeting during the week of October 13, 2014 and, to the extent necessary and reasonably feasible, will meet every other week through the week of December 15, 2014. The Work Group will hold five meetings. Presentations of recommendations to the Implementing Committee will occur on January 15, 2015.

Agendas



NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING
Available at eahcp.org

As requested by the EAHCP Implementing Committee, the 2014 Regional Water Conservation Program Work Group has been formed and has been constructed of representatives from throughout the Edwards Aquifer Region; a meeting of the **2014 Regional Water Conservation Program (RWCP) Work Group** of the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan Program is scheduled for **Wednesday, October 15, 2014 at the offices of the Edwards Aquifer Authority, located at 900 East Quincy Street, San Antonio, TX. The meeting will start at 9 a.m.**

Members of this workgroup include: Charlie Hickman (Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority), Colette Baron-Bradsby (Texas Parks and Wildlife), Diane Wassenich (San Marcos River Foundation), Karen Guz (San Antonio Water System), Randy Luensmann (Universal City), Richard Szecsy (Texas Aggregate and Concrete Association), Rick Illgner (Edwards Aquifer Authority), and Tyson Broad (Sierra Club).

1. Call to Order and Introductions of Work Group members (Attachment 1).
2. Public Comment.
3. Nomination and election of the Work Group Chair and Vice-chair.
Purpose: To designate a standing chair for the RWCP Work Group meetings.
Action: To unanimously elect a chair for the Work Group
4. Presentation of Work Group charge (Attachment 2).
Purpose: Presentation of the work group charge to the RWCP Work Group.
Action: To approve Work Group charge.
5. Determination of Work Group meeting schedules, dates/locations, and deliverable format (Attachment 3 and 4).
Purpose: To establish a schedule to result in a presentation of recommendations to the Implementing Committee by January 15, 2015.
Action: To approve Work Group schedule and deliverable format.
6. Presentation on the background and status of the RWCP.
Purpose: To review the goals and issues associated with the program to date.
Action: No action necessary.
7. Discussion on additional information needed by Work Group members.

Purpose: To identify any additional information needed by the Work Group that would assist in their Charge.

Action: To provide a list of information/resources related to the RWCP programs for HCP Staff to prepare.

8. Future Agenda Items:
9. Questions from the Public.
10. Adjourn.



NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING
Available at eahcp.org

As requested by the EAHCP Implementing Committee, the 2014 Regional Water Conservation Program Work Group has been formed and has been constructed of representatives from throughout the Edwards Aquifer Region; a meeting of the **2014 Regional Water Conservation Program (RWCP) Work Group** of the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan Program is scheduled for **Wednesday, October 29, 2014 at the San Marcos Activity Center (adjacent to the Public Library), 501 E. Hopkins St, San Marcos, TX. The meeting will start at 10 a.m.**

Members of this workgroup include: Charlie Hickman (Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority), Colette Barron Bradsby (Texas Parks and Wildlife), Diane Wassenich (San Marcos River Foundation), Karen Guz (San Antonio Water System), Randy Luensmann (Universal City), Richard Szecsy (Texas Aggregate and Concrete Association), Rick Illgner (Edwards Aquifer Authority), and Tyson Broad (Sierra Club).

11. Call to Order.

12. Public Comment.

13. Receive report from the Program Manager on general topics related to the Regional Water Conservation Program.

- Department of Defense
- Initial Commitment Contracts
- Texas Water Development Board's water audit program.

14. Brainstorming session.

- Municipal users
- Commercial/Industrial users
- Agriculture
- Exempt well users

Purpose: To provide the Work Group the opportunity to brainstorm ideas for development into potential recommendations.

Action: None required

15. Discussion on additional information needed by Work Group members.

Purpose: To provide the EAHCP Program Manager with any requests for information or plans for moving forward.

Action: None required

16. Future Agenda Items:

17. Questions from the Public.

18. Adjourn.

November 11th



NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING
Available at eahcp.org

As requested by the EAHCP Implementing Committee, the 2014 Regional Water Conservation Program Work Group has been formed and has been constructed of representatives from throughout the Edwards Aquifer Region; a meeting of the **2014 Regional Water Conservation Program (RWCP) Work Group** of the Edwards Aquifer Habitat Conservation Plan Program is scheduled for **Wednesday, December 3, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. at the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority, River Annex Building, 905 Nolan Street, Seguin, TX.** Lunch will be \$10 for the public, please RSVP to spayne@edwardsaquifer.org by Monday, December 1st.

Members of this workgroup include: Charlie Hickman (Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority), Colette Barron Bradsby (Texas Parks and Wildlife), Diane Wassenich (San Marcos River Foundation), Karen Guz (San Antonio Water System), Randy Luensmann (Universal City), Richard Szecsy (Texas Aggregate and Concrete Association), Rick Illgner (Edwards Aquifer Authority), and Tyson Broad (Sierra Club).

1. Call to Order.
2. Public Comment.
3. Receive report from the Program Manager on general topics related to the Regional Water Conservation Program.
4. Presentation and discussion of draft Work Group Report (Attachment1).
Purpose: To discuss the current list of strategies that have been compiled, contemplate the pros and cons associated with each recommendation and start to prioritize draft recommendations.
Action: Provide direction to EAHCP staff on next steps for report development.
5. Brainstorming session on additional strategies for Work Group Report.
Purpose: To provide the Work Group the opportunity to brainstorm ideas for development.
Action: None required
6. Discussion on additional information needed by Work Group members.
Purpose: To provide the Work Group with any information requested in past meetings.
Action: None required

7. Comments from the Public.

8. Adjourn.

December 11th

Minutes



**RWCP WORK GROUP
MEETING MINUTES
October 15, 2014
Available at eahcp.org**

19. Call to Order and Introductions of Work Group members – 9:07 am

Members of this Work Group include: Charlie Hickman (Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority), Colette Baron-Bradsby (Texas Parks and Wildlife), Diane Wassenich (San Marcos River Foundation), Karen Guz (San Antonio Water System), Randy Luensmann (Universal City), Richard Szecsy (Texas Aggregate and Concrete Association), Rick Illgner (Edwards Aquifer Authority), and Tyson Broad (Sierra Club).

Colette Baron-Bradsby, Richard Szecsy, and Tyson Broad were unable to make the meeting.

20. Public Comment.

No comment

21. Nomination and election of the Work Group Chair and Vice-chair.

Alicia Reinmund-Martinez, EAHCP Director, began with explaining the role of both the Chair and Vice-chair of the committee. Mrs. Reinmund-Martinez opened the floor to a nomination of a Chair of the Work Group. Dianne Wassenich nominated Colette Baron-Bradsby for Chair, Karen Guz seconded. There was no objection. Charlie Hickman nominated Dianne as Vice-chair, Rick Illgner seconded. There was no objection.

22. Presentation of Work Group charge.

This agenda item was postponed till after the program overview.

Nathan Pence quickly discussed the concepts found in the Work Group charge. There was no objection to the charge.

23. Determination of Work Group meeting schedules, dates/locations, and deliverable format.

The Work Group discussed possible locations to make attendance more convenient for all members. New Braunfels or San Marcos locations are acceptable for all members.

Additionally, moving the time to 10 am to 1 pm was supported by all members.

Based on the tentative schedule the future meetings will be held on:

- October 29th
- November 10th
- December 3rd

- December 16th

Mrs. Reinmund-Martinez presented the tentative report format to be presented back to the Implementing Committee. Nathan Pence, EAHCP Program Manager, mentioned the basis of this format was borrowed from the ASR/VISPO Work Group report. Discussion on the report format followed.

Rick Illgner motioned to approve the report format, Randy Luensmann seconded. There was no objection.

24. Presentation on the background and status of the RWCP.

Nathan Pence, EAHCP Program Manager, presented the background, purpose, and problems experienced in implementing the Regional Water Conservation Program and how it fits in with the EAHCP. Presentation can be found on the EAHCP website (eahcp.org).

Details pertaining to the initial commitment contracts and the rationale of the volume returned upon fulfillment of conservation goals were discussed. Darcy Frownfelter, General Council, confirmed contract expiration date of original commitments to be September 2023. A pro rata compensation will be returned to those with initial commitment regardless of the party that commits additional water to the program. Discussion followed. There were additional questions pertaining to the Department of Defense and other Aquifer users that could be utilized in this program.

25. Discussion on additional information needed by Work Group members.

- To what extent does the Department of Defense meter their use on base?
- The Work Group requested specific numbers for potential examples referenced to the initial commitment contracts and additional conservation agreements.
- Karen Guz discussed the possibility of a “just-in-time” conservation option.

26. Future Agenda Items:

- Department of Defense water use and options
- Exempt well numbers
- TWDB water loss report/regulations programs
- Examples to determine potential returns to the initial contracts per contracted conservation commitment.

27. Questions from the Public.

Representatives from Texas Agrilife Extension discuss the Lost Water Seminar to be on October 30th.

Adam Z. mentioned the Department of Defense’s Biological Opinion as a part of their permit with USFWS and confirmed their average use at 44 gallons per person per day. He mentioned the possibility of coordination between EAHCP and USFWS to find possible strategies to conserve additional water with various users.

28. Adjourn- 11:05 am



MEETING MINUTES
October 29, 2014
Available at eahcp.org

29. Call to Order.

Members of this workgroup include: Charlie Hickman (Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority), Colette Barron Bradsby (Texas Parks and Wildlife), Diane Wassenich (San Marcos River Foundation), Karen Guz (San Antonio Water System), Randy Luensmann (Universal City), Richard Szecsy (Texas Aggregate and Concrete Association), Rick Illgner (Edwards Aquifer Authority), and Tyson Broad (Sierra Club).

All committee members are present or represented.

Mrs. Barron Bradsby explained the official charge of the Work Group and called the meeting to order.

30. Public Comment.

No comment.

31. Receive report from the Program Manager on general topics related to the Regional Water Conservation Program.

- Department of Defense
Nathan Pence, Program Manager, explained where the EAHCP has explored with the Joint Bases of San Antonio (Department of Defense). Mr. Pence explained the mitigation the HCP has committed for DoD and potential partnership.
- Initial Commitment Contracts
Chris Abernathy, EAHCP Senior Coordinator, presented the details of the ICC of the RWCP.
- Texas Water Development Board's water audit program.
Shaun Payne, HCP Coordinator, presented details on the TWDB's water audit program.

Tyson Broad, Sierra Club, asked about the program budget and the average savings versus cost of various conservation methods.

32. Brainstorming session.

Mr. Abernathy presented some data that had been developed to give the Work Group a picture of unpumped water permitted in 2013 per permit type.

- Municipal users:
- Commercial/Industrial users:
Mr. Matthews, representative for Richard Szecsy, discussed industry and possible conservation programs.
Specific topics included:

- Certainty of supply is most intriguing to industry. Water shortage and CPM matches' peak season business and need.
- Concepts of a water audit in industry (potentially from AgriLife Extension Service).
- Dianne mentioned a local industry and the issues with water (i.e. purple pipe). Issues with reuse in industry are recharge zone rules.
- Karen Guz, SAWS, mentioned the opportunity to incentivize the reduction or elimination of new automatic irrigation systems. Ms. Guz described successful, and unsuccessful, conservation programs inside SAWS service area.
- Potentially focusing HCP dollars towards seasonal peak use conservation as more valuable.

The work Group discussed various companies/industries that would be ideal to target:

- Hotel/Motel industry
- Laundry Mats
- Hospitals
- Car washes
- Amusement Parks/Sports Facilities
- Universities

Discussion about public relations, possibly despite financial compensation.

- PR Campaigns
- State/Federal recognition (awards)

Assisting enforcement and education for regulators to aid compliance.

- Agriculture:

Ms. Barron Bradsby described an agricultural component to the conservation program of the EAHCP during the EARIP process.

A discussion about irrigation efficiency was brought-up. Don Meador mentioned the limited number of irrigators using inefficient irrigating in Hays and Comal County. Mr. Pence mentioned some details he had had with a couple irrigators in Medina and Uvalde County and mentioned the opportunity for targeting inefficient irrigation practices. The potential for improving irrigation conservation efforts was discussed. Don Meador, a Hays County irrigator, mentioned his personal business examples for possible conservation opportunities. Discussion followed.

Some recommendations:

- Built-in flexibility into existing programs to take advantage of good or bad conditions.
- Uniformity in conservation rules and regulations.
- Increase education throughout the region.

Ray Joy Pfanstiel, Edwards-region farmer, made various points that could be considered in determining conservation efforts with irrigators.

A recommendation to explore various partnerships with current water conservation programs through other entities including Land Trusts.

- Mr. Pence committed the effort between EAHCP Staff and AgriLife Extension Service to track down various programs that could be partnered with.
- Exempt well users:
A discussion about how many and who are the exempt well users and who is the right person or entities to confront those users.
Mr. Pence discussed the “double-benefit” agreed upon by USFWS that all Exempt well users that commit water to the RWCP the groundwater trust can claim all the savings (not half like other permitted wells).

33. Discussion on additional information needed by Work Group members.

Top 10 Municipalities with the most unpumped water

Golf Courses with excess water on their permit

Should this Work Group not develop recommendations that can help the issues could the Work Group look into budget issues?

34. Future Agenda Items:

Alicia Reinmund-Martinez, HCP Director, discussed the next meeting will have additional information provided as well as the continuation of the brainstorming session.

35. Questions from the Public.

Comment about the trust factors of rural land owners. That AgriLife is a well trusted organization. Using electric metering from public utilities to identify those exempt well users.

36. Adjourn. 1:23 pm



MEETING MINUTES
November 10, 2014

37. Call to Order.

Members of this workgroup include: Charlie Hickman (Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority), Colette Barron Bradsby (Texas Parks and Wildlife), Diane Wassenich (San Marcos River Foundation), Karen Guz (San Antonio Water System), Randy Luensmann (Universal City), Richard Szecsy (Texas Aggregate and Concrete Association), Rick Illgner (Edwards Aquifer Authority), and Tyson Broad (Sierra Club).

38. Public Comment.

No comment.

Richard Szecsy introduced himself to the Work Group.

39. Receive report from the Program Manager on general topics related to the Regional Water Conservation Program.

- Budget Summary

Nathan Pence, EAHCP Program Manager, presented slides in response to an information request about the RWCP Budget. The Work Group discussed the budget to acquire 20,000 AF of water into the Groundwater Trust. This works out to equal about \$950/AF of water conserved. Diane Wassenich asked about municipalities and the size of permittees participating. Additionally, she asked about the \$1900/AF being a bad idea versus short term lease rates. Discussion followed.

- Lost Water Seminar

Richard Szecsy and Chris Abernathy presented information on the Lost Water Seminar. Discussion followed.

40. Staff Report: Recharge sub-committee report.

Alicia Reinmund-Martinez, EAHCP Director, discussed the EARIP Recharge Facility Subcommittee Report. Collette Barron Bradsby, Work Group Chair, asked for comments. There was no comment. Discussion followed. Mrs. Barron Bradsby asked Adam Yablonski, EAA Board Member, if he had comments. He discussed trying to find out about flood irrigators in the EAA jurisdictional area. Discussion followed.

41. Presentation of the draft report and continued brainstorming session.

Mrs. Barron Bradsby expressed concerns about the municipalities not understanding the permit reduction criteria. She asked Calvin, Agrilife Extension, to discuss perceptions of municipalities and the program. Discussion followed.

Mrs. Wassenich pointed out that RWCP is forbearance only, Discussed pooling concept associate with ASR. Discussion followed.

Mrs. Wassenich requested that DOD water be a priority. Colette asked Mr. Pence to update the group about DOD. Mr. Pence gave numbers related to DOD. Discussion followed. Colette recommended leak detection and high efficiency toilets.

Ms. Barron Bradsby requested we move from DOD discussion reiterated that we change vocabulary, flexibility in terms.

Break

Ms. Barron Bradsby asked if anybody had any additional ideas. Karen Guz brought up excess holders discussion. Discussion followed.

Ms. Barron Bradsby discussed SWIFT funds from TWDB. The match with HCP funds were discussed.

Varying rates and lease terms were discussed as well.

- Exempt well users
Tyson Broad wondered about improving irrigation efficiencies sot increase recharge. Determined recharge enhancement probably does not qualify in the program.

13,000 AF in exempt wells. (EARIP Model estimate). Discussion about toilets being a good method to reach out to exempt well owners. Discussion followed.

- Commercial and Industrial
Richard Szecsy opened with language matters to represent investment. “Audit” is not a positive term. Use “excess capacity evaluation.” Connotation is highly important to industry. Discussion followed. Questions about industries incentive to participate. Discussion followed. Constant public relations issues in industry. Expedite permitting process. Financial compensation.

42. Discussion on additional information needed by Work Group members.

43. Future Agenda Items:

The next Work Group Meeting will be on December 3red at the GBRA Annex Building at 9:30 am.

- Information on exempt wells
- Information regarding permit holders with alternative water supply

44. Questions from the public.

No comment

45. Adjourn. 1:59 pm



**RWCP WORK GROUP
MEETING MINUTES
December 3, 2014
Available at eahcp.org**

- 1. Call to Order and Introductions of Work Group members – 9:40 am**
Members of this workgroup include: Charlie Hickman (Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority), Colette Baron Bradsby (Texas Parks and Wildlife), Diane Wassenich (San Marcos River Foundation), Karen Guz (San Antonio Water System), Randy Luensmann (Universal City), Richard Szecsy (Texas Aggregate and Concrete Association), Rick Illgner (Edwards Aquifer Authority), and Tyson Broad (Sierra Club).

Richard Szecsy was unable to attend.

- 2. Public Comment.**

No comment

- 3. Receive report from the Program Manager on general topics related to the Regional Water Conservation Program**

Nathan Pence, Program Manager, gave the Work Group an update on various RWCP topics.

Talks with the Department of Defense have continued with AgriLife's help.

In regards to a comment at last meeting, Mr. Pence has had a conversation with EAA staff about permit applications for industry.

Mr. Pence brought up some discussion about crafting/passing ordinances in cities for conservation. Discussion followed.

Chris Abernathy, EAHCP Senior Coordinator, mentioned a workshop Agrilife Extension hosted last week. Discussion about reaching out to various entities to inform them about the RWCP.

- 4. Brainstorming session on additional strategies Work Group Report.**

Mrs. Barron Bradsby opened the floor to any additional ideas the Work Group may have. A discussion followed about the details on potential ways conservation is discouraged.

Mr. Broad mentioned there needs to be more clarification on where various new topics in the Draft Report. Discussion followed.

Mr. Luensmann provided an idea about how to provide municipalities an opportunity to participate in the program without committing water for 15 years. This recommendation reflects the new "pooling" program that has been proposed for the ASR. Discussion

followed. Ms. Guz comments that the Work Group must contemplate the effect a “pooling” program may have on incentivizing firm conservation infrastructure. This specific recommendation will be added to the report for discussion.

5. Presentation and discussion of draft Work Group Report.

Mrs. Barron Bradsby mentioned the most productive method of moving forward would be to prioritize and combine similar recommendations.

The Work Group decided to organize the Recommendations into tiers:

Tier I-

Recommendation 1: Implement an Outreach Program to Ensure all Permit Holders are Informed about the RWCP

Recommendation 2: Build Flexibility in the Participate Agreements with Municipal and Industrial Users

Recommendation 3: Offer Incentives to Specific Business and Industries for their Excess Capacity

Recommendation 4: Pooling Surplus Water

Recommendation 5: Provide Settlement Opportunity for Permit Holders who Over-Pump their Permit

Recommendation 6: Offer Incentives and Assistance to Encourage Municipalities to Promote Landscape Conservation. Especially during Peak Demand

Tier II-

Recommendation 7: Create a Conservation Incentive Program for Exempt Well Owners

Recommendation 8: Explore Partnerships with Land Trust

Recommendation 9: Target Conservation Measures to Producers that Use Flood Irrigation

Lunch

6. Discussion on additional information needed by Work Group members.

Ms. Barron Bradsby began the conversation discussing financial and program flexibility. Additionally, the Work Group discussed the “pooling” concept details further. Discussion followed. Issues pertaining to Initial Commitment Contracts between EAA and SAWS,

TSU and COSM were discussed in relation to re-structuring the RWCP and specifically adding a pooling program of surplus water at the end of every year.

The Work Group spent time discussing various substantive details in each recommendation. Discussion ended with a plan to provide the Work Group a clean draft for review by the morning of Tuesday, December 9th.

The Work Group asked to be provided a list of over-pumping and enforcement/settlement action cases in 2003-2013.

7. Comments from the Public.

8. Adjourn- 1:57 pm

December 11th meeting minutes