

**Stakeholder Advisory Forum (SAF)
Central Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Groundwater Availability Model**

**Forum No. 8
Monday, November 18, 2002 at 10 a.m.**

**at
Elgin Bank Community Room
Elgin, Texas**

Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Greg Barker	
James Bené	R. W. Harden & Assoc., Inc.
John Burke	Aqua WSC
Joe Cooper	Lost Pines GCD
Reece deGraffenried	Twin Creek Water
Alan Dutton	BEG
Larry French	URS Corp.
Keith Hansberger	Lost Pines GCD
Bob King Johnson	SAWS
Bob Kier	Robert S. Kier Consulting
Dan Kowalski	Walnut Creek Mining Co.
James Kowis	Alcoa
Robert Mace	TWDB
David Meesey	TWDB
Ann Mesrobian	Lost Pines GCD
Barry Miller	Gonzales UWCD
Kevin Morrison	SAWS
Jean-Philippe Nicot	BEG
Joe Peters	TCEQ
Billie Woods	NFN
Del Woods	Rancher

**Stakeholder Advisory Forum (SAF)
Central Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Groundwater Availability Model**

**Forum Meeting No. 8
Monday November 18, 2002, 10:00 a.m.
Elgin Bank Community Room, Elgin, TX**

The eighth Stakeholder Advisory Forum (SAF) for the Central Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Groundwater Availability Model (GAM) was held on November 18, 2002, from 10:00 to 11:45 a.m. at the Elgin Bank Community Room, Elgin, Texas. The forum was attended by 21 people (please see SAF8_CW-c_a.pdf).

The purpose of the eighth SAF Forum was to receive public comments on the draft technical report of the Central Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer GAM model, available at the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)'s GAM website at www.twdb.state.tx.us/GAM/czwx_c/czwx_c.htm.

Introduction

Alan Dutton (Bureau of Economic Geology [BEG]) opened the Forum by explaining that the SAF will go through the draft report section by section and that comments will be posted to the TWDB web page. In addition, written comments are due to the TWDB by Thursday, November 21, 2002.

The following paragraphs present the comments made during the forum. Questions, answers, and comments are labeled in the following as Q, A, and C, respectively, for each section of the draft report.

Abstract

C: Stakeholder: Some special characters were not correctly translated in converting to the pdf files (e.g., quote marks, bullet symbols)

Chapter 1.0 Introduction

No comments.

Chapter 2.0 Study Area

No comments.

Chapter 3.0 Previous Work

No comments.

Chapter 4.0 Hydrologic Setting

- C: Stakeholder: Figure 14: The location of the San Marcos Arch might not be accurate.
- A: The San Marcos Arch is a broad feature but the figure shows the axis from the Ewing (1990) Tectonic Map of Texas as labeled in the caption.
- C: Stakeholder: Figures 15 and 16 would be easier to read if they were in colors
- C: Stakeholder: It would be easier for readers if the contour intervals used on maps such as Figure 25 were consistent between the reports for the Northern, Central, and Southern models of the aquifer.
- There were a number of comments and some discussion pertaining to pumping rates:
- C: Table 6c is not consistent with what we know of the rates of groundwater withdrawal for mining purposes. Numbers for Robertson County, year 2000, are probably 10,000 acre-feet/year too high. Numbers for Lee County, year 2010, are also too high. Currently operating mines will be closed by then. On the other hand, Bastrop County displays a rate of 0 acre-feet/year although it will include the future Three-Oak mine. This mine straddles Lee and Bastrop counties, some pumping currently attributed to Lee County should be migrated to Bastrop County. It would also be useful to include more details on the way those numbers were obtained.
- Q: In Table 6a, why is there a sharp increase in groundwater withdrawal for Lee County?
- A: Because of expected water demands represented in the model for both the City of San Antonio and Williamson County.
- C: Sources of pumping numbers should be cited and the way the different numbers are obtained should be detailed.
- C: The first paragraph of page 116 needs to be revised making sure information is complete and accurate.
- C: TNP is not a mine but a power plant (whose new name is Twin Oaks Power Plant).
- C: There is no worst/best or high/low scenarios for pumping rates included.
- A: The TWDB stipulated that the BEG would provide predictive results for the specified projection of future pumping rates. Additional model runs with other scenarios can be made by Stakeholders including groundwater

conservation districts, and they can ask the TWDB to make additional runs to reflect worst/best, high/low, or other scenarios.

Chapter 5.0 Conceptual Model of Groundwater Flow

- Q: What is the source of the last 2 lines of page 126 (about slower rate of increase in pumping)?
- A: That text is describing the change in slope of the total pumping line shown in figure 51 on page 106.
- C: Figure 51 should be made bigger and be presented in landscape orientation.
- C: Second line of the caption of figure 51 should read 2000, not 200.

Chapter 6.0 Model Design

No comments.

Chapter 7.0 Modeling Approach

No comments.

Chapter 8.0 Steady-State Model

- C: Grayscale figures (such as figure 62) are not easy enough to read.
- C: Water levels in figure 62 have a range of 200 ft or so but the scale shows a range of 600 ft.
- A: The scale was chosen to be the same for all figures that map water levels, including figures with historical and future drawdown, presented in Chapter 9.

Chapter 9.0 Transient Model

- C: Middle of page 175 may have a typo. The Bryan-College Station well field is in the Simsboro aquifer, not the Carrizo aquifer.
- A: One or more wells in the well field are in the Carrizo aquifer although most are in the Simsboro.
- C: Some of the pdf files on the TWDB web site are very large and prohibitive to download through a regular modem. Possible solutions include: use text-only

files, post on the web site both regular and the text-only versions, use an html format on the web site with optional links to figures, and to distribute CDs.

- Q: What is the meaning of the “100 acre-ft/yr” in the caption of table 10?
- A: It means that all numbers are rounded to the closest 100 acre-ft/yr. Wording will be changed in the final report.

Chapter 10.0 Predictions

- Q: Shouldn't caption of figure 94 read Carrizo instead of Simsboro as stated on the list of tables at the beginning of the report?
- A: Yes, captions of figure 94 to 98 should read Carrizo.
- Q: In table 11, is the change in storage a gain or a loss for the aquifer?
- A: Sign conventions are explained in the caption. A positive number means a gain for the aquifer. Negative values are withdrawals from the aquifer.

Chapter 11.0 Limitations of the Model

- Q: What are examples of limitations?
- A: An example of limitations discussed in the report is the ~30-mile distance from the northeastern boundary in which changes in boundary value assumptions have an impact on simulated water levels.
- Q: What model should be used in overlap areas?
- A: Robert Mace (TWDB Project Manager) suggested using the model in which the boundary is farthest from the point of interest.

Chapter 12.0 Future Improvements

No comments.

Chapter 13.0 Conclusions

No comments.

Chapter 14.0 Acknowledgments

No comments.

Chapter 15.0 References

No comments.

Appendix A and Appendix B

No comments.