

**DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT**  
**A RESOLUTION OF THE LOWER COLORADO REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP**  
**(REGION K)**  
**REGARDING THE GUADALUPE-BLANCO RIVER AUTHORITY SIMSBORO PROJECT, A**  
**RECOMMENDED STRATEGY IN THE SOUTH CENTRAL TEXAS REGIONAL WATER**  
**PLANNING GROUP (REGION L) 2011 WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.**

**WHEREAS** Region L requested that Region K respond to certain questions in a letter dated January 25, 2010 which identified the GBRA Simsboro project as a recommended strategy in the Region L IPP, recognizing that the project may create an “over-allocation”, providing its rationale as to why this is not a conflict”, and requesting a response to three (3) questions.

**WHEREAS** Region K provided a letter to Region L dated February 10, 2010 responding to its rationale and questions posed by Region L wherein Region K indicating that 1) Yes, the export quantities associated with the GBRA Simsboro Project “exceed the regional planning estimates of available groundwater in Bastrop (and) Lee counties”, and 2) No, Region K has not identified any alternative water management strategies.” “Region K has planned to fully use the Carrizo-Wilcox to supply demands in our Region. Based on data from the Lost Pines GCD, the district has already permitted considerably more water than appears to be available. At this time, **Region K believes that the Region L request creates a potential conflict.**” (Emphasis added)

**WHEREAS** the Lost Pines Groundwater Conservation District (LPGCD) provided public comment to Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority Board at its December 16, 2009 meeting regarding the 50,000 acre feet per year being requested, stating that “the wells, if permitted and drilled, would be subject to the LPGCD rule 8.3 which stipulates a five year operating permit ... The District is concerned that groundwater from LPGCD (Lee and Bastrop counties) is being viewed as a permanent solution for a long term need. A supply of groundwater from LPGCD should be considered as being an interruptible supply.”

**WHEREAS** the Lost Pines Groundwater Conservation District (LPCGC) commented to Region L on its 2011 IPP informing Region L that the desire for water from the GBRA Simsboro Project “was not included in the basis for establishing DFC’s in GMA 12.” “While the exact impact has yet to be quantified, it can be stated with assurance that groundwater production in excess of recharge, such as is proposed by the GBRA Simsboro Project, would have a depletion effect on storage in LPGCD and in GMA-12.”

**WHEREAS** Region K informed Region L by letter dated July 30, 2010 stating that the “GBRA Simsboro Project, as a ‘recommended’ WMS, results in a conflict with the Region K IPP as it exceeds the allotted water availability.” “Region L is effectively recommending that the water within the Simsboro be ‘mined’, and the available groundwater quantities be exceeded. This ‘overdraft’ policy has been rejected by Region K. Region K requests Region L consider revising its IPP to reflect the GBRA Simsboro Project as an ‘alternative’ WMS.”

**WHEREAS** Region K passed a resolution on February 9, 2000, opposing the mining or over-drafting of groundwater resources within its jurisdiction. It is, therefore, in conflict with the stated intent of Region K to accept an over-draft, especially one imposed by another region without its consent.

**WHEREAS** the Texas Water Development Board approved the Region L IPP and granted \$2,500,000 of Water Infrastructure Funding on December 16, 2010.

**WHEREAS** the actions of Region L and the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority related to the Simsboro Project are against the will of the people and elected officials in Region K as proclaimed by twelve (12) resolutions and over 465 petition signatures provided as evidence of the local opposition to these actions.



**WHEREAS there is evidence that a conflict exists that will cause over-pumping and economic damage as indicated below:**

1. The magnitude of the over-draft significantly surpasses the Managed Available Groundwater (MAG) in the Lost Pines GCD (see also table attached):

a. MAG for Bastrop and Lee Counties (all aquifers, 2060):	56,754 ac-ft/yr
b. Region K water availability planned (Bastrop Co., 2060):	36,153 ac-ft/yr
c. Region G water availability planned (Lee Co, 2060):	31,477 ac-ft/yr
d. Region L Simsboro Project (Bastrop Co., 2060):	30,000 ac-ft/yr
(Lee Co., 2060):	<u>20,000 ac-ft/yr</u>

**Over-draft amount (Supply (a) minus demand (b+c+d)) = -60,876 ac-ft/yr**

2. The Socio-Economic impact of water needs in excess of availability (over-drafting) in Bastrop County is excessive (based on the Bureau of Economic Geology's November 30, 2010 assessment, see also table attached):

a. Municipal Cost	2060	\$1,110,987,862
b. Irrigation Cost	2060	\$ 120,988
c. Manufacturing Cost	2060	\$ 27,517,344
d. Steam-Electric Cost	2060	<u>\$ 642,719,219</u>
<b>Total Socio-Economic Cost to Bastrop Co. =</b>		<b>\$1,781,345,414</b>

3. The economic cost of lost ecological services due to excessive over-drafting's impact on surface water and other natural resources are expected to be significant (estimates to be developed).

a. Rivers, streams & springs	N/A
b. Surface vegetation (Pine Forests)	N/A
c. Wastewater assimilation	N/A
d. Storm-water assimilation	N/A
e. Eco-tourism	N/A

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group (Region K) will, at the request of the people of the Region, take such actions as are necessary and prudent to protect the groundwater resources of the Region for local use without damaging the groundwater resources by "over-drafting" (mining) the aquifers.**

## Socio-Economic Impact of Water Needs (Groundwater Over-draft)

Based on a Bureau of Economic Geology Study of the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer - Final Summary Report for Task 5<sup>1</sup>

TCEQ Carrizo-Wilcox Study: Project 582-8-75374-119

Bastrop County Sector	Total Monetary Losses Per Acre-Foot of Water Supply Needed (Deficit) <sup>1</sup>					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Municipal	\$576	\$4,277	\$7,214	\$11,737	\$14,765	\$21,624
Irrigation	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$125
Manufacturing	\$63,229	\$63,229	\$63,229	\$63,229	\$63,229	\$126,458
Steam-Electric	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,719	\$27,719	\$27,719
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$63,930</b>	<b>\$67,631</b>	<b>\$70,568</b>	<b>\$102,810</b>	<b>\$105,838</b>	<b>\$175,926</b>
<b>OVER-DRAFT AMOUNT</b>	<b>-75,750</b>	<b>-71,295</b>	<b>-66,670</b>	<b>-66,568</b>	<b>-61,556</b>	<b>-60,876</b>

Bastrop County Demand <sup>2</sup>	Percent (%) of Demand in each Segment					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Municipal	49%	55%	45%	61%	64%	68%
Irrigation	6%	4%	24%	2%	2%	1%
Manufacturing	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Steam-Electric	44%	41%	31%	37%	35%	31%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Socio-Economic Costs of Water Needs (Groundwater Over-drafting)

Assumptions: The total quantity of over-draft is distributed across the segments even though Bastrop County does not have a demand for the total quantity of the over-draft and currently takes steam-electric from surface water.

Therefore the Socio-Economic impact may be over-estimated. Does Not include economic costs of ecological impacts.

Bastrop County Sector	Total Monetary Losses Per Acre-Foot of Water Supply Needed (Deficit)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Municipal	-\$21,470,690	-\$176,710,962	-\$244,522,972	-\$542,160,197	-\$710,333,708	-\$1,110,987,862
Irrigation	-\$565,099	-\$390,255	-\$2,255,747	-\$206,051	-\$156,630	-\$120,988
Manufacturing	-\$16,334,022	-\$15,573,415	-\$12,132,650	-\$14,584,051	-\$14,335,792	-\$27,517,344
Steam-Electric	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$767,221,317	-\$725,155,020	-\$642,719,219
<b>Total</b>	<b>-\$38,369,811</b>	<b>-\$192,674,632</b>	<b>-\$258,911,369</b>	<b>-\$1,324,171,615</b>	<b>-\$1,449,981,151</b>	<b>-\$1,781,345,414</b>

<sup>1</sup> BEG Final Summary Report for Task 5, <http://www.beg.utexas.edu/cswr/aquiferstudy/>

<sup>2</sup> Region K 2011 Water Plan - Chapter 2

### Ecological Services Economic Costs of Over-drafting the Aquifers (To be Developed)

Rivers, Streams & Springs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Surface Vegetation (Pine Forests)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wastewater Assimilation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stormwater Assimilation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Eco-Tourism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total Ecological Costs</b>						

### Lost Pines GCD Managed Available Groundwater<sup>3</sup> (MAG-12/2010)

Aquifer	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Calvert Bluff	1,507	1,889	2,225	2,694	3,321	3,264
Carrizo	6,514	7,502	8,217	9,094	11,596	11,803
Hooper	1,061	1,290	1,550	1,897	2,349	2,300
Queen City	1,146	1,023	2,659	890	838	785
Simsboro	29,479	32,637	31,249	34,780	36,380	37,049
Sparta	2,177	1,998	5,062	1,709	1,590	1,553
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41,884</b>	<b>46,339</b>	<b>50,962</b>	<b>51,064</b>	<b>56,074</b>	<b>56,754</b>

#### Region K Groundwater Availability (Demand)<sup>4</sup> - Bastrop County

Carrizo-Wilcox	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000
Trinity	12	12	10	10	8	8
Queen City	2,756	2,756	2,756	2,756	2,756	2,756
Sparta	5,389	5,389	5,389	5,389	5,389	5,389
<b>Bastrop County Total</b>	<b>36,157</b>	<b>36,157</b>	<b>36,155</b>	<b>36,155</b>	<b>36,153</b>	<b>36,153</b>

#### Region G Groundwater Availability (Demand)<sup>5</sup> - Lee County

Carrizo-Wilcox	27,533	27,533	27,533	27,533	27,533	27,533
Queen City	99	99	99	99	99	99
Sparta	145	145	145	145	145	145
Yegua-Jackson	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700
<b>Lee County Total</b>	<b>31,477</b>	<b>31,477</b>	<b>31,477</b>	<b>31,477</b>	<b>31,477</b>	<b>31,477</b>

#### Region L GBRA Simsboro Project (Demand)<sup>6</sup>

Bastrop County starting 2012	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Lee County starting 2012	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
<b>Simsboro Project Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>

<b>OVER -DRAFT AMOUNT</b>	<b>-75,750</b>	<b>-71,295</b>	<b>-66,670</b>	<b>-66,568</b>	<b>-61,556</b>	<b>-60,876</b>
---------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

<sup>3</sup> Managed Available Groundwater (MAG) from TWDB GAM Run 10-044 MAG; GAM Run 10-045 MAG; GAM Run 10-046 MAG; Bastrop & Lee Co.

<sup>4</sup> Region K 2011 Water Plan Chapter 3

<sup>5</sup> Region G 2011 Water Plan Chapter 3

<sup>6</sup> Region L 2011 Draft Water Plan - Volume II, 4.C.21 & Summary Sheet, September 2010