#### Extension of the Numerical Model of Groundwater Flow in the High Plains Aquifer System

#### Stakeholder Advisory Forum September 19, 2024

#### Thank you for signing in early.

The presentation will begin at 10:00 am and end at 11:15 am, Central Daylight Time Please stay muted during the meeting and use the chat box to submit questions



# **Meeting information**

 An audio and video recording of the meeting, presentation, and the report summarizing the meeting will be made available on the project's TWDB webpage

<u>https://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/hpas/hpas.asp</u>



# Why Stakeholder Advisory Forums?







Keep stakeholders updated about progress of the modeling project Inform how the groundwater model can, should, and should not be used Provide stakeholders with the opportunity to provide input and data to assist with model development





#### Extension of the Numerical Model of Groundwater Flow in the High Plains Aquifer System

**Question and Answer** 



#### Extension of the Numerical Model of Groundwater Flow in the High Plains Aquifer System

**Project and Model Overview** 



Lead Modeler : Tim Cawthon, P.G. Modeler: Shirley Wade, Ph.D., P.G. Modeler: Sofia Avendaño, GIT

## **Original Model**

- Completed in 2015 by INTERA
- MODFLOW-NWT
- 1/2 mile grid spacing
- 4 layers
- 84 years (1929 2012)
- Used for 2016 and 2021 Joint
   Planning cycles







#### **Model Boundary**



Model Area  $\approx$  77,000 mi<sup>2</sup>



Clear Fork GCD

Gateway GCD

Glasscock GCD

Coke County UWCD Crockett County GCD

Garza County UWCD

Hemphill County UWCD

High Plains UWCD No. 1

Llano Estacado UWCD

Irion County WCD

Lone Wolf GCD

Mesa UWCD

Mesquite GCD

Middle Pecos GCD

North Plains GCD

Panhandle GCD

Permian Basin UWCD

Reeves County GCD

Sandy Land UWCD

South Plains UWCD

Sterling County UWCD

Santa Rita UWCD

Wes-Tex GCD

#### **Model Official Aquifers**



# Model Layers



Layer	Aquifer 1	Aquifer 2	General Head Boundary
1	Ogallala		Pecos Valley Alluvium
2	Rita Blanca	Edwards-Trinity (High Plains)	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)
3	Upper Dockum		
4	Lower Dockum		

#### **Model Extension**



- Extend model (through December 31, 2020)
  - Well Package Add new wells and pumping
  - Other Packages Same values as 2012
  - Recharge Package Adjustment to Howard County recharge
- Run model and evaluate performance
  - Verify still meets original project goals
- Develop report



# Well Package Extension 1) Pumping Estimates 2) Well Dataset 3) Distribute Pumping to Wells



### **Pumping Estimates**

- TWDB Water Use Survey
  - Surveyed Pumping
    - Municipal and Industrial
  - Non-Surveyed County Pumping
    - Rural Domestic, Livestock, Irrigation, and Mining
- Local GCD Data
  - Meter data (Irrigation, Municipal, and Industrial)
  - County Estimates (Irrigation, Municipal, and Industrial)
  - Only if GCD covered entire county
- Original Model
  - No Dockum WUS or GCD pumping data for some counties
- Other States
  - New Mexico 2015 county estimates by pumping category
  - Oklahoma and Kansas: Same as 2012



Ogallala Aquifer Pumping Estimates



Water Use Survey (WUS)WUS (Irrigation Scaled)

GCD and WUS

\* GCD data was not used for Hartley, Moore, Hutchinson, and Potter counties because one GCD did not cover the entire county. Dockum Aquifer Pumping Estimates





Dockum Aquifer Pumping Estimates



Model 2012 Estimate

WUS or GCD estimate <u>is not</u> available but Original Model includes pumping



#### Edwards-Trinity (High Plains) Aquifer





### **Rita Blanca Aquifer**







### **Rita Blanca Aquifer**

Dallam County Water Use Survey Aquifer Splits

> $\frac{\text{Before 2004}}{\text{Ogallala} = 97.54\%}$ Rita Blanca = 1.23% Dockum = 1.23%

 $\frac{\text{After 2004}}{\text{Ogallala} = 90.87\%}$ Rita Blanca = 9.13% Dockum = 0%





#### Ogallala Aquifer Local GCD Example





#### Ogallala Aquifer Irrigation Scaling Ratios



Version 1 Irrigation scaling ratios between the Water Use Survey irrigation estimates and the Amosson and others (2003) estimates were developed for the Southern Ogallala counties. This ratio was kept the same after 1997.



Scaling

Ratio

0.69

0.90 0.53

0.62

0.81

0.89

County

Andrews

Bailey Borden

Briscoe

Castro

Cochran

Crosby

Dawson

Dickens

Ector

Floyd Gaines

Garza

Hale

Hockley

Howard

Lubbock

Lamb

Lynn

Martin

Midland

Motley

Oldham

Parmer

Swisher

Yoakum

Terry

Glasscock

**Deaf Smith** 

Armstrong

Amosson, S., Marek, T., New, L., Bretz, F., and Almas, L., 2003, Estimated irrigation demand for the Southern Ogallala GAM. Appendix B of the Groundwater Availability of the Southern Ogallala Aquifer in Texas and New Mexico Report.

#### **Dockum Model Estimates**

#### 2012 Model pumping with no GCD or WUS Pumping available

County	Aquifer	Use	Model (Acre-Feet)
Andrews	Dockum	Rural Domestic	1
Bailey	Dockum	Irrigation	5
Carson	Dockum	Irrigation	91
Dallam	Dockum	Irrigation	2,763
Dallam	Dockum	Livestock	8
Hale	<mark>Dockum</mark>	Irrigation	<mark>135</mark>
Hartley	Dockum	Irrigation	840
Lamb	Dockum	Irrigation	3
Loving	Dockum	Rural Domestic	2
Lubbock	Dockum	Rural Domestic	3
Pecos	Dockum	Irrigation	772
Pecos	Dockum	Rural Domestic	5
Reeves	Dockum	Irrigation	180
Reeves	Dockum	Rural Domestic	4
Sterling	Dockum	Irrigation	8



## Mining County Estimates

Harding

\$y2

San Migue

Woods

Dewey

Custer

Washita

Sherman Hansford

Alfalf

Blaine

Caddo

22

Maior

- WUS Mining County Pumping
  - Not split between aquifer
- Texas Submitted Drillers Reports (SDR) Database
  - **Rig Supply and Fracking Supply wells**
  - Assign aquifers ullet
  - Calculate aquifer splits per county ٠



#### Mining County Estimates

#### Dockum

		Annual Average	
		(2013-2020)	
County	Wells	Acre-Feet	
Midland	307	3,366	
<mark>Howard</mark>	<mark>568</mark>	<mark>1,541</mark>	
Martin	264	1,369	
Upton	140	1,140	
Andrews	37	877	
Reagan	146	834	
Ward	57	763	
Winkler	42	626	
Reeves	138	493	
Glasscock	70	492	
Borden	20	326	
Irion	46	316	
Loving	5	283	
Ector	25	163	
Scurry	8	71	
Crane	21	58	
Pecos	34	38	
Potter	27	37	
Sterling	7	25	
Mitchell	14	24	
Gaines	2	21	
Yoakum	2	10	
Oldham	1	6	
Crockett	2	5	
Nolan	1	5	
Hartley	3	4	
Dawson	6	4	
Tom Green	2	0	

Ogallala						
		Annual Average (2013-2020)	Ed			
County	Wells	Acre-Feet	1)			
Martin	1,563	7,912				
Midland	603	6,206				
Howard	<mark>2,093</mark>	<mark>5,637</mark>	County			
Andrews	73	1,072	Gaines			
Hemphill	71	285	Yoakum			
Ector	36	234	Dawson			
Glasscock	34	208	Hockley			
Borden	12	163				
Wheeler	12	158				
Yoakum	37	152				
Ochiltree	174	149				
Lipscomb	221	114				
Gaines	12	105				
Dawson	162	94				
Roberts	22	71				
Cochran	5	52				
Hockley	8	13				
Hansford	29	11				
Terry	22	5				
Hutchinson	15	4				
Hartley	6	3				
		Howard	d Count			
		77% O	gallala			
		21% D	ockum			

...

al Average Educardo Tripitu		Howard County Dockum Pumping			
L3-2020) re-Feet	Edwards-Trinity (High Plains)		5,000	Model Water Use Survey	
7,912			Annual Average	4,000 -	
6,206			(2013-2020)		
<mark>5,637</mark>	County	Wells	Acre-Feet	ی 3,000 -	Original
1,072	Gaines	2	21	e-fee	
285	Yoakum	3	15	2 000 -	
234	Dawson	5	3	2,000	
208	Hockley	2	3		
163				1,000 -	
158					
152					
149					20° 20° 20° 20° 20° 20° 20° 20°
114					Hausend Country Operlints Duranian
105				16,000 -	
94					Water Use Survey
/1				14,000 -	
12				12,000 -	
11					
5				- 10,000 -	
4				- 8,000 -	
3				ro	
				6,000 -	
Howard County		4,000 -			
77% Ogallala					
21% Dockum				2,000 -	
2% Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)			v (Plateau)		20° 20° 20 <sup>°</sup> 20 <sup>°</sup> 20 <sup>°</sup> 20 <sup>°</sup> 20 <sup>°</sup>

23

2020

2020

















# <u>Well Package Extension</u> 1) Pumping Estimates 2) Well Dataset 3) Distribute Pumping to Wells



## Well Point Dataset

- Texas Submitted Drillers Report (SDR) Database
  - Filtered by well proposed use category
  - Added wells drilled from 2013 through 2020
  - Assigned aquifers
- North Plains GCD Well Dataset
- Original Model Active Wells
- Other States
  - New Mexico Points of Diversion
  - Oklahoma and Kansas: No changes

SDR Database Categories Domestic Stock Irrigation **Rig Supply** Fracking Supply **Public Supply** Industrial Other uses\* Not used



## **Constructing Well Dataset**



SDR Wells	Texas Submitted Drillers Report Database
New Mexico Wells	Office of State Engineer Points of Diversion









#### **Texas Model Extension Wells**

Aquifer	Original	Extension	Increase
Ogallala	48,534	78,934	1.6x
Rita Blanca	34	161	
Edwards-Trinity (High Plains)	534	2,685	
Dockum	774	5,875	
Total Minor Aquifer Wells	1,342	8,723	6.5x
Total	49,876	87,657	
Multi-Aquifer Wells	-260	-2,686	
Total Wells	49,616	84,971	



#### **Submitted Drillers Report Database**





#### **Submitted Drillers Report Database**




## **Submitted Drillers Report Database**





## **Submitted Drillers Report Database**





# Well Package Extension 1) Pumping Estimates 2) Well Dataset 3) Distribute Pumping to Wells



## **Pumping Distribution**

- WUS Surveyed pumping
  - Matched to well owner names using fuzzy matching script.
- WUS County Estimates
  - Distributed evenly to wells by category
- North Plains GCD
  - Metered pumping distributed evenly to wells within each groundwater production unit.
- New Mexico
  - County estimates for 2015 distributed evenly to wells by category.



# Matching Water Use to Well Points





# Model Reduced Pumping



- Minimum Saturated Thickness
  - A saturated thickness of 30 feet is the minimum thickness before MODFLOW-NWT starts reducing pumping.
- Original Model Approach
  - The original modeling effort redistributed some pumping in low saturated thickness areas to areas with higher saturated thickness through an iterative process.
- Model Extension Approach
  - Try a simpler approach. Evenly distribute county pumping.







2013 – 2020 Submitted Driller's Reports Use Type = Irrigation and 2012 Model Simulated Saturated Thickness

#### **Ogallala Aquifer**

2012 Saturated Thickness (Feet)	2013 – 2020 Irrigation Wells	%	Multi- Aquifer Wells	
< 30 feet	1,117	14%	95	
30 to 50 feet	2,028	25%	76	
50 to 100 feet	3,372	41%	69	
> 100 feet	1,648	20%	18	
Total	8,165	100%	258	

86% in areas of > 30 feet



# **Draft Model Results**



























































# Water Level Targets



## Water Level Targets and Model Performance

- Compare observed to model simulated heads
  - Model Error Statistics
  - Hydrographs
- Data Sources (2013 2020)
  - Same target wells as original model
  - <u>TWDB Groundwater Database</u>
  - USGS Groundwater Data
- Methodology
  - MOD2OBS executable
  - Only measurements between October and April
  - Remove questionable measurement codes
  - Averaged well measurements per year





### GAM Standards and Original Model Goals

Page 3-27, "As noted in Section 2, while standard practice is to calibrate to a relative error of less than 10 percent, the large range for all of the aquifers in this model led to setting more absolute goals for the mean absolute error. Given the calibration of the previous groundwater availability models, the goals were approximately <u>30 feet mean absolute</u> error for the Ogallala Aquifer, and approximately <u>50 feet for the minor aquifers."</u>

<u>GAM Standard</u> MAE/Range < 10% (0.1)

<u>Original GAM Goals</u> Ogallala – MAE < 30 feet Minor Aquifers – MAE < 50 feet MAE = Mean Absolute Error ME = Mean Error Range = Range of Water Level Elevations

Year Range	Aquifer	Mean Error (feet)	Mean Absolute Error (feet)	Range	Mean Absolute Error/Range	Number
Predevelopment	Ogallala	15.3	27.3	2,752	0.010	436
	Rita Blanca	-30.3	61.7	3,014	0.020	87
	Edwards-Trinity					
	(High Plains)	-35.3	42.9	1,415	0.030	257
	Upper Dockum	-39.0	47.4	2,119	0.022	84
	Lower Dockum	10.3	52.0	3,050	0.017	233
1930-1979	Ogallala	-3.8	25.2	3,091	0.008	78,063
	Rita Blanca	-20.3	32.9	746	0.044	301
	Edwards-Trinity					
	(High Plains)	-45.1	49.0	1,430	0.034	1,113
	Upper Dockum	-27.9	30.9	1,912	0.016	326
	Lower Dockum	-14.3	45.1	3,145	0.014	3,220
1980-2012	Ogallala	1.5	28.4	3,529	0.008	91,805
	Rita Blanca	-24.0	42.6	2,841	0.015	1,078
	Edwards-Trinity					
	(High Plains)	-19.4	29.7	1,327	0.022	1,945
	Upper Dockum	-27.4	33.2	2,125	0.016	671
	Lower Dockum	-15.6	53.3	3,465	0.015	4,744
2013 - 2020	Ogallala	5.5	<mark>-1.7</mark> 26.7	3,065	<mark>+0.001</mark> 0.009	12,827
	Rita Blanca	-30.3	<mark>+16.6</mark> 59.2	2,744	<mark>+0.007</mark> 0.022	130
	Edwards-Trinity (High Plains)	-20.7	<mark>-2.5</mark> 27.2	1,085	+0.009 0.025	159
	Upper Dockum	-14.1	<mark>+1.4</mark> 34.4	1,745	<mark>+0.004</mark> 0.020	159
	Lower Dockum	-16.3	<mark>-7.2</mark> 45.9	3,056	<mark>0.000</mark> 0.015	960

<u>GAM Standard</u> MAE/Range < 10% (0.1)

<u>Original GAM Goals</u> Ogallala – MAE < 30 feet Minor Aquifers – MAE < 50 feet







Edwards-Trinity (High Plains) (2013 – 2020)

Dockum (2013 – 2020)












































## Water Budgets



## Texas Ogallala Budget





## Texas Rita Blanca Budget





## Texas Edwards-Trinity (High Plains) Budget





### **Texas Dockum Budget**





Project Task 2023 2024					4						2025				2026							2027						2	028									
	S	O N	I D	J	= M	Α	М、	JJ	A	s c	) N	D	J F	Μ	AN	ΙJ	JA	A S	0	N D	JI	FM	A	ΛJ	JA	\ S	0	NC	) J	FN	ΛA	M	J	JA	S C	N	D	J
1.0 Project Management																																	ιT					
										_							_							_				_										
2.0 Update well package																																						
2.1 Identify new and plugged wells and assign aquifers																					Ш												Щ					
2.2 Add new Pumping for 2013 through 2020																					Ш												Ш					
2.3 Update New Mexico pumping																																						
2.4 Distribute pumping to new well dataset																																						
			_		_						-		_		_					-				_		-		_										
3.0 Run model and calculate statistics																					Ш												Щ					
3.1 Gather new water level data																					Ш												Щ					
3.2 Run model and calculate statistics																																						
																													_									
4.0 Stakeholder Communication																					Ш												Ш					
4.1 Groundwater Management Area Meetings				X	X																																	
4.2 Stakeholder Advisory Forum										X																												
4.3 Provide draft model files and geodatabase																																						
																													_									
5.0 Documentation																																						
5.1 Develop figures, maps, and tables																																						
5.1 Draft Modeling Report											X																											
5.2 Final Modeling Report													X																									
GMA Proposed DFCs – May 2026												N	lay	202	26 -	- GI	MA	Pro	opo	sed	D	-Cs	5	K													Τ	
GMA Explanatory Report – January 2027						Π							T			Π			Τ		Π			Ja	nua	ary	202	27 -	– G	MA	<mark>、Ε</mark> Σ	pla	ina	tory	Re	port	t	Х

- Provide draft model files to stakeholders
- Develop model report
- Attend upcoming GMA meetings and answer any questions



## **Contact Information**

#### Tim Cawthon, P.G.

Lead Modeler 512-463-5076 Tim.Cawthon@twdb.texas.gov

Shirley Wade, Ph.D., P.G. Modeler 512-463-5604

Shirley.Wade@twdb.texas.gov

#### Daryn Hardwick, Ph.D.

Manager 512-475-0470 Daryn.Hardwick@twdb.texas.gov

Web information:

https://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/hpas/hpas.asp



## **Howard County Recharge**



- The water budgets for Howard County show unusual behavior during the historical period compared with other county budgets.
- The unusual budget is a result of the relatively large increase in recharge during the postdevelopment period.
- In addition, the storage component of the water budget in Howard County shows a reversal to increasing storage during predictive period.
- We revised the postdevelopment recharge in Howard County by capping the recharge at 1965 levels.
- The water budget is now more consistent with the budgets for other counties and does not show rising water levels during predictive period.



Andrews County - typical of other counties













## Capped Howard County recharge at stress period 37 (1965)

- Maintains conceptual model of rising recharge in postdevelopment, but,
- Storage component of budget rises above zero (rising water levels) only slightly and
- Storage component of budget does not exceed pumping (cross-over in plot).



Model-wide slight improvement in target statistics

Chattatta / A		Original H	PAS GAM		HPAS with recharge capped at SP 37 in Howard Cnty									
Statistic/Aquifer	<mark>Ogallala</mark>	Layer 2	U. Dockum	L. Dockum	Ogallala	Layer 2	U. Dockum	L. Dockum						
Residual mean	<mark>-0.95</mark>	-27.06	-27.54	<mark>-15.07</mark>	- <mark>0.92</mark>	-27.06	-27.54	<mark>-15.00</mark>						
Absolute Residual Mean	26.95	37.91	32.45	49.98	26.95	37.91	32.45	<mark>49.95</mark>						
Residual Standard Deviation	36.59	41.39	36.39	76.95	36.59	41.39	36.39	76.93						
RMS Error	36.60	49.45	45.64	78.41	36.60	49.45	45.64	78.38						
Number of observations	169,868	4,437	997	7,964	169.868	4,437	997	7,964						
Range of observations	3,687.56	3,839.51	2,124.64	3,465.36	3,687.56	3,839.51	2,124.64	3,465.36						
Scaled residual standard deviation	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02						
Scaled absolute residual mean	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01						
Scaled RMS Error	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02						
Scaled Residual Mean	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.00						













#### High Plains Aquifer System Groundwater Availability Model

Stakeholder Advisory Forum

September 20, 2024

1. Questions and Answers

<u>Question 1:</u> Did the Districts besides North Plains review and approve estimates or provide additional information? For example High Plains? (Cindy Ridgeway)

<u>Answer:</u> The TWDB Agriculture Water Conservation Team works with the Districts in developing annual irrigation use estimates for the TWDB Water Use Survey. These estimates are sent to the Districts for review. We sent out a request for production data to all the Districts on November 20, 2023 and received some data. If the pumping data was comprehensive for an entire county we incorporated it into the model. Districts are welcome to review the pumping data for the model extension and provide feedback. We may still have time for adjustments to the input pumping.

<u>Question 2:</u> Discuss General Head Boundary wells and how much that factors in flow into and out of the model. (Cindy Ridgeway)

<u>Answer:</u> In the Original Model, heads from the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley alternative groundwater availability model were used to estimate heads for the layer 1 and 2 general head boundaries implemented in the river package. In the Original Model, the heads were kept constant from 2004 through 2012. For the Model Extension, we kept the head values the same from 2013 through 2020.

Question 3: Do you have a map of actual dry holes in the Ogallala? (Cindy Ridgeway)

Answer: We will consider developing a map of dry holes and including the Final Report.

<u>Question 4:</u> It should be noted in the report of the model artifact in Gaines and model results should be used with caution in this select area. (Cindy Ridgeway)

Answer: We will be sure and use the results with caution in that area.

<u>Question 5:</u> Could you confirm that the Howard County recharge was addressed in this update? (Bill Hutchison)

<u>Answer:</u> Yes, the Howard County recharge issue was addressed in this update.

<u>Question 6:</u> I noticed there were some pretty significant changes and assumptions between how different water uses were implemented in each county and how it was distributed among the wells between what was done in the historical GAM and what was done in this extension period. This is the kind of thing that happens when you do an extension and I don't have any issues with that. It would be good to see an evaluation of the degree to which the model has adjusted to the new pumping distribution so that water level changes picked up at the end of the extension reflect the actual water use that happens after the end of the extension when we're using this in a predictive sense for drought planning versus the model slowly continuing to adjust to a new pumping distribution like you wouldn't want. You know recoveries occurring in an area due to the model adjusting to the extension instead of something happening in the predictive period. When you

change the assumptions the model has to adjust to that change and so having some sort of discussion about the degree to which it has adjusted to the change would be useful. (Wade Oliver)

<u>Answer:</u> We will do a predictive model run to evaluate the degree to which the model has adjusted to the new pumping distribution. We will include the results of this analysis in the Final Report.

<u>Question 7:</u> Need to be clear about what district data was and was not used in the report. (Wade Oliver)

Answer: We will document in the final report what district data was and was not used in the report.

<u>Question 8:</u> Can you tell us why you decided to change those assumptions and spread that pumping back out? (Amy Bush)

<u>Answer:</u> We were unsuccessful in replicating the original model pumping distribution. One of the reasons for this was because the original modeling effort went through an iterative process of running the model and then redistributing pumping within a county from areas of low saturated thickness to areas of higher saturated thickness to reduce the amount of model curtailed pumping. Section 3.1.6 of the Original Numerical Model Report describes this iterative process. We decided to try a different approach of evenly distributing total county pumping estimates for irrigation, rural domestic, livestock, and mining. This approach takes less time, is more transparent, and is able to be replicated for future extensions. The average model curtailed pumping from 2000 through 2012 is 176,853 Acre-Feet compared to an average of 221,497 Acre-Feet from 2013 through 2020 using the new approach. It is also important to note that 7,048 of 8,165 new Submitted Driller Reports from 2013 through 2020 with a proposed use of Irrigation were in areas of 2012 model simulated saturated thickness greater than 30 feet.

#### 2. Attendance List

Name	Organization
Christa Perry	Hemphill County Underground Water Conservation District
Jason Coleman	High Plains Underground Conservation District
Odell Ward	North Plains Groundwater Conservation District
Janet Guthrie	North Plains Groundwater Conservation District
Ashley Ausbrooks	Panhandle Groundwater Conservation District
Britney Britten	Panhandle Groundwater Conservation District
Amber Blount	Sandy Land Underground Water Conservation District
Adam Foster	Texas Alliance of Groundwater Districts
Michael Chambers	City of Lorenzo
Fabian Heaney	Red River Authority of Texas
Cole Walker	Colorado River Municipal Water District
Paula Jo Lemonds	HDR, Inc.
Wade Oliver	INTERA
John Ellis	INTERA
Alyssa Balzen	KT Groundwater
Philip Webster	KT Groundwater
Bill Hutchison	Consultant
Darrell Peckham	BNP Land LLC
Amy Bush	RMBJ Geo Inc.
Ray Brady	RMBJ Geo Inc.
Larry French	Texas Public Policy Foundation
Cindy Ridgeway	
Zedric Capus	Texas Water Development Board
Sara Sutton	Texas Water Development Board
Heather Rose	Texas Water Development Board
Connie Beniquez	Texas Water Development Board
Jennifer Badhwar	Texas Water Development Board
lan Jones	Texas Water Development Board
Shirley Wade	Texas Water Development Board
Saheli Majumdar	Texas Water Development Board
Tim Cawthon	Texas Water Development Board
Daryn Hardwick	Texas Water Development Board