

Minutes of Meeting  
5-04-09  
GCGCD

Mr. Roy  
Mr. Duke

Mr. Dohmann called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. at the Water District office. Everyone stood and recited the Pledge to the United States flag and the Water District Pledge.

Mr. Dohmann introduced guest Jim Kreneck, County Commissioner. Roll call of directors found Joe Kozielski was absent. Also in attendance was Michelle Shelton, GCGCD office assistant. Mr. Underdown with UEC joined the meeting at 5:07.

**Item 1 – Public Comment on Operations of the District** – Hearing none, the Board proceeded to *Item 8* of the agenda.

**Item 2 – Action on Minutes of April 20, 2009** – The Board reviewed the minutes of the 4-20-09 meeting. Mr. Irwin moved to approve the minutes as written and submitted. Mr. Duke seconded and the motion carried.

**Item 3 - Discussion and possible action on meetings attended and upcoming meetings –**

a. **5-6-09 – GMA 15 Meeting in Victoria** – CANCELLED – The GMA 15 meeting was cancelled due to TWDB employees being prohibited from traveling to locations outside of Austin as a result of the swine flu. No action was required.

b. **5-7-09 – Region L meeting in San Antonio** – Mr. Dohmann and Mr. Duke will be attending the Region L meeting in San Antonio at the SAWS offices. Mr. Dohmann will be an alternate for Bill Jones. At the previous Region L meeting the Board voted to amend the 2006 plan to be officially part of the State Water Plan. The process has gone through the 30 day public comment period. There will be an opportunity for public hearing at this meeting, then discussion regarding the proposed amendment to the 2006 State Water Plan. Another item of interest is agenda item 8 of the Region L agenda regarding discussion and appropriate action regarding designation of ecologically unique stream segments in Region L. Mr. Dohmann discussed the agenda items to be presented. No action was required.

c. **5-14-09 – Preliminary Hearing on UEC Permit Application – Goliad Auditorium – 10 a.m.** – Mr. Dohmann announced for the public the time and date of the Preliminary Hearing for the Contested Case. No action was required.

**Item 4 - Discussion and possible action on Correspondence –**

a. **Other correspondence** – The Board reviewed the Bee County Notice of Meeting. No action was required.

**Item 4 - Unfinished Business –**

a. **Update and action on Contested Case Hearing Preparations** – Mr. Dohmann discussed with the Board facts regarding the contract completion with the consultants Dr. Abitz and Neil Blandford with Daniel B. Stephens and the fact that both have been provided the background information that was requested in terms of any activity. Mr. Dohmann has authorized Mr. Blandford to review only that which is required to get him familiarized with the data and nothing else. As a preliminary indication of what goes into the contested case hearing and timeline, Mr. Dohmann pulled data from a similar hearing with a one year limit and reviewed

the timeline with the Board. This gives a basic indicator of events and timelines, and ending with the decision a year later. Mr. Dohmann's understanding is that expert witnesses are not required to be at the preliminary hearing. The only items to be addressed at this meeting will be the schedule and possible change in affected parties and/or review of current parties. No action was required.

**b. Update on Coleta Creek Interaction Study** – Mr. Dohmann reviewed the information with the Board that is prepared to present to USGS. No action was required.

**c. Update on isotope sampling at Perdido Point and Coleta Creek Reservoir** – Ms. Smith announced that there is nothing new to report. Cassi Otero has promised the scope later this week. No action was required.

**e. Water level monitoring report in East Goliad County – John Dreier** – Mr. Dreier reported to the Board that 7 wells were monitored with an average drawdown in a 4 month period of 2'. No action was required.

**f. Update on Market Days Booth – June 13** – Ms. Smith gave a review of the progress on the Market Days booth set for the date of June 13<sup>th</sup>. GCGCD has acquired a space on the northwest corner. Mr. Dohmann suggested bumper stickers with the water district pledge on it. Mr. Irwin moved to appropriate up to \$300 for the booth, Mr. Duke seconded and the motion carried.

**g. Update on Summer Education Program** – Ms. Smith presented to the Board a draft news article to put in the paper to see if there would be any interest in a summer program. The Board reviewed the article and made recommended changes. Recommended 12 and above as the age limit, set a specific date (not tentative), reword so not geared toward younger children. Ms. Smith will get in the paper this week. No action was required.

**h. Other unfinished business** – None

#### **Item 6 – New Business –**

**a. Discussion and action on Legislation** – Ms. Smith notified the Board that HB 753 and its companion bill have passed both houses. These do not require the governor's signature. Ms. Smith will get a copy of the complete act to put in the Director's binders. No action was required.

**b. Discussion and action on Rules Changes** – Deferred. No action was required.

**c. Discussion and action on payment of Baiamonte Law Firm Billing** – the Board reviewed the bill submitted by Baiamonte Law. Mr. Irwin moved to approve the bill as submitted, Mr. Dreier seconded and the motion carried.

**d. Discussion and action on proposal for building purchase** – Mr. Dohmann presented the Board with an overview of the commissioners meeting. The commissioners reviewed the sale of surplus buildings. Mr. Irwin was present at the meeting and asked by the Commissioners if GCGCD had any interest in buying the old Ag building. He stated that he would take it to the Board and report back to the Commissioners. Mr. Irwin stated that the property appraised at \$125,000 and they received no bids. Minimum price was not mentioned at the meeting. Mr. Irwin has accumulated and presented figures on

operating expenses, insurance, maintenance, etc. Mr. Duke moved to have Mr. Irwin convey back to commissioners that we are interested in pursuing a purchase agreement on the Ag Building. Mr. Dreier seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

- e. **Discussion and action on GAM run information** – The Board reviewed the draft DFC's from Neil Hudgens. Mr. Dohmann reviewed the map to be presented to GMA 15 for the DFC information in Goliad County. No action was required.
  
- f. **Discussion and action on District's willingness to participate in water quality monitoring outside UEC permit area** – Water contamination is documented in UEC's PAA-1 application for mining. This agenda item is about GCGCD's role in the future relative to that contaminated water and its potential migration down dip. As part of that discussion TCFQ has stated that water moves a few feet in 100 years and other sources suggest that it moves a very short distance. Neither of these statements is correct according to TWDB GAM runs and water budget for the Evangeline Aquifer in Goliad County. Recharge for the Evangeline is reported at 8,000 ac/ft/yr. There is another recharge for the Chicot not in the area in question. There are lateral flows in and out of the County, flows that exchange water in the river, vertical leakage that would apply in the Evangeline itself and also Chicot to the Evangeline leakage, and the usage or pumpage. If you look at the recharge area, there are four identified water sands and most of the use is from the two upper sands. The upper two sands which provide most of the pumping supply in the upper reaches of Goliad County are at 24 miles wide. How much water is in 1' of aquifer in the two primary supply sands? It is about 21ac/ft. Divide that into a water movement number or water use number and divide into 8,000 ac/ft of recharge, movement is 381' a year if you have a uniform homogenous aquifer throughout the entire 24 miles. If you consider lateral movement, the migration would be in the order of 600' a year. There is an identified contaminated area of water, migration is going to occur, not uniform but more than a couple of feet a year. The Board looked at what GCGCD's role is in monitoring the condition that we have. Mr. Irwin responded that the District needs to continue our tracking and data and the Board was in full agreement. 12 wells cost approximately \$5,000 for quality testing per occurrence. Mr. Irwin moved to continue monitoring every 6 months and deal with the data as it comes out, and to review the wells in the schedule now to set out an annual budget. Ms. Smith seconded and the motion carried unanimously.
  
- g. **Discussion and action on purchase of large page printer from Michelle Shelton** – Mr. Irwin moved to purchase the Hewlett Packard 2500 CM document printer from Michelle Shelton for \$150. Ms. Smith seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**Item 7 - GCGCD Calendar** – The Board reviewed the Calendar for May, 2009. No action was required.

**Item 8 - Public Hearing on El Monte Ranch Applications** – The Board reviewed a rehearing of a previously held permit hearing where there was an approval for a permitted well for El Monte that is irrigation well and approved at 60 ac/ft per year for a single new well to pump. The pump in the permit application and approval required 3-phase power for a 7 ½ hp pump. The landowner did more investigation, and during discussions with Mr. Dohmann, initially he received a suggestion to drill two new wells side by side equipped with 5 hp pumps. Mr. Dohmann inquired as to why the landowner wanted to drill two new wells when there is an OFS well that is already drilled and ready. The existing well is 260' deep.

This permit is to equip the new well with a 5 hp pump and equip the existing OFS well with a 5 hp pump. Both wells will run in parallel to supply the irrigation system.

Mr. Dohmann opened the meeting for public comment. Ms. Smith stated the Hamptons had some concerns about how the wells would be reported. They are concerned that the shallower and older well is in the same sand as their well. Another thing the Hamptons asked was regarding the level monitoring of their well; what would be the alarm or trigger point? Mr. Dohmann stated the monitoring is for the purpose of noting any changes that are occurring. The Board doesn't feel a trigger point should be set but that all data should come back before the Board for review. Mr. Dohmann stated we need to get a baseline before pumping begins. This is the only way we can make sure of the drawdown. The District needs to convey to the Hamptons that we will baseline their well, monitor relative to baseline and monitor other wells around the area; then all information will be evaluated and taken into consideration. Two wells spread the load out and are beneficial to everyone. The new well will comply with the previously defined drilled below 360' depth requirements. Another issue would be vertical leakage and going deeper is not necessarily the answer. This could affect upper sands as well. The well will be permitted as a 2 well system that will be revisited in 3 years. The District needs to obtain operating pressure of the system, Kwh, and static water level. Mr. Duke moved to approve the permit. Mr. Irwin seconded and the motion carried.

**Item 9 - Public Comment** – None

**Item 10 - Adjourn** – Mr. Duke moved for adjournment, Ms. Smith seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Barbara Smith, Secretary GCGCD  
Michelle Shelton, Office/Field Assistant

*Barbara Smith*  
*Approved 5/18/09*