



2006 Regional Water Planning Process Survey
SUMMARY OF BRAZOS G MEMBER RESPONSES
January 20, 2006 (Revised)

I. 2006 Regional Water Planning Process

1) What do you think went right in the 2006 Water Planning Process?

- Jon Burrows - We were able to respond to specific concerns from our fast growing areas and were able to get appropriate adjustments to population projections.
- Tom Clark - The process worked well.
- Scott Diermann - HDR did a good job of educating members around issues. There was good opportunity for public comment and involvement.
- Tim Fambrough – We started early and had experienced engineering firms putting the plan together, so it was a very smooth operation.
- Phil Ford - During this cycle, the process was inclusive of the majority of the interests in the planning area. Overall, the organizational input has reflected a positive reaction from both member and community interests.
- Horace Grace - I have no complaints about the 06 process.
- Terry Kelley - David Dunn/HDR did a great job to guide, suggest, recommend. David Meesey/TWDB coordination meshed well with the Group's efforts. Ample opportunity was allowed for public input and collaboration with water suppliers. Brazos G members worked well together with a team-like spirit to accomplish the mission.
- Mike McGuire - The process went forward with the wide diversity of interests at the table.
- Stephen Stark – Thought we did a good job. I had no problems with the process.
- Wiley Stem – I believe that all water supply issues were considered in the process and that the plan is functional.
- Randy Waclawczyk - Blank
- Kent Watson - I think every interest was heard and was given adequate consideration.
- Kathleen Webster – We completed a plan that sustained and improved 2001 results.
- Wayne Wilson - A consensus among board members for the plan.

2) What do you think went wrong in the 2006 Water Planning Process and how would you improve it?

- Jon Burrows - I am not sure anything went wrong. Some aspects seem to take a long time.
- Tom Clark – N/A
- Scott Diermann - We may have started policy input too late to have a significant effect in the legislative session. The calendar timing was not good.
- Tim Fambrough – I am not aware of anything that went wrong.
- Phil Ford - The TWDB and the TCEQ's requirement of including projects in the regional plan prior to permitting have turned the RWP into a de-facto permitting process. The RWP was never intended or structured to be part of the permitting process. The consistency test, under present interpretation, will become a redundant process with the TCEQ permitting process. The TCEQ should consider requiring the State Water Plan to show a need for a proposed project but not require the specific project be in the RWP.
- Horace Grace - Bringing on new board members in the middle of the planning cycle. New members should have to go to at least one water law seminar before joining the board.
- Terry Kelley - I suspect its average among all RPGs to say the road was bumpy in places, but I recollect no regrets for the planning process and the decisions made via the group's actions.
- Mike McGuire – We need to remember the original premise was that we are a bottoms-up planning group.
- Stephen Stark – Thought we did a good job.
- Wiley Stem - The consideration of projected demand and population projections separately without both projections being available for evaluation simultaneously. I do not believe this approach and the limits placed on these

projections (the adjustments for conservation and limitations on a County growth projection set by the State) will be consistent with the reality of the growth that will actually take place. For instance, had these same limits been applied to Williamson County in the 1960's or 1970's, I doubt the projection would have been consistent with the actual growth that has taken place. These projections should be reviewed together.

- Randy Waclawczyk - None
- Kent Watson – I think groundwater districts should be able to determine the water available and submit to us for us to use.
- Kathleen Webster – Unable to evaluate because of my short involvement with the group.
- Wayne Wilson - Conflict with groundwater availability numbers with groundwater districts

3) Do you think this planning cycle was successful?

- Jon Burrows - Yes
- Tom Clark – Yes
- Scott Diermann – Yes
- Tim Fambrough – Yes
- Phil Ford - Yes
- Horace Grace – Yes
- Terry Kelley – Yes
- Mike McGuire – Yes, but we need to begin the next iteration.
- Stephen Stark - Yes
- Wiley Stem – Yes
- Randy Waclawczyk -Yes
- Kent Watson – Yes
- Kathleen Webster – Yes, we completed a plan.
- Wayne Wilson - Yes

4) Is the five (5) year planning cycle an appropriate time frame?

- Jon Burrows - Yes
- Tom Clark – Yes
- Scott Diermann - Generally yes. I would look to alter the schedule such that policy development and final plan development be complete just prior to a legislative session instead of during or just after.
- Tim Fambrough – Yes
- Phil Ford - Yes, the five year planning cycle will be appropriate for at least another cycle if the amendment process is kept in place. Particular attention should be paid to a “truing up” of projected growth and actual growth through census data.
- Horace Grace – Yes
- Terry Kelley – Yes
- Mike McGuire – It is probably a good compromise. If you would like to see something changed, it is too long and vice versa. The 5 year time frame is necessary to provide on or more attempts to get things right before the revised census changes the ground rules.
- Stephen Stark - Yes
- Wiley Stem - I think so if we can come up with a reasonable amendment policy that does not damage the credibility of the work we did.
- Randy Waclawczyk - Yes for at least one more cycle.
- Kent Watson - Yes
- Kathleen Webster – Yes, especially if we simplify the amendment process.
- Wayne Wilson – Yes

5) Faced with less water planning funds, what creative ways would you pursue the next planning cycle?

- Jon Burrows - Contiguous Regions with somewhat similar situations might be able to use the same consultants and professionals for the objective aspects of the professional services needed.
- Tom Clark - The legislature needs to appropriate the funds and not allow the program to become another unfunded mandate.
- Scott Diermann - Start with the last WAM run and only adjust water requirements where the base assumptions have changed more than 5% (arbitrary number) then recommend water strategies to meet the new gaps. If there are no significant near term changes (next 10 years) then reissue the plan.
- Tim Fambrough – Secure more funds such as grants, etc. There is no need to have a planning cycle if you can't afford to do it correctly.
- Phil Ford - It may be possible to limit project scopes during off years (when there is no updated census data) to just special, as-needed studies and consideration of amendments.
- Horace Grace – Each county can add more funding as we did by paying for administration cost.
- Terry Kelley - The initial data collection and collaboration with water suppliers should relieve a substantial amount of our workload for subsequent cycles.
- Mike McGuire – I think we might be a little looser or not to micromanage the proposed projects.
- Stephen Stark – We have two planning cycles completed. I would think we focus only on “new critical issues” that might emerge and use existing process for upgrading each five years.
- Wiley Stem – Emphasis on reuse and a TWDB/TCEQ initiative to establish a toll on return flows that will help the planning process and hopefully resolve conflicts that revolve around reuse.
- Randy Waclawczyk - Only modify the plans where changes occur as oppose to an entire new plan.
- Kent Watson – Make the scope of work for the engineers not as detailed.
- Kathleen Webster – Limit the scope to special issues i.e., environmental flows and groundwater. Topics should be very carefully selected. We need to not reach too far.
- Wayne Wilson - Obtain more water availability #s from groundwater districts & other entities.

6) How can the funding mechanism for regional planning be improved?

- Jon Burrows - If the State thinks this is an important thing to do, the State should fund it. The local entities do not need another unfunded mandate sent to them. This is especially important when the Legislature is contemplating revenue caps and appraisal caps. The local entities cannot support unfunded mandates when the State ties the entities hands to raise revenue.
- Tom Clark - Since the River Authority revenue is paid by water users, it should be authorized to make up any short falls.
- Scott Diermann - I have no suggestions.
- Tim Fambrough – Seek more sources of revenue to fund regional planning.
- Phil Ford - The RWP could request a small amount of local cost share from water supply entities and county government. The funding formula should have a pro-rata component for population and projected water shortage. (Brazos G used this method for our 2001 Plan.)
- Horace Grace – No comment.
- Terry Kelley - It would not be a popular move to go back to the region's water suppliers for funding as initially done. However, if needed, it may be the best, fairest way to obtain funding. BRA's stepping forward to displace this problematic chore was indeed a relief.
- Mike McGuire – I don't know the answer to that. The RWPG's do not need to become an unfunded mandate from Austin. It does take money to plan, but none of the board draw any salaries from the planning process, making it cheap for the state.
- Stephen Stark – If possible, get more “local dollars from stakeholders”.
- Wiley Stem – I do not know enough about this to comment.
- Randy Waclawczyk – Not sure.
- Kent Watson - Blank

- Kathleen Webster – The legislature will need to provide the funds if planning is to continue for the long term.
- Wayne Wilson - State government needs to make a commitment to appropriately funding the 5 year water planning process.

7) From your perspective, what is the mission of regional water planning?

- Jon Burrows - To realistically project the water needs of the region for the foreseeable future and to plan for adequate water sources.
- Tom Clark - Provide comprehensive water planning and use on a regional basis and coordinate planning efforts and projected use with bordering regions to ensure adequate use of resources.
- Scott Diermann - Develop a water supply plan for an area that involves input from all stakeholders and serves to build a plan that is in the best long term interest for the region.
- Tim Fambrough – To develop our portion of the State Water Plan with a realistic plan for an adequate water supply for the future.
- Phil Ford - The mission of regional water planning is to integrate various sources of water supply and demand information, along with population projections, into a single coherent document that may be used to plan for a successful future for this state.
- Horace Grace – We are part of the water development board and our mission should not exceed theirs. If appointed us then we could have a different mission.
- Terry Kelley - Brazos G RPG works together to accomplish the state's goal to provide sound comprehensive regional water planning. Obtaining data through coordination with water suppliers enables appropriate assessment and recommended strategies that best serves the future water needs within the region.
- Mike McGuire – The mission is to attempt to be proactive for the region to provide the future needs. No one has a crystal ball, but the effort must be made to access future needs, given the long lead times for future sources. Wiley Stem said it well in the policy meeting last week that we don't necessarily need to plan to provide the water for the growth of the cities at the expense of the rest of the region. If we provide for the water for other areas beside the cities, the growth of the region will continue and be region wide. If we can develop the resources of the region and spread the growth then we don't necessarily have to develop the huge infrastructure to transport large quantities long distances. Kind of like Alcoa building the power plant next to the aluminum smelter.
- Stephen Stark – To make sure a viable water plan is in place for each five year cycle.
- Wiley Stem - To insure sustainable water availability and quality through solid planning practices without disrupting effective planning that was previously done at the community level.
- Randy Waclawczyk - To ensure that adequate water resources are available throughout our region for the next 50 years and hopefully beyond; identify shortages and develop water management strategies for each shortage.
- Kent Watson - It should be a bottoms up planning with more input from the bottom and less from the top.
- Kathleen Webster – The basic mission is to plan for a sustainable water supply for the entire region without depleting the water resources in our slower growing areas thus insuring they will always be areas of little or no growth.
- Wayne Wilson - Combining all aspects of water supplies, water demand & growth within each region to ensure adequate water supplies to meet those needs & help find solutions for expected water shortages.

8) Is the regional water planning accomplishing this mission?

- Jon Burrows - Yes
- Tom Clark – Yes
- Scott Diermann – Yes
- Tim Fambrough – Yes
- Phil Ford - Yes
- Horace Grace – Yes
- Terry Kelley – Yes
- Mike McGuire – In some ways, but we must never lose sight that we are a voluntary group that is self appointing, that has no regulatory powers and that desires no regulatory powers.

- Stephen Stark - Yes
- Wiley Stem - Not completely – some water rights holders and providers feel threatened by the process while others feel it is not allowing them to develop new supplies.
- Randy Waclawczyk - Yes
- Kent Watson - For the most part.
- Kathleen Webster – Yes, overall I think we are accomplishing this mission but I think we must become more concerned about the economic impacts of our planning. If planning continues to be done with projected population growth as the main focus we will be severely impacting the possibilities of future economic development in our slower growing areas. The availability of water drives the economic engine for all parts of the state.
- Wayne Wilson – Partially, we could do more to assist in alternative water supplies.

II. Potential New Issues for Future Planning Efforts

(Good: Good Idea; **Bad:** Bad Idea; **Blank:** No opinion)

1) Consider and plan for two scenarios for population projections, high and low.

- Jon Burrows - Good
- Tom Clark – Bad
- Scott Diermann – Good
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Good
- Horace Grace – Bad
- Terry Kelley – Good
- Mike McGuire – Good; We need to not stifle possible unforeseen economic opportunities because we had blinders on.
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Good
- Randy Waclawczyk - Good
- Kent Watson – Good
- Kathleen Webster - Good
- Wayne Wilson - Good

2) Account for University or other institutions with their own water supplies separate from Municipal water supplies.

- Jon Burrows - Blank
- Tom Clark – Bad
- Scott Diermann – Good
- Tim Fambrough – Blank
- Phil Ford - Good
- Horace Grace – Bad
- Terry Kelley – Good
- Mike McGuire – Good
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Blank
- Randy Waclawczyk - Good
- Kent Watson – Bad
- Kathleen Webster - Blank
- Wayne Wilson - Good

3) Change regional water plan funding to spread across legislative budget bienniums.

- Jon Burrows - Good
- Tom Clark – Good
- Scott Diermann – Good
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Bad
- Horace Grace – Good
- Terry Kelley – Good
- Mike McGuire – Good
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Good
- Randy Waclawczyk - Blank
- Kent Watson – Bad
- Kathleen Webster - Blank
- Wayne Wilson - Blank

4) Create a senate of Regional Water Planning Group delegates at the state level to establish direct communication between Regions and Legislators.

- Jon Burrows - Good
- Tom Clark – Good
- Scott Diermann – blank
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Bad
- Horace Grace – Bad
- Terry Kelley – Good
- Mike McGuire – Bad
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Good
- Randy Waclawczyk - Good
- Kent Watson – Bad
- Kathleen Webster - Bad
- Wayne Wilson - Bad

5) Redefine the role of regional water planning groups during non-census planning cycles, to consider environmental, regional economy, mitigation, regional facilities, partnering, permitting and design aspects.

- Jon Burrows - Good
- Tom Clark – Blank
- Scott Diermann – Bad
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Good
- Horace Grace – Good
- Terry Kelley – Good
- Mike McGuire – Good
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Blank
- Randy Waclawczyk - Good
- Kent Watson – Bad

- Kathleen Webster - Bad
- Wayne Wilson - Good

6) Encourage the TPWD to play a more active role in determining scopes of work for environmental assessments of water management strategies and water management plans.

- Jon Burrows - Blank
- Tom Clark – Good
- Scott Diermann – Good
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Blank
- Horace Grace – Good
- Terry Kelley – Good
- Mike McGuire – Bad
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Blank
- Randy Waclawczyk - Bad
- Kent Watson – Bad
- Kathleen Webster - Blank
- Wayne Wilson - Bad

7) Continue funding updates to the groundwater (TWDB) and surface water (TCEQ) availability models.

- Jon Burrows - Good
- Tom Clark – ??Who fund?
- Scott Diermann – Good
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Good
- Horace Grace – Good
- Terry Kelley – Blank
- Mike McGuire – Good
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Good
- Randy Waclawczyk - Good
- Kent Watson – Good
- Kathleen Webster - Good
- Wayne Wilson - Good

8) Reevaluate criteria and assumptions for applying surface water and groundwater availability models in planning.

- Jon Burrows - Blank
- Tom Clark – Good
- Scott Diermann – Good
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Good
- Horace Grace – Good
- Terry Kelley – Blank
- Mike McGuire – Good
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Blank

- Randy Waclawczyk - Good
- Kent Watson – Good
- Kathleen Webster - Good
- Wayne Wilson - Good

9) Encourage enforcement of water quality standards and funding for water quality monitoring.

- Jon Burrows - Good
- Tom Clark – Good
- Scott Diermann – Good
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Blank
- Horace Grace – Good
- Terry Kelley – Blank
- Mike McGuire – Good
- Stephen Stark - Good
- Wiley Stem – Good
- Randy Waclawczyk - Good
- Kent Watson – Bad
- Kathleen Webster - Blank
- Wayne Wilson - Good

10) Bridge the role for Regional Water Planning Groups from reconnaissance level studies to implementation of projects.

- Jon Burrows - Blank
- Tom Clark –??Who?
- Scott Diermann – Bad
- Tim Fambrough – Good
- Phil Ford - Good
- Horace Grace – Good
- Terry Kelley – Blank
- Mike McGuire – I have mixed feelings about this. This makes us a regulatory agency.
- Stephen Stark - Blank
- Wiley Stem – Blank
- Randy Waclawczyk - Good
- Kent Watson – Good
- Kathleen Webster - Bad
- Wayne Wilson - Good

11) Others: (please list)

(NO ADDITIONAL COMMENTS LISTED FROM MEMBERS)