

Sterling County
Underground Water
Conservation District

Management Plan

2018 - 2023

Re-Adopted: May 14, 2018

Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District

Physical Address:

612 4th Street
Sterling City, TX 76951

Mailing Address:

P.O. Box 873
Sterling City, TX 76951

Phone: 325 378-2704

Fax: 325 378-2624

Cell: 325 277-2594

Web Site:

<http://www.sterlinguwcd.org>




Table of Contents

District Mission	1
Purpose of Management Plan	1
Time Period for this Plan	2
Statement of Guiding Principles	2
General Description	3
History	3
Location and Extent	3
Regional Cooperation and Coordination	3
Groundwater Resources	5
Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	5
Dockum Aquifer	5
Lipan Aquifer	6
Technical District Information Required by Texas Administrative Code	6
Modeled Available Groundwater in the District	8
Amount of Groundwater being Used within the District on an Annual Basis	8
Annual Amount of Recharge from Precipitation to the Groundwater Resources within the District	8
Annual Volume of Water that Discharges from the Aquifer to Springs and Surface Water Bodies	8
Estimate of the Annual Volume of Flow into the District, out of the District and Between Aquifers in the District	8
Projected Surface Water Supplies within the District	8
Projected Total Demand for Water within the District	8
Water Supply Needs	8
Water Management Strategies	8
Actions, Procedures, Performance and Avoidance for Plan Implementation	9
Methodology for Tracking Progress	9
Goals, Management Objectives and Performance Standards	10
Goal 1.0 - §36.1071(a)(1) Providing the Efficient Use of Groundwater	10
Goal 2.0 - §36.1071(a)(2) Controlling and Preventing Waste of Groundwater	10
Goal 3.0 - §36.1071(a)(6) Addressing Drought Conditions	10
Goal 4.0 - §36.1071(a)(7) Addressing Conservation and Precipitation Enhancement	11
Goal 5.0 - §36.1071(a)(8) Addressing the Desired Future Conditions established under §36.108	11

Management Goals Determined Not-Applicable	11
Goal 6.0 - §36.1071(a)(3) Controlling and Preventing Subsidence	11
Goal 7.0 - §36.1071(a)(4) Addressing Conjunctive Surface Water Management Issues . . .	12
Goal 8.0 - §36.1071(a)(5) Addressing Natural Resource Issues.	12
Goal 9.0 - §36.1071(a)(7) Addressing Recharge Enhancement.	12
Goal 10.0 - §36.1071(a)(7) Addressing Rainwater Harvesting	12
Goal 11.0 - §36.1071(a)(7) Addressing Brush Control	12

Appendix A - GAM Run 10-043 MAG (Version 2)

Appendix B - Estimated Historical Groundwater Use and 2017 State Water Plan Datasets: Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District

Appendix C - GAM Run 17-012: Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District Management Plan

Appendix D - District Rules

Appendix E - Resolution Adopting the Management Plan

Appendix F - Evidence of Notice and Hearing

Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District Management Plan 2018-2023

The Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District (the “District”) was created by the 69th Texas Legislature under the authority of Section 59, Article XVI, of the Texas Constitution, and in accordance with Chapter 51 and 52 of the Texas Water Code (“Water Code”), Acts of the 70th Legislature, Regular Session, 1987. In 1995, by Acts of the 74th Legislature, Chapter 52 of the Water Code was repealed and replaced with Chapter 36 of the Water Code effective September 1, 1995. In 2009, by Acts of the 81st Legislature, the enabling legislation for the District was recodified in Texas Special District Local Laws Code Ann. ch. 8814 Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District.

The District is a governmental agency and a body politic and corporate. The District was created “to provide for the conservation, preservation, protection, recharge, and prevention of waste and pollution of the district’s groundwater and surface water” consistent with the objectives set forth in Section 59, Article XVI, of the Texas Constitution, and Chapter 36, Water Code. The District is composed of the territory described by Section 1, Chapter 915, Acts of the 70th Legislature, Regular Session, 1987, and as that territory has been modified under Chapter 36, Water Code, or other law.

District Mission

The mission of the District is to develop, promote and implement water conservation and management strategies to:

- a) conserve, preserve, and protect the groundwater supplies of the District,
- b) protect and enhance recharge,
- c) prevent waste and pollution, and
- d) to effect the efficient, beneficial and wise use of water for the benefit of the citizens and economy of the District.

The District seeks to protect the groundwater quality and quantity within the District, pursuant to the powers and duties granted under Chapter 36, Subchapter D of the Texas Water Code. Any action taken by the District shall only be after full consideration and respect has been afforded to the individual property rights of all citizens of the District.

The District also seeks to maintain groundwater ownership and rights of the landowners and their lessees as provided in the Texas Water Code §36.002.

Purpose of Management Plan

The 75th Texas Legislature in 1997 enacted Senate Bill 1 (“SB 1”) to establish a comprehensive statewide water planning process. In particular, SB 1 contained provisions that required groundwater conservation districts to prepare management plans to identify the water supply resources and water

demands that will shape the decisions of each district. SB 1 designed the management plans to include management goals for each district to manage and conserve the groundwater resources within their boundaries. In 2001, the Texas Legislature enacted Senate Bill 2 (“SB 2”) to build on the planning requirements of SB 1 and to further clarify the actions necessary for districts to manage and conserve the groundwater resources of the state of Texas.

The Texas Legislature enacted significant changes to the management of groundwater resources in Texas with the passage of House Bill 1763 (HB 1763) in 2005. HB 1763 created a long-term planning process in which groundwater conservation districts (GCDs) in each Groundwater Management Area (GMA) are required to meet and determine the Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) for the groundwater resources within their boundaries by September 1, 2010 and every five years thereafter. In addition, HB 1763 required GCDs, to share management plans with the other GCDs in the GMA for review by the other GCDs.

The Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District’s management plan satisfies the statutory requirements of Chapter 36 of the Texas Water Code, and the administrative requirements of the Texas Water Development Board’s (TWDB) rules.

Time Period for this Plan

This plan becomes effective upon adoption by the Board of Directors. The plan remains in effect for ten years with the required review and re-adoption, with or without revisions, every five years.

Statement of Guiding Principles

The District recognizes that groundwater resources are of the utmost importance for the economy for all groundwater users, first for the residents of the District, and then the region. Also recognized is the importance of understanding the aquifers and aquifer characteristics for proper management of these resources. Integrity and ownership of groundwater are also recognized as important for the management of this precious resource.

The primary goal of the District is to preserve the integrity of the groundwater in the district from all potential contamination sources, mainly oil and gas production and related activities. This is accomplished as the District sets objectives to provide for the conservation, preservation, protection, recharge, prevention of waste and pollution, and efficient use of water including:

- a) acquiring additional hydrogeologic data for the aquifers within the District;
- b) protecting the landowner’s right to the beneficial use of groundwater resources beneath his land;
- c) promulgating rules for the protection of all users while maintaining adequate future supplies and;
- d) cooperation with other local GCD’s to manage shared groundwater resources.

These objectives are best achieved through guidance from the locally elected board members who

understand the local conditions and can manage the resource for the benefit of the residents of the district and region. The District shall seek to ensure that maximum groundwater withdrawals do not exceed amounts that would be significantly detrimental for future residents of the District.

General Description

History

The citizens of Sterling County, accepting the importance of protecting the integrity of groundwater from potential contamination from the vast amount of oil and gas production and associated activities and the necessity of local control of groundwater resources, introduced legislation in the 70th Regular Legislative Session (1987) for creation of the District. The District was confirmed the same year. Government of the District is by a five member locally elected board serving staggered four year terms.

Location and Extent

The District has an areal extent of 616,101 acres (963 square miles) in Sterling and Tom Green Counties located in the west-central part of Texas. Elevation ranges from approximately 2,200 to 2,700 feet above mean sea level. Estimated 2020 population is 1,215¹ including the County Seat, Sterling City. Economy in the District consists of agriculture and oil and gas activities. Agriculture land use is mainly range land with limited crop land.

The majority of the District overlies the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer. Minor aquifers of Dockum and Lipan are also present. The District is included in the Upper Colorado Region of the Colorado River Basin, Region F Regional Water Planning Group and Groundwater Management Area 7.

Regional Cooperation and Coordination

West Texas Regional Groundwater Alliance

Since 1988 the District has been involved in coordination of district activities with other GCD's managing the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer. In 1988, four groundwater conservation districts; Coke County UWCD, Glasscock County UWCD, Irion County WCD, and Sterling County UWCD signed an original Cooperative Agreement. As new districts were created, they too signed the Cooperative Agreement. In the fall of 1996, the original Cooperative Agreement was redrafted and the West Texas Regional Groundwater Alliance was created.

The regional alliance consists of seventeen locally created and locally funded groundwater conservation districts covering all or part of twenty-two counties, that encompass approximately

¹ Table 2-1, Historical and Projected Population by County, 2016 Region F Water Plan

18.2 million acres or 28,368 square miles, of West Central Texas. This West Texas region is as diverse as the State of Texas. Due to the diversity of this region, each member district provides its own unique programs to best serve its constituents. Current member districts are:

Coke Co. UWCD	Crockett Co. GCD	Glasscock GCD
Hickory UWCD # 1	Hill Country UWCD	Irion Co. WCD
Kimble Co. GCD	Lipan-Kickapoo WCD	Lone Wolf GCD
Menard Co. UWD	Middle Pecos GCD	Permian Basin UWCD
Plateau UWC & SD	Santa Rita UWCD	Sterling Co. UWCD
Sutton Co. UWCD	Wes-Tex GCD	

This Alliance was created because the local districts have a common objective: to facilitate the conservation, preservation and protection of groundwater supplies, protection and enhancement of recharge, prevention of waste and pollution, and beneficial use of water and related resources. Local districts monitor water-related activities which include but are not limited to the State’s largest industries of farming, ranching and oil and gas production. The alliance provides coordination essential to the activities of these member districts as they monitor these activities in order to accomplish their objectives.

West Texas Weather Modification Association

In 1996, in response to the resident landowners of seven groundwater conservation districts, the West Texas Weather Modification Association was formed for the purpose of providing weather modification (cloud seeding) for rainfall and recharge enhancement throughout the geographical region of its members. The target area of the Association includes all of seven counties and part of an 8th for a total area of over 5.8 million acres or 9,000 square miles of West Central Texas.

Current membership includes:

City of San Angelo	Crockett Co GCD	Irion County WCD
Plateau UWC & SD	Santa Rita UWCD	Sterling County UWCD
	Sutton County UWCD	

Recognizing the importance of rainfall in the region, this Association was formed to provide benefits from enhanced rainfall which includes a reduction of groundwater withdrawals, increase in runoff, increase in agricultural productivity with the resulting economic impact for the region, provide additional recharge, and increase spring flow. These benefits are not only realized within the region but also downwind and down stream of the target area.

Regional Water Planning

The District has been active in the Region F, Regional Water Planning Group meetings to provide input in developing and adopting the 2001, 2006, 2011 and 2016 Regional plans. As the Regional

Planning Group moves toward adopting future Regional Plans the District will continue to participate in the planning process.

Groundwater Management Area

Groundwater Management Area 7 covers all or part of thirty-three counties and includes twenty groundwater conservation districts. These GCD's manage groundwater resources at the local level in all or part of twenty-four counties within GMA 7 and surrounding areas. The District continues to actively participate in meetings and discussions to determine a feasible future desired condition of the aquifers within the management area and district.

Groundwater Resources

Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer

Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer is a major aquifer extending across much of the southwestern part of the state. The water-bearing units are composed predominantly of limestone and dolomite of the Edwards Group and sands of the Trinity Group. Although maximum saturated thickness of the aquifer is greater than 800 feet, freshwater saturated thickness averages 433 feet. Water quality ranges from fresh to slightly saline, with total dissolved solids ranging from 100 to 3,000 milligrams per liter, and water is characterized as hard within the Edwards Group. Water typically increases in salinity to the west within the Trinity Group. Elevated levels of fluoride in excess of primary drinking water standards occur within Glasscock and Irion counties. Springs occur along the northern, eastern, and southern margins of the aquifer primarily near the bases of the Edwards and Trinity groups where exposed at the surface. San Felipe Springs is the largest exposed spring along the southern margin. Of groundwater pumped from this aquifer, more than two-thirds is used for irrigation, with the remainder used for municipal and livestock supplies. Water levels have remained relatively stable because recharge has generally kept pace with the relatively low amounts of pumping over the extent of the aquifer.²

Dockum Aquifer

The Dockum Aquifer is a minor aquifer found in the northwest part of the state. It is defined stratigraphically by the Dockum Group and includes, from oldest to youngest, the Santa Rosa Formation, the Tecovas Formation, the Trujillo Sandstone, and the Cooper Canyon Formation. The Dockum Group consists of gravel, sandstone, siltstone, mudstone, shale, and conglomerate. Groundwater located in the sandstone and conglomerate units is recoverable, the highest yields coming from the coarsest grained deposits located at the middle and base of the group. Typically, the water-bearing sandstones are locally referred to as the Santa Rosa Aquifer. The water quality in the aquifer is generally poor—with freshwater in outcrop areas in the east and brine in the western

² Texas Water Development Board, Report 380, Aquifers of Texas

subsurface portions of the aquifer—and the water is very hard. Naturally occurring radioactivity from uranium present within the aquifer has resulted in gross alpha radiation in excess of the state’s primary drinking water standard. Radium-226 and -228 also occur in amounts above acceptable standards. Groundwater from the aquifer is used for irrigation, municipal water supply, and oil field waterflooding operations, particularly in the southern High Plains. Water level declines and rises have occurred in different areas of the aquifer.³

Lipan Aquifer

The Lipan Aquifer is a minor aquifer found in parts of Coke, Concho, Glasscock, Irion, Runnels, Schleicher, Sterling, and Tom Green counties in west-central Texas. The aquifer includes water-bearing alluvium and the updip portions of older, underlying strata. The alluvium includes as much as 125 feet of saturated sediments of the Quaternary Leona Formation. These deposits consist mostly of gravels and conglomerates cemented with sandy lime and layers of clay. The formation generally fines upward with conglomerates existing mainly in locations of thicker alluvium. The underlying strata include the San Angelo Sandstone of the Pease River Group and the Choza Formation, Bullwagon Dolomite, Vale Formation, Standpipe Limestone, and Arroyo Formation of the Clear Fork Group. These units are predominantly limestones and shales. Groundwater in the alluvial deposits and the upper parts of the older rocks is hydraulically connected, and most wells in the area are completed in both units. Groundwater flow in the Lipan Aquifer does not appear to be structurally controlled. Higher production wells appear to correspond to alluvial deposits overlying the Choza, Bullwagon, and Vale formations. In these areas, thick alluvial deposits with conglomerates lie near the contact with the Permian. Groundwater in the alluvium ranges from fresh to slightly saline, containing between 350 and 3,000 milligrams per liter of total dissolved solids, and is very hard. Water in the underlying parts of the Choza Formation and Bullwagon Dolomite tends to be moderately saline with total dissolved solids in excess of 3,000 milligrams per liter. The aquifer is primarily used for irrigation but also supports livestock and municipal, domestic, and manufacturing uses. Because of drought and heavy irrigation pumping in the late 1990s, water levels decreased significantly in some areas, and the aquifer could not be pumped through the entire irrigation season. In other areas, however, the aquifer could be pumped, but only at a reduced rate.⁴

Technical District Information Required by Texas Administrative Code

Estimate of modeled available groundwater in District based on desired future conditions. Texas Water Code § 36.001 defines modeled available groundwater as “the amount of water that the executive administrator determines may be produced on an average annual basis to achieve a desired future condition established under Section 36.108.”

The joint planning process set forth in Texas Water Code § 36.108 must be collectively conducted by all groundwater conservation districts within the same GMA. The District is a member of GMA 7. GMA 7 declared the Dockum and Lipan Aquifers as not relevant for regional planning purposes

³ Ibid

⁴ Ibid

in the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District on September 22, 2016 and adopted DFCs for the Edwards/Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer on March 22, 2018. The adopted DFCs were forwarded to the TWDB for development of the MAG calculations. The submittal package for the DFCs can be found here: http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/management_areas/DFC.asp.*

A summary of the desired future conditions and the modeled available groundwater are summarized below.

Edwards/Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer: An average drawdown of 7 feet for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifer, except for the Kinney County GCD, based on the GMA 7 Technical Memorandum 18-01.

Dockum Aquifer: Not relevant for joint planning purposes within the boundaries of Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District.

Lipan Aquifer: Not relevant for joint planning purposes within the boundaries of Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District.

Estimated Modeled Available Groundwater in ac/ft for the Edwards/Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer by district from GAM Run 10-043 MAG (Version 2). *

	Year					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Sterling Co UWCD	2,497	2,497	2,497	2,497	2,497	2,497

* Information will be amended when new information is available later in 2018

Modeled Available Groundwater in the District.

Please refer to Appendix A

Amount of Groundwater being Used within the District on an Annual Basis

Please refer to Appendix B (Estimated Historical Groundwater Use and 2017 State Water Plan Datasets: Sterling County Water Conservation District)

Annual Amount of Recharge from Precipitation to the Groundwater Resources within the District

Please refer to Appendix C

Annual Volume of Water that Discharges from the Aquifer to Springs and Surface Water Bodies

Please Refer to Appendix C

Estimate of the Annual Volume of Flow into the District, out of the District and Between Aquifers in the District

Please refer to Appendix C

Projected Surface Water Supplies within the District

Please refer to Appendix B

Projected Total Demand for Water within the District

Projected water demands do not exceed projected available groundwater both in Sterling County and the portion of the district located in Tom Green County.

Please refer to Appendix B

Water Supply Needs

Projected supply needs do not exceed projected groundwater supplies both in Sterling County and the portion of the district located in Tom Green County.

Please refer to Appendix B

Water Management Strategies

The district continues to encourage conservation, reuse and weather modification to meet the projected strategies in the TWDB 2017 State Water Plan. Please refer to Appendix B

Actions, Procedures, Performance and Avoidance for Plan Implementation

The District will implement and utilize the provisions of this plan as a guide for determining the direction and/or priority for District activities. Operations of the District and all agreements entered into by the District will be consistent with the provisions of this plan.

The District has adopted rules for the management of groundwater resources and will amend those rules as necessary pursuant to TWC Chapter 36 and the provisions of this plan. The promulgation of the rules will be based on the best technical evidence available. Current rules are available at <http://www.sterlingwcd.org/rules>.

The District shall treat all residents with equality. Residents may apply to the District for discretion in enforcement of the rules on grounds of adverse economic effect or unique local character. In granting discretion to any rule, the Board shall consider the potential for adverse effect on adjacent landowners. The exercise of said discretion by the Board shall not be construed as limiting the power of the Board. The District will seek cooperation in the implementation of this plan and the management of groundwater supplies within the District.

Methodology for Tracking Progress

The methodology that the District will use to track the progress in achieving the management goals will be as follows: the District holds a regular monthly Board Meeting for the purpose of conducting District business. Each month the Managers Report will reflect meetings attended, water samples collected and analyzed, water levels monitored, fluid injection permit applications, reports on any school or civic group programs, resulting action regarding potential contamination or remediation of actual contamination, and other matters of district importance.

Goals, Management Objectives and Performance Standards

Goal 1.0 - §36.1071(a)(1) Providing the Efficient Use of Groundwater

Gather groundwater data both to improve the understanding of the aquifers and their hydrogeologic properties and to quantify this resource for prudent planning and efficient use.

1.1. Management Objective

The District will measure, record, and accumulate a historic record of static water levels in the monitoring network quarterly.

1.1a. Performance Standard

Water level measurements will be reported quarterly at regular board meetings.

Goal 2.0 - §36.1071(a)(2) Controlling and Preventing Waste of Groundwater

Minimize potential contamination of the groundwater by monitoring the drilling, spacing and completion of wells.

2.1. Management Objective

The District will register new wells drilled within the district in accordance with District Rules.

2.1a. Performance Standard

The District will maintain files including information on the drilling, spacing and completion of all new wells drilled within the District. Wells registered will be reported quarterly at regular board meetings.

Goal 3.0 - §36.1071(a)(6) Addressing Drought Conditions

3.1. Management Objective

The District will monitor the NOAA Climate Prediction Center, <http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/> and the TWDB drought page, <https://waterdatafortexas.org/drought/>, and report quarterly at regular board meetings

3.1a. Performance Standard

Number of times index is reported.

3.2 .Management Objective

The District will maintain the rainfall monitor network.

3.2a. Performance Standard

Number of times rainfall network is monitored.

Goal 4.0 - §36.1071(a)(7) Addressing Conservation and Precipitation Enhancement

4.1 Management Objective - Conservation

The District will continue to be a source for available informational materials and programs to improve public awareness of efficient use, wasteful practices and conservation measures including the water conservation best management practices guide presented by the Water Conservation Advisory Council: <http://www.savetexaswater.org/bmp/>.

4.1a. Performance Standard

Number of informational materials and programs provided.

4.2 Management Objective - Precipitation Enhancement

The District will continue to participate in the West Texas Weather Modification Association.

4.2a. Performance Standard

Number of meetings attended.

Goal 5.0 - §36.1071(a)(8) Addressing the Desired Future Conditions established under §36.108

Gather groundwater and rainfall data both to improve the understanding of the aquifers and their hydrogeologic properties and to achieve desired future conditions.

5.1 Management Objective

The District will each year measure, record, and accumulate an historic record of static water levels and rainfall accumulation in the well and rainfall monitoring networks to evaluate adherence to adopted desired future conditions.

5.1a. Performance Standard

The District will maintain files including number of water levels measured and static levels information on the well monitoring network. Water level measurements will be reported quarterly at regular board meetings and wells tracked by the TWDB will be reported annually.

5.1b. Performance Standard

The District will maintain files including number of rain gauges downloaded and rainfall accumulation from the rainfall monitoring network.

Management Goals Determined Not-Applicable

Goal 6.0 - §36.1071(a)(3) Controlling and Preventing Subsidence

The rigid geologic framework of the region precludes significant subsidence from occurring. This management goal is not applicable to the operations of the District.

Goal 7.0 - §36.1071(a)(4) Addressing Conjunctive Surface Water Management Issues

There are no surface water management entities within the District. This management goal is not applicable to the operations of the District.

Goal 8.0 - §36.1071(a)(5) Addressing Natural Resource Issues

The District has no documented occurrence of endangered or threatened species dependent upon groundwater. This management goal is not applicable to the operations of the District.

Goal 9.0 - §36.1071(a)(7) Addressing Recharge Enhancement

The diverse topography, and limited knowledge of any specific recharge sites makes any type of recharge enhancement project economically unfeasible. This management goal is not applicable to the operation of the District.

Goal 10.0 - §36.1071(a)(7) Addressing Rainwater Harvesting

The semiarid nature of the area within the District makes the cost of rainwater harvesting projects economically unfeasible. Educational material and programs on rainwater harvesting are provided by the Texas AgriLife Extension Service. This management goal is not applicable to the operations of the District.

Goal 11.0 - §36.1071(a)(7) Addressing Brush Control

The District recognizes the benefits of brush control through increased spring flows and the enhancement of native turf which limits runoff. However, most brush control projects within the District are carried out and funded through the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and ample educational material and programs on brush control are provided by the Texas AgriLife Extension Service. This management goal is not applicable to the operations of the District.

Appendix A - GAM Run 10-043 MAG (Version 2)

Appendix B - Estimated Historical Groundwater Use and 2017 State Water Plan Datasets: Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District

Appendix C - GAM Run 17-012: Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District Management Plan

Appendix D - District Rules

Appendix E - Resolution Adopting the Management Plan


Appendix F - Evidence of Notice and Hearing

APPENDIX A

This page is intentionally left blank.

GAM RUN 10-043 MAG (VERSION 2): MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU), TRINITY, AND PECOS VALLEY AQUIFERS IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 7

by Jerry Shi, Ph.D., P.G.
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Resources Division
Groundwater Availability Modeling Section
(512) 463-5076
November 12, 2012



The seal appearing on this document was authorized by Jianyou (Jerry) Shi, P.G. 11113 on November 12, 2012.

This page is intentionally blank.

GAM RUN 10-043 MAG (VERSION 2): MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU), TRINITY, AND PECOS VALLEY AQUIFERS IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 7

by Jerry Shi, Ph.D., P.G.
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Resources Division
Groundwater Availability Modeling Section
(512) 463-5076
November 12, 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The modeled available groundwater values for Groundwater Management Area 7 for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Trinity, and Pecos Valley aquifers are summarized in Table 1. These values are also listed by county (Table 2), river basin (Table 3), and regional water planning area (Table 3). The modeled available groundwater values for the relevant aquifers in Groundwater Management Area 7 were initially based on Scenario 10 of GAM Run 09-035. In GAM Run 09-035, the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Trinity, and Pecos Valley aquifers were simulated and reported together. Though the desired future condition statement, specifying an average drawdown of 7 feet, only explicitly references the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer, it is the intent of the districts to also incorporate the Trinity and Pecos Valley aquifers. This was confirmed by Ms. Caroline Runge of Menard Underground Water District acting on behalf of Groundwater Management Area 7 in an e-mail to Ms. Sarah Backhouse at the Texas Water Development Board on June 6, 2012. The results here, therefore, contain information for each of these three aquifers. The modeled available groundwater from the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Trinity, and Pecos Valley aquifers in Groundwater Management Area 7 that achieves the requested desired future conditions is approximately 449,400 acre-feet per year from 2010 to 2060.

Earlier draft versions of this report showed modeled available groundwater for portions of the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer within the Lipan-Kickapoo Water Conservation District, the Lone Wolf Groundwater Conservation District, the Hickory Underground Water Conservation District No. 1, and the portion of the Trinity Aquifer within the Uvalde Underground Water Conservation District. However, Groundwater Management Area 7 declared those counties “not relevant” for joint planning purposes. Since modeled available groundwater only applies to areas with a specified desired future condition, we updated this report to depict modeled available groundwater only in counties with specified desired future conditions.

The modeled available groundwater for Kinney County Groundwater Conservation District previously reported in Draft GAM Run 10-043 MAG (Shi and Oliver, 2011) dated January 26, 2011, has been updated in a new model run and is presented in this report. The new model run is an update of Scenario 3 of Groundwater Availability Modeling Task 10-027, which meets the desired future conditions for the area adopted by the districts of Groundwater Management Area 7.

REQUESTOR:

Mr. Allan Lange of Lipan-Kickapoo Water Conservation District on behalf of Groundwater Management Area 7.

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST:

In a letter dated August 13, 2010, Mr. Lange provided the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) with the desired future conditions of the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer in Groundwater Management Area 7. On June 6, 2012 TWDB clarified through e-mail with Ms. Caroline Runge of Menard Underground Water District acting on behalf of Groundwater Management Area 7 that the intent of the districts within Groundwater Management Area 7 was to also incorporate the Trinity and Pecos Valley aquifers, except where explicitly stated as non-relevant in the desired future conditions of the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer. The desired future conditions for the aquifer[s], as described in Resolution # 07-29-10-9 and adopted July 29, 2010 by the groundwater conservation districts within Groundwater Management Area 7, are described below:

- 1) An average drawdown of 7 feet for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)[, Pecos Valley, and Trinity] aquifer[s], except for the Kinney County [Groundwater Conservation District], based on Scenario 10 of the TWDB [Groundwater Availability Model] run 09-35 which is incorporated in its entirety into this resolution; and*
- 2) In Kinney County, that drawdown which is consistent with maintaining, at Las Moras Springs, an annual average flow of 23.9 [cubic feet per second] and a median flow of 24.4 [cubic feet per second] based on Scenario 3 of the Texas Water Development Board's flow model presented on July 27, 2010; and*
- 3) the Edwards-Trinity [Aquifer] is not relevant for joint planning purposes within the boundaries of the Lipan-Kickapoo [Water Conservation District], the Lone Wolf [Groundwater Conservation District], and the Hickory Underground Water Conservation District No. 1; and*
- 4) the Trinity (Hill Country) portion of the aquifer is not relevant for joint planning purposes within the boundaries of the Uvalde [Underground Water Conservation District] in [Groundwater Management Area] 7.*

METHODS, PARAMETERS AND ASSUMPTIONS:

The desired future condition for Kinney County was evaluated in a new model run (Shi and others, 2012). The new model run is an update of Scenario 3 of Groundwater Availability Modeling (GAM) Task 10-027 (Hutchison, 2010a). Both model runs were based on the MODFLOW-2000 model developed by the TWDB to assist with the joint planning process regarding the Kinney County Groundwater Conservation District (Hutchison and others, 2011b). In both model runs, the total pumping in Kinney County, which lies within Groundwater Management Areas 7 and 10, was maintained at approximately 77,000 acre-feet per year to achieve the desired future conditions at Las Moras Springs. Details regarding this new model run are summarized in Shi and others (2012).

The desired future condition for the remaining areas in Groundwater Management Area 7 was based on Scenario 10 of GAM Run 09-035 using a MODFLOW-2000 model developed by the TWDB (Hutchison and others, 2011a). Details regarding this scenario can be found in Hutchison (2010b). In GAM Run 09-035, the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Trinity, Pecos Valley, and Trinity aquifers were simulated and reported together. The desired future condition statement specifying of an average drawdown of 7 feet, which is achieved in the above simulation, only explicitly references the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer. By stating that the above simulation is “incorporated in its entirety” into the resolution, it is the intent of the districts to also incorporate the Trinity and Pecos Valley aquifers. The results below, therefore, contain information on the Trinity and Pecos Valley aquifers in addition to the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer. This interpretation has been confirmed by Ms. Caroline Runge on behalf of Groundwater Management Area 7 to Ms. Sarah Backhouse at the Texas Water Development Board.

The locations of the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Trinity, and Pecos Valley aquifers are shown in Figure 1.

RESULTS:

The modeled available groundwater values from aquifers in Groundwater Management Area 7 that achieve the desired future conditions is approximately 445,000 acre-feet per year for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifer, 2,500 acre-feet per year for the Trinity Aquifer, and 1,600 acre-feet per year for the Pecos Valley Aquifer (Tables 1, 2, and 3). These tables contain the modeled available groundwater for the aquifers subdivided by county, regional water planning area, and river basin for use in the regional water planning process. These areas are shown in Figure 2.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 show the modeled available groundwater for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Trinity, and Pecos Valley aquifers summarized by county, regional water planning area, and river basin, respectively, within Groundwater Management Area 7.

The modeled available groundwater for the aquifers within and outside the groundwater conservation districts in Groundwater Management Area 7 where they were determined to be relevant for the purposes of joint planning are presented in Table 7. As shown in Table 7, the modeled available groundwater within the groundwater conservation districts in Groundwater Management Area 7 is approximately 370,000 acre-feet per year from 2010 to 2060.

LIMITATIONS:

The groundwater model used in developing estimates of modeled available groundwater is the best available scientific tool that can be used to estimate the pumping that will achieve the desired future conditions. Although the groundwater model used in this analysis is the best available scientific tool for this purpose, it, like all models, has limitations. In reviewing the use of models in environmental regulatory decision-making, the National Research Council (2007) noted:

“Models will always be constrained by computational limitations, assumptions, and knowledge gaps. They can best be viewed as tools to help inform decisions rather than as machines to generate truth or make decisions. Scientific advances will never make it possible to build a perfect model that accounts for every aspect of reality or to prove that a given model is correct in all respects for a particular regulatory application. These characteristics make evaluation of a regulatory model more complex than solely a comparison of measurement data with model results.”

A key aspect of using the groundwater model to develop estimates of modeled available groundwater is the need to make assumptions about the location in the aquifer where future pumping will occur. As actual pumping changes in the future, it will be necessary to evaluate the amount of that pumping as well as its location in the context of the assumptions associated with this analysis. Evaluating the amount and location of future pumping is as important as evaluating the changes in groundwater levels, spring flows, and other metrics that describe the condition of the groundwater resources in the area that relate to the adopted desired future condition.

Given these limitations, users of this information are cautioned that the modeled available groundwater numbers should not be considered a definitive, permanent description of the amount of groundwater that can be pumped to meet the adopted desired future condition. Because the application of the groundwater model was designed to address regional scale questions, the results are most effective on a regional scale. Texas Water Development Board makes no warranties or representations relating to the actual conditions of any aquifer at a particular location or at a particular time.

It is important for groundwater conservation districts to monitor future groundwater pumping as well as whether or not they are achieving their desired future conditions. Because of the limitations of the groundwater model and the assumptions in this analysis, it is important that the groundwater conservation districts work with Texas Water Development Board to refine these modeled available groundwater numbers given the reality of how the aquifer responds to the actual amount and location of pumping now and in the future.

REFERENCES:

Hutchison, William R., 2010a, GAM Task 10-027: Texas Water Development Board, GAM Task 10-027 Report, 7 p.

Hutchison, William R., 2010b, GAM Run 09-035 (version 2): Texas Water Development Board, GAM Run 09-035 Report, 10 p.

Hutchison, William R., Jones, Ian, and Anaya, Roberto, 2011a, Update of the Groundwater Availability Model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley Aquifers of Texas, Texas Water Development Board, 59 p.

Hutchison, William R., Shi, Jerry, and Jigmond, Marius, 2011b, Groundwater Flow Model of the Kinney County Area, Texas Water Development Board, 138 p.

Shi, Jerry, Ridgeway, Cindy, and French, Larry, 2012, Draft GAM Task Report 12-002: Modeled Available Groundwater in Kinney County (April 11, 2012).

Shi, Jerry and Oliver, Wade, 2011, GAM Run 10-043 MAG (January 26, 2011).

Texas Water Development Board, 2007, Water for Texas - 2007—Volumes I-III; Texas Water Development Board Document No. GP-8-1, 392 p.

November 12, 2012

Page 12 of 15

TABLE 6. MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU), TRINITY, AND PECOS VALLEY AQUIFERS IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 7 BY RIVER BASIN FOR EACH DECADE BETWEEN 2010 AND 2060. RESULTS ARE IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR.

River Basin	Year					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Brazos	633	633	633	633	633	633
Colorado	207,392	207,392	207,392	207,392	207,392	207,392
Guadalupe	139	139	139	139	139	139
Nueces	10,527	10,527	10,527	10,527	10,527	10,527
Rio Grande	230,720	230,720	230,720	230,720	230,720	230,720
Total	449,411	449,411	449,411	449,411	449,411	449,411

TABLE 7. MODELED AVAILABLE GROUNDWATER FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU), TRINITY, AND PECOS VALLEY AQUIFERS IN GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 7 BY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR EACH DECADE BETWEEN 2010 AND 2060. RESULTS ARE IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR.

Groundwater Conservation District	Year					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Coke County UWCD	998	998	998	998	998	998
Crockett County GCD	4,685	4,685	4,685	4,685	4,685	4,685
Glasscock GCD	106,075	106,075	106,075	106,075	106,075	106,075
Hill Country UWCD	4,996	4,996	4,996	4,996	4,996	4,996
Irion County WCD	2,435	2,435	2,435	2,435	2,435	2,435
Kimble County GCD	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,283
Kinney County GCD	70,338	70,338	70,338	70,338	70,338	70,338
Menard County UWD	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194
Middle Pecos GCD	117,386	117,386	117,386	117,386	117,386	117,386
Plateau UWC and SD	8,050	8,050	8,050	8,050	8,050	8,050
Real-Edwards CRD	13,167	13,167	13,167	13,167	13,167	13,167
Santa Rita UWCD	27,416	27,416	27,416	27,416	27,416	27,416
Sterling County UWCD	2,497	2,497	2,497	2,497	2,497	2,497
Sutton County UWCD	6,438	6,438	6,438	6,438	6,438	6,438
Uvalde County UWCD (Edwards-Trinity Plateau)	1,635	1,635	1,635	1,635	1,635	1,635
Wes-Tex GCD	693	693	693	693	693	693




FIGURE 1. MAP SHOWING THE BOUNDARY OF THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU), PECOS VALLEY, AND TRINITY AQUIFERS ACCORDING TO THE 2007 STATE WATER PLAN (TWDB, 2007).




FIGURE 2. MAP SHOWING REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AREAS, GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, COUNTIES, AND RIVER BASINS IN AND NEIGHBORING GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 7.

This page is intentionally blank.

APPENDIX B

This page is intentionally blank.

Estimated Historical Groundwater Use And 2017 State Water Plan Datasets: Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District

by Stephen Allen
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Division
Groundwater Technical Assistance Section
stephen.allen@twdb.texas.gov
(512) 463-7317
February 8, 2018

GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN DATA:

This package of water data reports (part 1 of a 2-part package of information) is being provided to groundwater conservation districts to help them meet the requirements for approval of their five-year groundwater management plan. Each report in the package addresses a specific numbered requirement in the Texas Water Development Board's groundwater management plan checklist. The checklist can be viewed and downloaded from this web address:

<http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/docs/GCD/GMPChecklist0113.pdf>

The five reports included in this part are:

1. Estimated Historical Groundwater Use (checklist item 2)
from the TWDB Historical Water Use Survey (WUS)
2. Projected Surface Water Supplies (checklist item 6)
3. Projected Water Demands (checklist item 7)
4. Projected Water Supply Needs (checklist item 8)
5. Projected Water Management Strategies (checklist item 9)
from the 2017 Texas State Water Plan (SWP)

Part 2 of the 2-part package is the groundwater availability model (GAM) report for the District (checklist items 3 through 5). The District should have received, or will receive, this report from the Groundwater Availability Modeling Section. Questions about the GAM can be directed to Dr. Shirley Wade, shirley.wade@twdb.texas.gov, (512) 936-0883.

DISCLAIMER:

The data presented in this report represents the most up-to-date WUS and 2017 SWP data available as of 2/8/2018. Although it does not happen frequently, either of these datasets are subject to change pending the availability of more accurate WUS data or an amendment to the 2017 SWP. District personnel must review these datasets and correct any discrepancies in order to ensure approval of their groundwater management plan.

The WUS dataset can be verified at this web address:

<http://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/waterusesurvey/estimates/>

The 2017 SWP dataset can be verified by contacting Sabrina Anderson (sabrina.anderson@twdb.texas.gov or 512-936-0886).

The values presented in the data tables of this report are county-based. In cases where groundwater conservation districts cover only a portion of one or more counties the data values are modified with an apportioning multiplier to create new values that more accurately represent conditions within district boundaries. The multiplier used in the following formula is a land area ratio: (data value * (land area of district in county / land area of county)). For two of the four SWP tables (Projected Surface Water Supplies and Projected Water Demands) only the county-wide water user group (WUG) data values (county other, manufacturing, steam electric power, irrigation, mining and livestock) are modified using the multiplier. WUG values for municipalities, water supply corporations, and utility districts are not apportioned; instead, their full values are retained when they are located within the district, and eliminated when they are located outside (we ask each district to identify these entity locations).

The remaining SWP tables (Projected Water Supply Needs and Projected Water Management Strategies) are not modified because district-specific values are not statutorily required. Each district needs only "consider" the county values in these tables.

In the WUS table every category of water use (including municipal) is apportioned. Staff determined that breaking down the annual municipal values into individual WUGs was too complex.

TWDB recognizes that the apportioning formula used is not perfect but it is the best available process with respect to time and staffing constraints. If a district believes it has data that is more accurate it can add those data to the plan with an explanation of how the data were derived. Apportioning percentages that the TWDB used are listed above each applicable table.

For additional questions regarding this data, please contact Stephen Allen (stephen.allen@twdb.texas.gov or 512-463-7317).

Estimated Historical Water Use

TWDB Historical Water Use Survey (WUS) Data

Groundwater and surface water historical use estimates are currently unavailable for calendar year 2016. TWDB staff anticipates the calculation and posting of these estimates at a later date.

STERLING COUNTY

100% (multiplier)

All values are in acre-feet

Year	Source	Municipal	Manufacturing	Mining	Steam Electric	Irrigation	Livestock	Total
2015	GW	244	0	8	0	924	211	1,387
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
2014	GW	263	0	252	0	931	209	1,655
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
2013	GW	244	0	256	0	1,050	211	1,761
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
2012	GW	232	0	206	0	849	193	1,480
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
2011	GW	306	0	84	0	977	216	1,583
	SW	0	0	23	0	0	24	47
2010	GW	226	0	136	0	688	225	1,275
	SW	0	0	37	0	0	25	62
2009	GW	226	0	106	0	1,026	256	1,614
	SW	0	0	29	0	0	29	58
2008	GW	246	0	76	0	738	241	1,301
	SW	0	0	21	0	0	27	48
2007	GW	206	0	0	0	477	290	973
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	32	32
2006	GW	273	0	0	0	600	266	1,139
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	30	30
2005	GW	240	0	0	0	450	255	945
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	28	28
2004	GW	253	0	0	0	496	202	951
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	51	51
2003	GW	256	0	0	0	613	197	1,066
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	49	49
2002	GW	288	0	0	0	717	322	1,327
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	81	81
2001	GW	285	0	0	0	681	368	1,334
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	93	93
2000	GW	316	0	0	0	637	292	1,245
	SW	0	0	0	0	0	73	73

TOM GREEN COUNTY

0.82% (multiplier)

All values are in acre-feet

Year	Source	Municipal	Manufacturing	Mining	Steam Electric	Irrigation	Livestock	Total
2015	GW	37	4	0	0	393	4	438
	SW	106	2	0	0	21	1	130
2014	GW	29	4	0	0	346	4	383
	SW	114	2	0	0	25	1	142
2013	GW	33	3	0	0	279	4	319
	SW	114	2	0	0	25	1	142
2012	GW	32	3	0	0	433	9	477
	SW	123	2	0	0	24	2	151
2011	GW	39	4	4	0	65	10	122
	SW	149	3	4	0	23	3	182
2010	GW	31	3	4	0	310	9	357
	SW	137	2	4	0	54	2	199
2009	GW	21	4	4	0	547	9	585
	SW	134	2	4	0	33	2	175
2008	GW	13	4	4	0	704	10	735
	SW	129	3	4	0	0	3	139
2007	GW	13	4	0	0	564	7	588
	SW	122	2	0	0	44	2	170
2006	GW	13	3	0	0	271	11	298
	SW	142	2	0	0	132	3	279
2005	GW	13	3	0	0	228	10	254
	SW	113	13	0	0	107	3	236
2004	GW	11	3	0	0	200	1	215
	SW	110	14	0	0	108	11	243
2003	GW	12	3	0	0	212	1	228
	SW	107	14	0	2	110	12	245
2002	GW	13	2	0	0	234	2	251
	SW	99	14	0	4	115	15	247
2001	GW	12	2	0	0	219	1	234
	SW	105	18	0	4	120	13	260
2000	GW	13	1	0	0	168	2	184
	SW	137	14	0	5	81	14	251

Projected Surface Water Supplies

TWDB 2017 State Water Plan Data

STERLING COUNTY

100% (multiplier)

All values are in acre-feet

RWPG	WUG	WUG Basin	Source Name	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
F	IRRIGATION, STERLING	COLORADO	COLORADO RUN-OF-RIVER	30	30	30	30	30	30
F	LIVESTOCK, STERLING	COLORADO	COLORADO LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	26	26	26	26	26	26
Sum of Projected Surface Water Supplies (acre-feet)				56	56	56	56	56	56

TOM GREEN COUNTY

0.82% (multiplier)

All values are in acre-feet

RWPG	WUG	WUG Basin	Source Name	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
F	COUNTY-OTHER, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	MOUNTAIN CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	COUNTY-OTHER, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	IRRIGATION, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	COLORADO RUN-OF-RIVER	14	14	14	14	14	14
F	IRRIGATION, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	LIVESTOCK, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	COLORADO LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	13	13	13	13	13	13
F	MANUFACTURING, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	COLORADO RUN-OF-RIVER	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	MANUFACTURING, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	OH IVIE LAKE/RESERVOIR NON-SYSTEM PORTION	6	5	6	5	5	5
F	MANUFACTURING, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	MILLERSVIEW-DOOLE WSC	COLORADO	COLORADO RIVER MWD LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	136	190	179	166	155	144
F	SAN ANGELO	COLORADO	COLORADO RUN-OF-RIVER	189	189	188	188	188	187
F	SAN ANGELO	COLORADO	OH IVIE LAKE/RESERVOIR NON-SYSTEM PORTION	5,270	5,122	4,949	4,790	4,632	4,476
F	SAN ANGELO	COLORADO	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sum of Projected Surface Water Supplies (acre-feet)				5,628	5,533	5,349	5,176	5,007	4,839

Estimated Historical Water Use and 2017 State Water Plan Dataset:

Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District

February 8, 2018

Page 5 of 10

Projected Water Demands

TWDB 2017 State Water Plan Data

Please note that the demand numbers presented here include the plumbing code savings found in the Regional and State Water Plans.

STERLING COUNTY

100% (multiplier)

All values are in acre-feet

RWPG	WUG	WUG Basin	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
F	COUNTY-OTHER, STERLING	COLORADO	33	33	33	33	33	33
F	IRRIGATION, STERLING	COLORADO	983	942	901	860	820	782
F	LIVESTOCK, STERLING	COLORADO	322	322	322	322	322	322
F	MINING, STERLING	COLORADO	780	953	812	522	270	140
F	STERLING CITY	COLORADO	276	282	281	281	281	281
Sum of Projected Water Demands (acre-feet)			2,394	2,532	2,349	2,018	1,726	1,558

TOM GREEN COUNTY

0.82% (multiplier)

All values are in acre-feet

RWPG	WUG	WUG Basin	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
F	CONCHO RURAL WATER CORPORATION	COLORADO	538	548	559	572	590	607
F	COUNTY-OTHER, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	11	11	11	12	12	12
F	IRRIGATION, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	767	765	764	762	760	758
F	LIVESTOCK, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	14	14	14	14	14	14
F	MANUFACTURING, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	20	21	23	25	27	29
F	MILLERSVIEW-DOOLE WSC	COLORADO	272	279	285	293	302	311
F	MINING, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	9	9	9	9	9	9
F	SAN ANGELO	COLORADO	18,244	20,002	20,851	21,930	23,240	24,665
Sum of Projected Water Demands (acre-feet)			19,875	21,649	22,516	23,617	24,954	26,405

Projected Water Supply Needs

TWDB 2017 State Water Plan Data

Negative values (in red) reflect a projected water supply need, positive values a surplus.

STERLING COUNTY

All values are in acre-feet

RWPG	WUG	WUG Basin	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
F	COUNTY-OTHER, STERLING	COLORADO	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	IRRIGATION, STERLING	COLORADO	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	LIVESTOCK, STERLING	COLORADO	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	MINING, STERLING	COLORADO	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	STERLING CITY	COLORADO	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sum of Projected Water Supply Needs (acre-feet)			0	0	0	0	0	0

TOM GREEN COUNTY

All values are in acre-feet

RWPG	WUG	WUG Basin	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
F	CONCHO RURAL WATER CORPORATION	COLORADO	69	59	48	35	17	0
F	COUNTY-OTHER, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	-556	-573	-629	-678	-724	-768
F	IRRIGATION, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	-31,651	-31,422	-31,243	-31,061	-30,832	-30,604
F	LIVESTOCK, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	17	17	17	17	17	17
F	MANUFACTURING, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	-1,211	-1,459	-1,657	-1,853	-2,094	-2,357
F	MILLERSVIEW-DOOLE WSC	COLORADO	37	87	76	60	43	26
F	MINING, TOM GREEN	COLORADO	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	SAN ANGELO	COLORADO	-9,250	-11,156	-12,167	-13,397	-14,870	-16,462
Sum of Projected Water Supply Needs (acre-feet)			-42,668	-44,610	-45,696	-46,989	-48,520	-50,191

Projected Water Management Strategies

TWDB 2017 State Water Plan Data

STERLING COUNTY

WUG, Basin (RWPG)

All values are in acre-feet

Water Management Strategy	Source Name [Origin]	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
IRRIGATION, STERLING, COLORADO (F)							
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - STERLING COUNTY	DEMAND REDUCTION [STERLING]	49	94	135	135	135	135
WEATHER MODIFICATION	WEATHER MODIFICATION [ATMOSPHERE]	25	25	25	25	25	25
		74	119	160	160	160	160
MINING, STERLING, COLORADO (F)							
MINING CONSERVATION - STERLING COUNTY	DEMAND REDUCTION [STERLING]	55	67	57	37	19	10
		55	67	57	37	19	10
STERLING CITY, COLORADO (F)							
MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION - STERLING CITY	DEMAND REDUCTION [STERLING]	5	5	5	5	5	5
		5	5	5	5	5	5
Sum of Projected Water Management Strategies (acre-feet)		134	191	222	202	184	175

TOM GREEN COUNTY

WUG, Basin (RWPG)

All values are in acre-feet

Water Management Strategy	Source Name [Origin]	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
CONCHO RURAL WATER CORPORATION, COLORADO (F)							
DESALINATION OF OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES IN TOM GREEN COUNTY - CONCHO RURAL WSC	OTHER AQUIFER [TOM GREEN]	150	150	150	150	150	150
MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION - CONCHO RURAL WSC	DEMAND REDUCTION [TOM GREEN]	33	35	37	38	40	41
		183	185	187	188	190	191
COUNTY-OTHER, TOM GREEN, COLORADO (F)							
ABILENE REDUCTION FOR WEST TEXAS WATER PARTNERSHIP	FORT PHANTOM HILL LAKE/RESERVOIR [RESERVOIR]	0	60	69	61	68	73
BRUSH CONTROL - SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM [RESERVOIR]	41	25	29	26	28	31
CEDAR RIDGE RESERVOIR	CEDAR RIDGE LAKE/RESERVOIR [RESERVOIR]	0	89	104	92	101	110
DESALINATION OF OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES IN TOM GREEN COUNTY - SAN ANGELO	OTHER AQUIFER [TOM GREEN]	0	0	0	96	105	115

Estimated Historical Water Use and 2017 State Water Plan Dataset:

Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District

February 8, 2018

Page 8 of 10

REUSE - SAN ANGELO	DIRECT REUSE [TOM GREEN]	290	174	202	179	197	214
SUBORDINATION - SAN ANGELO SYSTEM	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM [RESERVOIR]	225	225	225	225	225	225
		556	573	629	679	724	768

IRRIGATION, TOM GREEN, COLORADO (F)

IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - TOM GREEN COUNTY	DEMAND REDUCTION [TOM GREEN]	4,679	9,335	11,175	11,175	11,175	11,175
WEATHER MODIFICATION	WEATHER MODIFICATION [ATMOSPHERE]	4,945	4,945	4,945	4,945	4,945	4,945
		9,624	14,280	16,120	16,120	16,120	16,120

MANUFACTURING, TOM GREEN, COLORADO (F)

ABILENE REDUCTION FOR WEST TEXAS WATER PARTNERSHIP	FORT PHANTOM HILL LAKE/RESERVOIR [RESERVOIR]	0	181	216	200	235	273
BRUSH CONTROL - SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM [RESERVOIR]	98	75	90	83	98	113
CEDAR RIDGE RESERVOIR	CEDAR RIDGE LAKE/RESERVOIR [RESERVOIR]	0	271	324	299	351	409
DESALINATION OF OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES IN TOM GREEN COUNTY - SAN ANGELO	OTHER AQUIFER [TOM GREEN]	0	0	0	312	366	425
REUSE - SAN ANGELO	DIRECT REUSE [TOM GREEN]	685	528	631	582	683	794
SUBORDINATION - SAN ANGELO SYSTEM	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM [RESERVOIR]	428	404	396	378	361	343
		1,211	1,459	1,657	1,854	2,094	2,357

MILLERSVIEW-DOOLE WSC, COLORADO (F)

MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION - MILLERSVIEW-DOOLE WSC	DEMAND REDUCTION [TOM GREEN]	10	11	11	12	12	13
SUBORDINATION - CRMWD SYSTEM	COLORADO RIVER MWD LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM [RESERVOIR]	105	56	74	92	108	122
		115	67	85	104	120	135

MINING, TOM GREEN, COLORADO (F)

MINING CONSERVATION - TOM GREEN COUNTY	DEMAND REDUCTION [TOM GREEN]	74	76	78	78	79	81
		74	76	78	78	79	81

SAN ANGELO, COLORADO (F)

ABILENE REDUCTION FOR WEST TEXAS WATER PARTNERSHIP	FORT PHANTOM HILL LAKE/RESERVOIR [RESERVOIR]	0	1,383	1,587	1,875	1,664	1,903
BRUSH CONTROL - SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM [RESERVOIR]	747	576	661	781	693	793
CEDAR RIDGE RESERVOIR	CEDAR RIDGE LAKE/RESERVOIR [RESERVOIR]	0	2,074	2,381	2,810	2,497	2,854
DESALINATION OF OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES IN TOM GREEN COUNTY - SAN ANGELO	OTHER AQUIFER [TOM GREEN]	0	0	0	2,928	2,600	2,973

Estimated Historical Water Use and 2017 State Water Plan Dataset:

Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District

February 8, 2018

Page 9 of 10


HICKORY WELL FIELD EXPANSION IN MCCULLOCH COUNTY - SAN ANGELO	HICKORY AQUIFER [MCCULLOCH]	0	0	0	0	0	0
MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION - SAN ANGELO	DEMAND REDUCTION [TOM GREEN]	656	753	793	842	894	949
REUSE - SAN ANGELO	DIRECT REUSE [TOM GREEN]	5,232	4,033	4,629	5,466	4,854	5,550
SUBORDINATION - SAN ANGELO SYSTEM	SAN ANGELO LAKES LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM [RESERVOIR]	3,570	3,389	3,207	3,034	2,858	2,685
		10,205	12,208	13,258	17,736	16,060	17,707
Sum of Projected Water Management Strategies (acre-feet)		21,968	28,848	32,014	36,759	35,387	37,359

APPENDIX C

This page is intentionally blank.

GAM RUN 17-012: STERLING COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Ian C. Jones, Ph.D., P.G.
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Division
Groundwater Availability Modeling Section
(512) 463-6641
March 31, 2017



I. C. Jones
3/27/17

This page is intentionally blank.

GAM RUN 17-012: STERLING COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Ian C. Jones, Ph.D., P.G.
Texas Water Development Board
Groundwater Division
Groundwater Availability Modeling Section
(512) 463-6641
March 31, 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Texas State Water Code, Section 36.1071, Subsection (h) (Texas Water Code, 2015), states that, in developing its groundwater management plan, a groundwater conservation district shall use groundwater availability modeling information provided by the Executive Administrator of the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) in conjunction with any available site-specific information provided by the district for review and comment to the Executive Administrator.

The TWDB provides data and information to the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District in two parts. Part 1 is the Estimated Historical Water Use/State Water Plan dataset report, which will be provided to you separately by the TWDB Groundwater Technical Assistance Section. Please direct questions about the water data report to Mr. Stephen Allen at (512) 463-7317 or stephen.allen@twdb.texas.gov. Part 2 is the required groundwater availability modeling information and this information includes:

1. the annual amount of recharge from precipitation, if any, to the groundwater resources within the district;
2. for each aquifer within the district, the annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface-water bodies, including lakes, streams, and rivers; and
3. the annual volume of flow into and out of the district within each aquifer and between aquifers in the district.

The groundwater management plan for the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District should be adopted by the district on or before May 28, 2018, and submitted to the Executive Administrator of the TWDB on or before June 27, 2018. The

current management plan for the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District expires on August 26, 2018.

We used the groundwater availability models for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer (Anaya and Jones, 2009), High Plains Aquifer System (Deeds and Jigmond, 2015), and Lipan Aquifer (Beach and others, 2004) to estimate the management plan information for the aquifers within Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District. This report replaces the results of GAM Run 10-026 (Aschenbach, 2010). GAM Run 17-012 meets current standards set after the release of GAM Run 10-026 and includes results from the groundwater availability model for the High Plains Aquifer System for the Dockum Aquifer. Tables 1 through 3 summarize the groundwater availability model data required by statute and Figures 1 through 3 show the areas of the respective models from which the values in the tables were extracted. If after reviewing the figure, the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District determines that the district boundaries used in the assessment do not reflect current conditions, please notify the TWDB at your earliest convenience.

METHODS:

In accordance with the provisions of the Texas State Water Code, Section 36.1071, Subsection (h), the groundwater availability models for the High Plains Aquifer System (for the Dockum Aquifer), the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), and Lipan aquifers were used to estimate information for the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District management plan. Water budgets were extracted for the respective historical model periods (1929 through 2012, 1980 through 2000, and 1980 through 1998 for the groundwater availability models for the High Plains Aquifer System, Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer, and Lipan Aquifer, respectively) using ZONEBUDGET Version 3.01 (Harbaugh, 2009). The average annual water budget values for recharge, surface-water outflow, inflow to the district, and outflow from the district for the aquifers within the district are summarized in this report.

PARAMETERS AND ASSUMPTIONS:

Dockum Aquifer

- We used version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the High Plains Aquifer System. See Deeds and Jigmond (2015) for assumptions and limitations of the model.
- The model was run with MODFLOW-NWT (Niswonger and others, 2011).
- The groundwater availability model for the High Plains Aquifer System contains four layers:

- Layer 1—the Ogallala Aquifer and the Pecos Valley Alluvium Aquifer
 - Layer 2—the Rita Blanca Aquifer, the Edwards-Trinity (High Plains) Aquifer, the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer, and pass-through cells of the Dockum Aquifer
 - Layer 3—the upper Dockum Group and pass-through cells of the lower Dockum Group
 - Layer 4—the lower Dockum Group
- Perennial rivers and reservoirs were simulated using the MODFLOW-NWT river package. Springs, seeps, and draws were simulated using the MODFLOW-NWT drain package. For this analysis, groundwater discharge to surface water includes groundwater leakage to the river and drain packages.

Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer

- We used version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley aquifers. See Anaya and Jones (2009) for assumptions and limitations of the groundwater availability model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley aquifers. The Pecos Valley Aquifer does not occur within Sterling County Underground Water District and therefore no groundwater budget values are included for it in this report.
- This groundwater availability model includes two layers within Sterling County Underground Water District, which generally represent the Edwards Group (Layer 1) and the Trinity Group (Layer 2) of the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer. Individual water budgets for the District were determined for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer (Layer 1 and Layer 2 combined).
- The model was run with MODFLOW-96 (Harbaugh and McDonald, 1996).

Lipan Aquifer

- Version 1.01 of the groundwater availability model for the Lipan Aquifer was used for this analysis. See Beach and others (2004) for assumptions and limitations of the groundwater availability model.
- The Lipan Aquifer model includes one layer representing the Quaternary Leona Formation, portions of the underlying Permian Formations, and the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer to the west, south, and north.

- The model does not cover the entire Lipan Aquifer (Figure 3). Consequently, please contact Mr. Stephen Allen with the TWDB at (512) 463-7317 or stephen.allen@twdb.texas.gov for additional information on the aquifer in areas not covered by the groundwater availability model in the Sterling County Underground Water District.
- The model was run with MODFLOW-1996 (Harbaugh and MacDonald, 1996).

RESULTS:

A groundwater budget summarizes the amount of water entering and leaving the aquifer according to the groundwater availability model. Selected groundwater budget components listed below were extracted from the groundwater availability models for the High Plains Aquifer System (includes the Dockum Aquifer), the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), and the Lipan aquifers within Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District and averaged over the respective historical calibration periods, as shown in Tables 1 through 3.

1. Precipitation recharge—the areally distributed recharge sourced from precipitation falling on the outcrop areas of the aquifers (where the aquifer is exposed at land surface) within the district.
2. Surface-water outflow—the total water discharging from the aquifer (outflow) to surface-water features such as streams, reservoirs, and springs.
3. Flow into and out of district—the lateral flow within the aquifer between the district and adjacent counties.
4. Flow between aquifers—the net vertical flow between the aquifer and adjacent aquifers or confining units. This flow is controlled by the relative water levels in each aquifer and aquifer properties of each aquifer or confining unit that define the amount of leakage that occurs.

The information needed for the district's management plan is summarized in Tables 1 through 3. It is important to note that sub-regional water budgets are not exact. This is due to the size of the model cells and the approach used to extract data from the model. To avoid double accounting, a model cell that straddles a political boundary, such as a district or county boundary, is assigned to one side of the boundary based on the location of the centroid of the model cell. For example, if a cell contains two counties, the cell is assigned to the county where the centroid of the cell is located.

TABLE 1: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU) AQUIFER FOR THE STERLING COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT.

Management Plan requirement	Aquifer or confining unit	Results
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	10,202
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface-water body including lakes, streams, and rivers	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	6,077
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	1,709
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	4,472
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district ¹	From the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer into the Dockum Aquifer.	579 to 1,166

¹ The model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley Alluvium aquifers estimates an average of 1,166 acre-feet flowing from the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer into the Dockum Aquifer while the model for the High Plains Aquifer System estimates an average of 579 acre-feet flowing from the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer into the Dockum Aquifer. Differences are due to the various assumptions in each model.




FIGURE 1: AREA OF THE GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FOR THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU) AQUIFER FROM WHICH THE INFORMATION IN TABLE 1 WAS EXTRACTED (THE EDWARDS-TRINITY (PLATEAU) AQUIFER EXTENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY).

TABLE 2: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE DOCKUM AQUIFER FOR THE STERLING COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT.

Management Plan requirement	Aquifer or confining unit	Results
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Dockum Aquifer	454
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface-water body including lakes, streams, and rivers	Dockum Aquifer	382
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Dockum Aquifer	132
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Dockum Aquifer	631
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district ²	From the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer into the Dockum Aquifer.	579 to 1,166

² The model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley Alluvium aquifers estimates an average of 1,166 acre-feet flowing from the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer into the Dockum Aquifer while the model for the High Plains Aquifer System estimates an average of 579 acre-feet flowing from the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer into the Dockum Aquifer. Differences are due to the various assumptions in each model.




FIGURE 2: AREA OF THE GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FOR THE HIGH PLAINS AQUIFER SYSTEM FROM WHICH THE INFORMATION IN TABLE 2 WAS EXTRACTED (THE DOCKUM AQUIFER EXTENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY).

TABLE 3: SUMMARIZED INFORMATION FOR THE LIPAN AQUIFER FOR THE STERLING COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. ALL VALUES ARE REPORTED IN ACRE-FEET PER YEAR AND ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST 1 ACRE-FOOT.

Management Plan requirement	Aquifer or confining unit	Results
Estimated annual amount of recharge from precipitation to the district	Lipan Aquifer	102
Estimated annual volume of water that discharges from the aquifer to springs and any surface-water body including lakes, streams, and rivers	Lipan Aquifer	0
Estimated annual volume of flow into the district within each aquifer in the district	Lipan Aquifer	277
Estimated annual volume of flow out of the district within each aquifer in the district	Lipan Aquifer	443
Estimated net annual volume of flow between each aquifer in the district		Not applicable ³

³ The model was developed prior to the extension of the Lipan Aquifer along the North Concho River. The western boundary of the model only extends into Tom Green County.




FIGURE 3: AREA OF THE GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FOR THE LIPAN AQUIFER FROM WHICH THE INFORMATION IN TABLE 2 WAS EXTRACTED (THE LIPAN AQUIFER EXTENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY).

LIMITATIONS:

The groundwater models used in completing this analysis are the best available scientific tools that can be used to meet the stated objectives. To the extent that this analysis will be used for planning purposes and/or regulatory purposes related to pumping in the past and into the future, it is important to recognize the assumptions and limitations associated with the use of the results. In reviewing the use of models in environmental regulatory decision making, the National Research Council (2007) noted:

“Models will always be constrained by computational limitations, assumptions, and knowledge gaps. They can best be viewed as tools to help inform decisions rather than as machines to generate truth or make decisions. Scientific advances will never make it possible to build a perfect model that accounts for every aspect of reality or to prove that a given model is correct in all respects for a particular regulatory application. These characteristics make evaluation of a regulatory model more complex than solely a comparison of measurement data with model results.”

A key aspect of using the groundwater model to evaluate historic groundwater flow conditions includes the assumptions about the location in the aquifer where historic pumping was placed. Understanding the amount and location of historic pumping is as important as evaluating the volume of groundwater flow into and out of the district, between aquifers within the district (as applicable), interactions with surface water (as applicable), recharge to the aquifer system (as applicable), and other metrics that describe the impacts of that pumping. In addition, assumptions regarding precipitation, recharge, and interaction with streams are specific to particular historic time periods.

Because the application of the groundwater models was designed to address regional-scale questions, the results are most effective on a regional scale. The TWDB makes no warranties or representations related to the actual conditions of any aquifer at a particular location or at a particular time.

It is important for groundwater conservation districts to monitor groundwater pumping and overall conditions of the aquifer. Because of the limitations of the groundwater model and the assumptions in this analysis, it is important that the groundwater conservation districts work with the TWDB to refine this analysis in the future given the reality of how the aquifer responds to the actual amount and location of pumping now and in the future. Historic precipitation patterns also need to be placed in context as future climatic conditions, such as dry and wet year precipitation patterns, may differ and affect groundwater flow conditions.

REFERENCES:

- Anaya, R., and Jones, I. C., 2009, Groundwater Availability Model for the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) and Pecos Valley Aquifers of Texas: Texas Water Development Board Report 373, 103 p.,
http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/eddt_p/ET-Plateau_Full.pdf.
- Aschenbach, E., 2011, GAM Run 10-026, 8 p.,
<http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/docs/GAMruns/GR10-026.pdf>
- Beach, J. A., Burton, S., and Kolarik, B., 2004, Groundwater Availability Model for the Lipan Aquifer in Texas: Prepared for the Texas Water Development Board by LBG-Guyton Associates, unpublished report, 246 p.,
http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/lipn/LIPN_Model_Report.pdf
- Deeds, N. E., and Jigmond, M., 2015, Numerical Model Report for the High Plains Aquifer System Groundwater Availability Model: Prepared for the Texas Water Development Board by INTERA Inc., 640 p.
http://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/models/gam/hpas/HPAS_GAM_Numerical_Report.pdf
- Harbaugh, A. W., 2009, Zonebudget Version 3.01, A computer program for computing subregional water budgets for MODFLOW ground-water flow models: U.S. Geological Survey Groundwater Software.
- Harbaugh, A. W., Banta, E. R., Hill, M. C., and McDonald, M. G., 2000, MODFLOW-2000, the U.S. Geological Survey modular ground-water model -- User guide to modularization concepts and the Ground-Water Flow Process: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 00-92, 121 p.
- National Research Council, 2007, Models in Environmental Regulatory Decision Making Committee on Models in the Regulatory Decision Process, National Academies Press, Washington D.C., 287 p., http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11972.
- Niswonger, R.G., Panday, S., and Ibaraki, M., 2011, MODFLOW-NWT, a Newton formulation for MODFLOW-2005: USGS, Techniques and Methods 6-A37, 44 p.
- Texas Water Code, 2015, <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/docs/WA/pdf/WA.36.pdf>.

APPENDIX D

DISTRICT RULES

<http://www.sterlingwcd.org/rules>

This page is intentionally blank.

APPENDIX E

This page is intentionally blank.

STERLING COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

P.O. Box 873 Sterling City, TX 76951
Office: 325 378-2704 FAX: 325 378-2624 E-Mail: scuwcd@verizon.net

ADOPTION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN 2018-2023

WHEREAS, the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District was created by Acts of the 70th Legislature (1987), H.B. 2587, in accordance with Article XVI, Section 59 of the Constitution of Texas and Chapters 51 and 52 of the Texas Water Code, as amended; and

WHEREAS, H.B. 2587 was amended by Acts of the 78st Legislature (2003), H.B. 3556, in accordance with Chapters 36 and 49 of the Texas Water Code, as amended; and

WHEREAS, Acts of the 81st Legislature, the enabling legislation for the District was recodified in Texas Special District Local Laws Code Ann. ch. 8814 Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District

WHEREAS, the District is required by Chapter 36, §36.1071 of the Texas Water Code to develop and adopt a Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, the District is required by Chapter 36, §36.1072 of the Texas Water Code to review and re-adopt the plan with or without revisions at least once every five years and to submit the adopted Management Plan to the Executive Administrator of the Texas Water Development Board for review and approval; and

WHEREAS, the District's readopted revised Management Plan shall be approved by the Executive Administrator if the plan is administratively complete; and

WHEREAS, the District Board of Directors, after reviewing the existing Management Plan, has determined that this plan should be revised and replaced with a new 5-Year Management Plan expiring in 2023; and

WHEREAS, the District Board of Directors has determined that the 5-Year Management Plan addresses the requirements of Chapter 36, §36.1071.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved, that the Board of Directors of the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District, following notice and hearing, hereby adopts this 5-Year Management Plan; and

FURTHER, be it resolved, that this new Management Plan shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

Adopted this 14th day of May, 2018, by the Board of Directors of the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District.



Attesting Signature



Presiding Officer

APPENDIX F

This page is intentionally blank.

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

STERLING COUNTY UWCD
PO BOX 873
STERLING CITY, TX 76951

State of Wisconsin, County of Brown


Public Notice

The Sterling County Under-
ground Water Conservation
District will hold a Public
Hearing at 8:00 am on May
14, 2018 at the Sterling Coun-
ty UWCD office, 612 4th, Ster-
ling City, TX, to receive pub-
lic comment on a proposed
revised 2018-2023 Manage-
ment Plan. Copies of the pro-
posed plan may be obtained
by contacting the District
Office at 325 378-2704, email:
scuwcd@verizon.net or web-
site: [http://www.sterlinguw-
cd.org/](http://www.sterlinguw-
cd.org/). Written comments
will be received through May
10, 2018 by mail, email or
hand delivery.


On **April 16, 2018**, personally appeared before me the undersigned,
a Notary Public in and for said county and state, legal clerk of the
SAN ANGELO STANDARD-TIMES, a daily newspaper published in
San Angelo, County of TOM GREEN, State of Texas and of general
circulation in the following counties: **Tom Green, Coke, Concho,
Crockett, Irion, Kimble, Mason, McCulloch, Menard, Reagan,
Runnels, Schleicher, Sterling, Sutton**. The attached advertisement,
a true copy of which is hereto annexed, was published in said
newspaper in its issues thereof the following dates:

April 16, 2018

Subscribed and sworn to before me on **April 16, 2018**.




Legal Clerk



Notary Public

9-19-21

My commission expires



Ad#: 1985352
P.O.:
of Affidavits: 0

#29169

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING OF THE STERLING COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

The Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District will hold a Public Hearing at 8:00 am on May 14, 2018 at the Sterling County UWCD office, 612 4th, Sterling City, TX, to receive public comment on a proposed revised 2018-2023 Management Plan

NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE STERLING COUNTY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

The REGULAR term of the Sterling County Underground Water Conservation District meeting will convene following the PUBLIC HEARING on the 14th day of MAY, 2018, at the Water District Office, 612 4th, Sterling City, Texas, to transact the following business:

- 1. Public Comment - Limit 5 Minutes Each Person (Must Sign and Submit a Public Participation Form Prior to Meeting)
2. Approve Minutes of the Previous Meeting
3. Consider and Take Action on Payment of Bills Due
4. Receive Manager's Report on the Following Topics: (a) Meetings Attended (b) Well Surveillance Reports (c) Notice of Intent
5. Consider and Take Action on the Proposed Revised 2018-2023 Management Plan
6. Adjourn

Signature of Scott Holland, Manager and Diana Thomas, Asst. Manager

CERTIFICATE

THE STATE OF TEXAS }
COUNTY OF STERLING }

I, Jerri McCutchen, Clerk of the County Court in and for Sterling County, Texas, hereby certify that the above and foregoing instrument is a true and correct copy of original "Notice of Meeting" as filed by S.C. Underground Water Conservation District, in my office on 9th May, A.D., 2018.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF OFFICE, this the 9th day of May 2018, A.D. 2018.

Jerri McCutchen, Clerk, County Court

Sterling County, Texas

Signature of Jerri McCutchen