

Texas

Water

Conditions

Report

March 2026

RAINFALL

In March, little rainfall [yellow and orange shading, Figure 1(a)] to no rain [red shading, Figure 1(a)] fell over the High Plains, the Low Rolling Plains, southern North Central, the Trans Pecos, the Edwards Plateau, Southern, Lower Valley, much of South Central, and the western Upper Coast climate divisions. The southern Low Rolling Plains, areas of the Edwards Plateau, North Central, East Texas, areas of northern and southern Southern, portions of northern and central South Central, and the eastern Upper Coast climate divisions received up to 7.75 inches of rain [light and dark blue shading, Figure 1(a)].

Compared to historical data from 1991–2020, much of the state received 0–75 percent of normal rainfall [yellow and orange shading, Figure 1(b)]. 125–200 percent of normal rainfall [green shading, Figure 1(b)] was only received in the southern Low Rolling Plains, areas of eastern and western North Central, small portions of the central Trans Pecos, areas of the Edwards Plateau, an area in northern Southern, and northeastern Upper Coast climate divisions. 200–300 percent of normal rainfall [light blue shading, Figure 1(b)], was seen in southwestern Edwards Plateau, and southern Southern climate division.




Figure 1: (a) Monthly accumulated rainfall, and (b) Percent of normal rainfall

DROUGHT

At the end of March, 98.82% of the state was in the D0 (abnormally dry) through D4 (exceptional drought) categories (**Figure 2**). This is approximately 0.07% lower than the end of February.




Figure 2. The percentage of land area in Texas experiencing abnormally dry conditions, and in drought, according to the U.S. Drought Monitor map as of March 24, 2026.

RESERVOIR STORAGE




Figure 3. Reservoir conservation storage at end-March expressed as percent full (%)

Out of 120 monitored reservoirs in the state, 11 reservoirs held 100 percent conservation storage capacity, and 41 reservoirs were at or above 90 percent full this month. Sixteen reservoirs remained at or below 30 percent full: Abilene (3.6 percent full), Choke Canyon (7.7 percent full), Corpus Christi (8.7 percent full), E.V. Spence (11.6 percent full), Falcon (19.1 percent full), Greenbelt (7.3 percent full), J.B. Thomas (27.4 percent full), Mackenzie (12.3 percent full), Medina Lake (4.0 percent full), New Terrell City (26.8 percent full), O.C. Fisher (14.2 percent full), Oak Creek (18.0 percent full), Palo Duro Reservoir (0.4 percent full), Sweetwater (23.4 percent full), Twin Buttes (10.5 percent full), and White River (27.9 percent full). Elephant Butte Reservoir (New Mexico) was 12.7 percent full (Figure 3).

Reservoir conservation storage was at or above normal [Figure 4(a), blue shading] for East Texas (86.4 percent full), North Central (91.9 percent full), and the Upper Coast (73.2 percent full) climate divisions. The South Central (62.1 percent full) and the Low Rolling Plains (61.5 percent full) had abnormally low conservation storage [Figure 4(a), yellow shading]. Conservation storage was moderately low [Figure 4(a), orange shading] for the Edwards Plateau (44.6 percent full) climate divisions. The High Plains (38.1 percent full) had severely low conservation storage [Figure 4(a), brown shading]. The Southern (15.0 percent full) and Trans Pecos (19.2 percent full) climate divisions had extremely low conservation storage [Figure 4(a), maroon shading].

Combined conservation storage by river basin or sub-basin was exceptionally low [<10 percent full, red shading, Figure 4(b)] in the San Antonio and Nueces river basins. The Upper/Mid Rio Grande river basin had extremely low conservation storage [10–20 percent full, maroon shading, Figure 4 (b)]. Severely low conservation storage [20–40 percent full, brown shading, Figure 4(b)] was seen in the Upper Colorado, and Lower Rio Grande river basins. The Canadian and Lavaca river basins had moderately low conservation storage [40–60 percent full, orange shading, Figure 4(b)]. The Guadalupe river basin had abnormally low conservation storage [60–70 percent full, yellow shading, Figure 4(b)]. Normal to high conservation storage [>70 percent full, blue shading, Figure 4(b)] was seen in the Upper and Lower Red, Sulphur, Cypress, Upper and Lower Sabine, Upper and Lower Trinity, Upper and Lower Brazos, Neches, Lower Colorado, and San Jacinto river basins.




Figure 4: Reservoir Storage Index by a) climate division, and b) basin/sub-basin.

*Reservoir Storage Index is defined as the percent full of conservation storage capacity.

Percent full is calculated as the combined conservation storage of all reservoirs in a climate region or a basin/subbasin, excluding dead pool storage.

CONSERVATION STORAGE DATA FOR SELECTED MAJOR TEXAS RESERVOIRS

Name of lake or reservoir	Storage capacity	Storage at end-March 2026		Storage change from end-Feb 2026		Storage change from end-Mar 2025	
	(acre-feet)	(acre-feet)	(%)	(acre-feet)	(%)	(acre-feet)**	(%)
Abilene, Lake	7,900	285	3.6	0	0.0	-42	0.0
Alan Henry Reservoir	96,207	79,725	82.9	-1,285	-1.3	-11,689	-12.1
*Amistad Reservoir (Texas & Mexico)	3,275,532	618,922	18.9	-55,408	-1.7	-44,988	-1.4
*Amistad Reservoir (Texas)	1,813,408	568,643	31.4	-30,632	-1.7	99,842	5.5
Amon G Carter, Lake	19,266	16,376	85.0	-357	-1.9	-2,820	-14.6
Aquilla Lake	43,243	39,831	92.1	-444	-1.0	-3,412	-7.9
Arlington, Lake	40,157	37,886	94.3	849	2.1	-1,312	-3.3
Arrowhead, Lake	230,359	185,170	80.4	-3,992	-1.7	32,904	14.3
Athens, Lake	29,503	29,503	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
*Austin, Lake	23,972	23,174	96.7	31	0.1	-62	0.0
B A Steinhagen Lake	69,186	63,892	92.3	292	0.4	-881	-1.3
Bardwell Lake	43,856	43,856	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Belton Lake	432,631	417,644	96.5	-4,137	0.0	19,652	4.5
Benbrook Lake	85,648	70,700	82.5	-1,731	-2.0	-11,650	-13.6
Bob Sandlin, Lake	192,417	180,768	93.9	-86	0.0	-11,649	-6.1
Bois d'Arc Lake	367,609	324,939	88.4	-2,796	0.0	-1,645	0.0
Bonham, Lake	11,027	8,289	75.2	-260	-2.4	-2,414	-21.9
Brady Creek Reservoir	28,808	27,337	94.9	-303	-1.1	18,094	62.8
Bridgeport, Lake	372,183	316,223	85.0	-113	0.0	47,809	12.8
*Brownwood, Lake	130,868	107,242	81.9	-787	0.0	-19,169	-14.6
Buchanan, Lake	866,694	814,718	94.0	220	0.0	330,449	38.1
Caddo, Lake	29,898	29,898	100.0	0	0	0	0.0
Canyon Lake	378,781	223,468	59.0	-4,573	-1.2	44,036	11.6
Cedar Creek Reservoir in Trinity	644,686	541,616	84.0	14,670	2.3	-102,089	-15.8
Champion Creek Reservoir	41,580	16,668	40.1	-363	0.0	-2,865	-6.9
Cherokee, Lake	40,094	40,094	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Choke Canyon Reservoir	662,820	51,129	7.7	-4,541	0.0	-51,099	-7.7
*Cisco, Lake	29,003	13,707	47.3	-142	0.0	-2,756	-9.5
Coleman, Lake	38,075	31,514	82.8	-337	0.0	-5,266	-13.8
Colorado City, Lake	31,040	23,416	75.4	-194	0.0	-4,278	-13.8
*Coleto Creek Reservoir	30,758	16,394	53.3	-500	-1.6	-5,075	-16.5
Comanche Creek Reservoir	151,250	151,250	100	2,641	1.7	1,733	1.1
Conroe, Lake	417,577	393,709	94.3	-2,312	0.0	-23,670	-5.7
Corpus Christi, Lake	256,062	22,405	8.7	-3,671	-1.4	-37,998	-14.8
Crook, Lake	9,195	8,861	96.4	-94	-1.0	-334	-3.6
Cypress Springs, Lake	66,756	64,638	96.8	-383	0.0	-2,118	-3.2
E. V. Spence Reservoir	517,272	59,903	11.6	-2,222	0.0	-22,007	-4.3
Eagle Mountain Lake	185,087	152,846	82.6	-4,608	-2.5	9,852	5.3
Elephant Butte Reservoir (Texas)	852,491	108,098	12.7	5,804	0.7	-11,831	-1.4
Elephant Butte Reservoir (Total Storage)	1,985,900	250,228	12.6	13,435	0.7	-27,387	-1.4
*Falcon Reservoir (Texas & Mexico)	2,646,817	348,080	13.2	600	0.0	4,810	0.2
*Falcon Reservoir (Texas)	1,562,367	298,767	19.1	-22,727	-1.5	48,603	3.1
Fork Reservoir, Lake	606,088	528,543	87.2	-1,934	0.0	-74,058	-12.2
Fort Phantom Hill, Lake	70,030	50,048	71.5	-124	0.0	5,943	8.5
Georgetown, Lake	38,005	28,830	75.9	143	0.4	3,273	8.6
Gibbons Creek Reservoir	25,721	24,885	96.7	-328	-1.3	3,431	13.3
Graham, Lake	45,288	34,264	75.7	-637	-1.4	-7,651	-16.9
Granbury, Lake	132,949	130,353	98.0	-484	0.0	-1,862	-1.4

CONSERVATION STORAGE DATA FOR SELECTED MAJOR TEXAS RESERVOIRS

Name of lake or reservoir	Storage capacity	Storage at end-March 2026		Storage change from end-Feb 2026		Storage change from end-Mar 2025	
	(acre-feet)	(acre-feet)	(%)	(acre-feet)	(%)	(acre-feet)**	(%)
<i>Continued</i>							
Granger Lake	51,822	51,822	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Grapevine Lake	163,064	163,064	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Greenbelt Lake	59,968	4,354	7.3	-175	0.0	-996	-1.7
*Halbert, Lake	6,033	4,542	75.3	5	0.1	-1,008	-16.7
Hords Creek Lake	8,109	4,428	54.6	-50	0.0	-362	-4.5
Houston County Lake	17,113	17,113	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Houston, Lake	132,318	131,861	99.7	-457	0.0	-457	0.0
Hubbard Creek Reservoir	313,298	129,493	41.3	-2,726	0.0	-11,247	-3.6
Hubert H Moss Lake	24,058	21,516	89.4	-51	0.0	-2,337	-9.7
Inks, Lake	13,729	13,147	95.8	258	1.9	8	0.1
J. B. Thomas, Lake	199,931	54,810	27.4	-2,703	-1.4	-23,023	-11.5
Jacksonville, Lake	25,670	25,670	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Jim Chapman Lake (Cooper)	258,723	194,801	75.3	-6,535	-2.5	-63,922	-24.7
Joe Pool Lake	149,629	149,629	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Kemp, Lake	245,307	224,507	91.5	-15,323	-6.2	-20,800	-8.5
Kickapoo, Lake	86,345	71,289	82.6	-1,637	-1.9	14,310	16.6
Lavon Lake	409,757	401,750	98.0	16,027	3.9	-8,007	-2.0
Leon, Lake	27,762	22,459	80.9	-314	-1.1	-4,179	-15.1
Lewisville Lake	563,228	561,068	99.6	-2,160	0.0	47,458	8.4
Limestone, Lake	203,780	170,855	83.8	-4,539	-2.2	-17,924	-8.8
*Livingston, Lake	1,603,504	1,598,847	99.7	-4,657	0.0	-4,657	0.0
*Lost Creek Reservoir	11,950	11,144	93.3	-3	0.0	-479	-4.0
Lyndon B Johnson, Lake	112,778	111,429	98.8	64	0.1	320	0.3
Mackenzie Reservoir	46,450	5,698	12.3	-101	0.0	1,552	3.3
Marble Falls, Lake	7,597	7,197	94.7	-102	-1.3	-6	0.0
Martin, Lake	75,726	67,753	89.5	834	1.1	-7,825	-10.3
Medina Lake	254,823	10,066	4.0	-697	0.0	4,379	1.7
Meredith, Lake	500,000	229,119	45.8	-2,795	0.0	25,409	5.1
Millers Creek Reservoir	26,768	18,111	67.7	-757	-2.8	-2,355	-8.8
*Mineral Wells, Lake	5,273	4,952	93.9	192	3.6	648	12.3
Monticello, Lake	34,740	27,296	78.6	-17	0.0	-2,767	-8.0
Mountain Creek, Lake	22,850	22,850	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Murvaul, Lake	38,285	38,182	99.7	0	0.0	-103	0.0
Nacogdoches, Lake	39,522	38,377	97.1	1,347	3.4	-1,145	-2.9
Nasworthy	9,615	8,269	86.0	-13	0.0	61	0.6
Navarro Mills Lake	49,827	47,453	95.2	-1,017	-2.0	-2,374	-4.8
New Terrell City Lake	8,583	2,300	26.8	210	2.4	26	0.3
Nocona, Lake (Farmers Crk)	21,444	18,106	84.4	-287	-1.3	-666	-3.1
North Fork Buffalo Creek Reservoir	15,400	12,156	78.9	-566	-3.7	6,621	43.0
O' the Pines, Lake	241,363	229,186	95.0	3,587	1.5	-12,177	-5.0
O. C. Fisher Lake	115,742	16,395	14.2	-452	0.0	7,619	6.6
*O. H. Ivie Reservoir	554,340	249,955	45.1	-3,131	0.0	33,357	6.0
Oak Creek Reservoir	39,210	7,057	18.0	-322	0.0	-3,087	-7.9

CONSERVATION STORAGE DATA FOR SELECTED MAJOR TEXAS RESERVOIRS

Name of lake or reservoir	Storage capacity	Storage at end-March 2026		Storage change from end-Feb 2026		Storage change from end-Mar 2025	
	(acre-feet)	(acre-feet)	(%)	(acre-feet)	(%)	(acre-feet)**	(%)
<i>Continued</i>							
Palestine, Lake	367,303	364,077	99.1	-3,226	0.0	-3,226	0.0
Palo Duro Reservoir	61,066	226	0.4	-15	0.0	-234	0.0
Palo Pinto, Lake	26,766	24,975	93.3	-150	0.0	-644	-2.4
Pat Cleburne, Lake	26,008	24,828	95.5	859	3.3	1,134	4.4
*Pat Mayse Lake	113,683	100,428	88.3	-475	0.0	-13,255	-11.7
Possum Kingdom Lake	538,139	486,307	90.4	-3,310	0.0	-39,758	-7.4
Proctor Lake	54,762	41,168	75.2	-681	-1.2	-13,364	-24.4
Ray Hubbard, Lake	439,559	436,640	99.3	19,583	4.5	-2,919	0.0
Ray Roberts, Lake	788,167	787,600	99.9	1,417	0.2	19,128	2.4
Red Bluff Reservoir	145,165	83,121	57.3	626	0.4	24,869	17.1
Richland-Chambers Reservoir	1,099,417	1,019,618	92.7	0	0.0	-79,799	-7.3
Sam Rayburn Reservoir	2,857,077	2,015,967	70.6	65,277	2.3	-841,110	-29.4
Somerville Lake	150,293	109,653	73.0	-7,868	-5.2	-17,975	-12.0
Stamford, Lake	51,570	40,006	77.6	-1,716	-3.3	-4,662	-9.0
Stillhouse Hollow Lake	229,796	213,305	92.8	-4,098	-1.8	5,879	2.6
Striker, Lake	16,878	16,198	96.0	-387	-2.3	-407	-2.4
Sweetwater, Lake	12,267	2,872	23.4	-109	0.0	-1,317	-10.7
*Sulphur Springs, Lake	17,747	14,043	79.1	-208	-1.2	-3,704	-20.9
Tawakoni, Lake	871,685	837,758	96.1	14,689	1.7	-33,927	-3.9
Texana, Lake	158,975	81,514	51.3	-8,280	-5.2	-44,517	-28.0
Texoma, Lake (Texas & Oklahoma)	2,487,601	2,463,026	99.0	-17,129	0.0	182,810	7.3
Texoma, Lake (Texas)	1,243,801	1,231,512	99.0	-8,565	0.0	91,404	7.3
Toledo Bend Reservoir (Texas & Louisiana)	4,472,900	3,932,490	87.9	106,746	2.4	-357,579	-8.0
Toledo Bend Reservoir (Texas)	2,236,450	1,964,195	87.8	53,373	2.4	-178,789	-8.0
Travis, Lake	1,098,044	812,301	74.0	-25,994	-2.4	347,219	31.6
Twin Buttes Reservoir	182,454	19,215	10.5	-1,825	-1.0	5,899	3.2
Tyler, Lake	72,073	69,560	96.5	321	0.4	-2,513	-3.5
Waco, Lake	188,891	183,942	97.4	-918	0.0	12,071	6.4
Waxahachie, Lake	11,060	9,392	84.9	186	1.7	-1,668	-15.1
Weatherford, Lake	17,812	11,754	66.0	-137	0.0	-809	-4.5
White River Lake	31,846	8,879	27.9	-420	-1.3	2,560	8.0
Whitney, Lake	564,808	530,795	94.0	0	0.0	-34,013	-6.0
Worth, Lake	24,419	18,442	75.5	-969	-4.0	2,862	11.7
Wright Patman Lake	122,593	122,593	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
STATEWIDE TOTAL							
STATEWIDE TOTAL	32,202,675	23,103,317	71.7	767,649	2.4	-613,534	-1.9

*Total volume below elevation of conservation pool top is used as the conservation storage capacity, because the dead pool storage is unknown.

**Monthly and yearly changes do not include reservoirs that did not have data in the last month or last year, respectively.

SOIL MOISTURE

At the end of March 2026, root zone soil moisture was low [yellow, orange shading, Figure 5(a)] in the northeastern and southern High Plains, scattered areas of the Low Rolling Plains, portions of the Trans Pecos, areas of the Southern, northern and the southern border of the South Central, and western East Texas climate divisions. Average soil moisture [green shading, Figure 5(a)] was seen in portions of all climate divisions. High soil moisture [blue shading, Figure 5(a)] was seen in the Edwards Plateau, North Central, portions of East Texas, portions of northern South Central, and the Upper Coast climate divisions.

Compared to conditions at the end of March soil moisture increased [blue shading in Figure 5(b)] in the northern and southern Low Rolling Plains, Edwards Plateau, Southern, northern South Central, North Central, central East Texas and the eastern Upper Coast climate divisions. Soil moisture decreased [red shading in Figure 5(b)] in the High Plains, central Low Rolling Plains, Trans Pecos, northwestern Edwards Plateau, southern and northeastern South Central, central and eastern North Central, East Texas, and the Upper Coast climate divisions.




Figure 5: (a) Root zone soil moisture conditions in March 2026 and (b) the difference in root zone soil moisture between end-February 2026 and end-March 2026.

STREAMFLOW CONDITIONS

Much below normal streamflow (<10th percentile, maroon shading, Figure 6) was seen in the Canadian, Upper Red, Upper and Lower Sabine, Upper and Lower Brazos, Upper and Middle Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, Lavaca, and portions of the San Antonio-Nueces river basins.

Below normal streamflow (10–24th percentile, orange shading, Figure 6) was seen in the Upper and Lower Red, Middle and Lower Brazos, Neches, Lower Trinity, San Jacinto, Upper Trinity, Colorado, San Antonio, Guadalupe, Brazos-Colorado, Lavaca-Guadalupe, Colorado-Lavaca, San Antonio-Nueces, Nueces, Pecos, and the Upper Rio Grande river basins.

Normal streamflow (25–75th percentile, green shading, Figure 6) was recorded in the Canadian, Upper and Lower Red, Middle Colorado, Trinity, Middle Neches, San Jacinto-Brazos, Trinity-San Jacinto, Neches-Trinity, portions of Upper/Mid and Lower Rio Grande and Nueces-Rio Grande river basins.





Figure 6: Runoff percentiles by Hydrologic Unit Code based on active streamflow gauges operated by the U.S. Geological Survey and the International Boundary and Water Commission.

RECORDER WELL NETWORK AND WATER DATA FOR TEXAS

The TWDB, in partnership with its cooperators, continues to install and monitor automatic water level recorders in monitoring wells throughout the state. An automatic groundwater level recorder well, or recorder well, refers to a water well installed with water level recording equipment, a datalogger, and satellite or cellular transmitter. The selection and distribution of the 18 wells shown in this report are based on several considerations: key areas of drawdown and recovery, areas where local conditions are affected by recurring pumping cycles or seasonal activities, wells with a means of triggering drought conditions, and site availability. The spatial distribution of recorder wells attempts to capture broader conditions and trends representative of each aquifer while also highlighting areas of particular interest. The hydrographs provided in this report show a five-year history. For more information and to view full periods of record for available hydrographs, please visit [Water Data for Texas](http://www.twdb.texas.gov/WaterDataforTexas).



* Well numbers used in this publication on the aquifer map to indicate the monitoring well locations (numbers 1 to 18) are different than the TWDB's seven-digit state well number.

MARCH 2026 GROUNDWATER LEVELS IN MONITORING WELLS

Water level measurements were available for 18 key monitoring wells in the state. Water levels rose in 8 monitoring wells since the beginning of March, with an increase of 0.03 feet in the Hansford County Ogallala Aquifer well (#1 on map) to 4.97 feet in the Reeves County Pecos Valley Aquifer well (#14 on map). Water levels declined in ten monitoring wells, ranging from a decline of -0.05 feet in the Lamb County Ogallala Aquifer well (#2 on map) to -10.21 feet in the Pecos County Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer well (#15 on map). The J-17 well (#8 on map) in San Antonio recorded a water level of 106.11 feet below land surface or 624.89 feet above mean sea level. Edwards Aquifer Authority Stage 4 permit reductions remain in effect as a result of well J-17 water levels and area spring flow levels.

Monitoring Well	March (depth to water, feet)	February (depth to water, feet)	Month Change	Year Change	Historical Change*	First Measured (year)
(1) Hansford 0354301	167.23	167.26	0.03	-1.06	-97.11	1951
(2) Lamb 1053602	156.25	156.20	-0.05	-0.72	-128.08	1951
(3) Martin 2739903	143.86	143.91	0.05	0.90	-38.97	1964
(4) Dallas 3325202**	946.81	942.96	-3.85	27.00	155.86	2000
(5) Coryell 4035404	552.63	552.47	-0.16	-2.81	-260.63	1955
(6) Kendall 6802609	154.31	155.15	0.84	9.69	-94.31	1975
(7) Bell 5804816	126.32	125.24	-1.08	-0.48	-2.81	2008
(8) Bexar 6837203	106.11	103.88	-2.23	-4.91	-59.47	1932
(9) Anderson 3813106	239.96	240.50	0.54	-0.36	-94.96	1965
(10) La Salle 7738103	548.76	541.83	-6.93	-14.98	-295.69	2003
(11) Harris 6514409	196.10	196.71	0.61	-0.23	-60.60*	1947
(12) Victoria 8017502	30.80	31.69	0.89	0.82	3.20	1958
(13) El Paso 4913301	300.53	299.99	-0.54	-2.85	-68.63	1964
(14) Reeves 4644501	149.20	154.17	4.97	7.95	-57.11	1952
(15) Pecos 5216802	208.28	198.07	-10.21	-1.65	38.60	1976
(16) Schleicher 5512134	315.50	315.84	0.34	2.56	-13.60	2003
(17) Haskell 2135748	46.64	46.26	-0.38	0.42	-3.64	2002
(18) Hudspeth 4807516	148.70	145.51	-3.19	-1.62	-44.78	1966


* Change since the original measurement taken on the date indicated in the last column.

** Recorder well #4 (State Well #33-19-101) was temporarily replaced with another recorder well in Dallas County (State Well #33-25-202) due to ongoing construction in the area.


NA (not available). All data are provisional and subject to revision.

MARCH 2026 MONITORING WELL HYDROGRAPHS


(1) State Well [#03-54-301](#)
Near Spearman, Hansford County
Ogallala Aquifer




(2) State Well [#10-53-602](#)
Near Earth, Lamb County
Ogallala Aquifer



(3) State Well [#27-39-903](#)
Northwest Martin County
Ogallala Aquifer



***(4) State Well [#33-25-202](#)**
Southeast Dallas, Dallas County
Twin Mountains Formation-Trinity Aquifer




* Recorder well #4 (State Well #33-19-101) was temporarily replaced with another recorder well in Dallas County (State Well #33-25-202) due to ongoing construction in the area. The data shown in the time period displayed in this hydrograph are under review related to recent data collection issues and trends.


(5) State Well [#40-35-404](#)
Gatesville, Coryell County
Hosston Formation-Trinity Aquifer




(6) State Well [#68-02-609](#)
Waring, Kendall County
Travis Peak Formation-Trinity Aquifer




(7) State Well [#58-04-816](#)
Near Salado, Bell County
Edwards (Balcones Fault Zone) Aquifer




(9) State Well [#38-13-106](#)
Neches, Anderson County
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer




(10) State Well [#77-38-103](#)
Near Cotulla, La Salle County
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer




(11) State Well [#65-14-409](#)
North Houston, Harris County
Evangeline Formation-Gulf Coast Aquifer




(12) State Well [#80-17-502](#)
Near Bloomington, Victoria County
Lissie Formation-Gulf Coast Aquifer




(13) State Well [#49-13-301](#)
El Paso, El Paso County
Hueco-Mesilla Bolsons Aquifer



(14) State Well [#46-44-501](#)
Near Pecos, Reeves County
Pecos Valley Aquifer




(15) State Well [#52-16-802](#)
Fort Stockton, Pecos County
Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer




(16) State Well [#55-12-134](#)
Eldorado, Schleicher County
Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer




(17) State Well [#21-35-748](#)
Near O'Brien, Haskell County
Seymour Aquifer




**(18) State Well [#48-07-516](#)
Dell City, Hudspeth County
Bone Spring-Victorio Peak Aquifer**



**(8) State Well [#68-37-203 \(J-17\)](#)
San Antonio, Bexar County
Edwards (Balcones Fault Zone) Aquifer**



The late March water level measurement in this Edwards (Balcones Fault Zone) Aquifer well, located at an elevation of 731 feet above mean sea level, was 106.11 feet below land surface, or 624.89 feet above mean sea level. This was 2.23 feet below last month's measurement, 4.91 feet below last year's measurement, and 59.47 feet below the initial measurement recorded in 1932.



Water levels below the red line indicate periods in which Edwards Aquifer Authority Stage 4 drought restrictions are in effect. On August 12, 2025, the Edwards Aquifer Authority declared an increase to Stage 4 permit reductions which remain in effect as a result of well J-17 water levels and area spring flow levels.