Stakeholder advisory forum for the Carrizo-Wilcox, Gulf Coast, Blaine, and Rustler Aquifer Brackish Groundwater Mapping Projects

September 9, 2016 1:30-4:00 pm.

Meeting held in Room 170 at the Stephen F. Austin Building, Austin, TX.

<u>List of Stakeholder Statements (S), questions (Q), and responses (R).</u>

Note: This list is based on meeting notes. A video recording was not made.

Introduction by Robert Mace, TWDB

1. Q: Will the production zones being presented to the Board on October 20th for approval be publicly available for review prior to the board meeting?

A: TWDB response - Not sure, but today's meeting notes and the contractor reports will be posted to the website and is made publicly available.

Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer presentation by John Meyer, TWDB

- 1. Q: Is there a reason for separate potential production areas instead of a combined area? A: TWDB response - The BEG delineated the potential production areas, and the potential production areas look like they can be combined. BEG staff is determining if potential production areas can be combined based on stratigraphy. This is an ongoing process as the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer project was originally designed to be a two-year project, but it was changed to one-year.
- 2. Q: Have you determined what the impact would be to freshwater and to the excluded areas? A: TWDB response - Groundwater impacts are primarily being analyzed within potential production areas due to the compressed timeline of the study. Looking at areas outside of potential production areas would have required a new groundwater availability model, which would have necessitated a multi-year project.
- 3. Q: What happens in areas that are close to brackish resources that could be produced?
 A: TWDB response The model indicated drawdowns extend beyond the potential production areas.
- 4. Q: Did the project consider cities, like the City of Alice, which have future municipal use plans for brackish groundwater use?

A: TWDB response - The model and study are based on conditions at the time of designation and did not consider potential future use.

5. Q: Did the project consider all underground injection control permitted injection wells? A: TWDB response - Yes, and TWDB staff are currently reviewing that data.

Gulf Coast Aquifer presentation by Steve Young, INTERA, Incorporated

1. Q: There is a significant difference between the aerial extent of the potential production area in the draft version of the report and today's presentation. Additionally, previous exclusion areas are now being included, and there seems to be a shift from physical barriers to distance barriers. What is the rationale for these changes?

A: INTERA response - More data and cross-sections were considered and analyzed between the last stakeholder meeting and today's presentation, and as a result more well fields were added. Additionally, the location of the potential production areas was still not decided and not all the existing cross-sections had been analyzed at the time of the last stakeholder meeting.

2. Q: Given the lack of data downdip, have you considered hypothesis-testing your model with plausible values.

A: INTERA response - There would be too much uncertainty given the heterogeneity of the aquifer.

3. Q: In the first presentation there were no potential production areas in Kenedy County due to disposal wells and objections by Kenedy County Groundwater Conservation District. Why the change?

A: INTERA response - There will probably be no potential production areas near the coast.

A: TWDB response - Additionally comments from Kenedy County Groundwater Conservation

District will be taken into account when recommending the placement of brackish groundwater production zones.

Blaine Aquifer presentation by Vince Clause, Allan R. Standen, LLC

1. No Questions

Rustler Aquifer Presentation by Van Kelly, INTERA, Incorporated

Q: Did you use formal optimization to model your drawdowns or a trial-and-error approach?
 A: INTERA response - A trial-and-error approach was used.