

**Minutes of the September 3, 2020 Meeting of  
The Coastal Bend Regional Water Planning Group (Region N)  
For the Senate Bill 1 Regional Water Planning Program**

The Coastal Bend Regional Water Planning Group for the Senate Bill 1 was held via virtual WebEx Conference.

**Agenda Item I - Call to Order:** Ms. Carola Serrato, Co-Chair of the Coastal Bend RWPG, called the meeting to order at 1:37 P.M.

**Agenda Item II - Roll Call:** Mr. John Byrum began roll call.

Voting members of the Coastal Bend RWPG in attendance included:

Mr. Scott Bledsoe III (Water Districts)	Ms. Carola Serrato (Water Utilities)
Mr. Lonnie Stewart (GMA 13)	Mr. Tom Redding, Jr (River Authorities)
Dr. Pancho Hubert (Small Business)	Mr. Charles Ring (Agriculture)
Ms. Barbara Reaves (Municipal)	Ms. Donna Rosson (Public)
Mr. John Burris (Other)	Mr. Carl Crull (Other)
Mr. Andy Garza (GMA 16)	Mr. Mark Scott (Municipal)
Ms. Rosario Martinez for Mr. Jace Tunnell (Environmental)	
Ms. Teresa Carrillo (Environmental)	

Non-Voting members of the Coastal Bend RWPG in attendance included:

Dr. Jim Tolan (TPWD)	Mr. David Fuentes (Liaison Region M)
Ms. Nelda Barrera (TDA)	Mr. Kevin Smith (TWDB)
Mr. John Byrum (Nueces River Authority)	Ms. Kristi Shaw (HDR)
Mr. Tomas Dominguez (NRCS)	

Victoria Salinas, Sky Lewey, and Travis Pruski (Nueces River Authority) administration

Voting Members Absent:

Mr. Chuck Burns (Agriculture)	Mr. Bill Dove (Small Business)
Mr. Lavoyger Durham (Counties)	Mr. Bill Stockton
Mr. Gary Eddins (Electric Utilities)	Mr. Mark Sugarek (GMA 15)
Mr. Joe Almaraz (Industries)	Mr. Robert Kunkel (Industries)

Guests Included:

Mr. Steve Ramos (City of Corpus Christi)	Ms. Kathryn Mastyn
Ms. Emily Nye	Mr. Errol Summerlin
Mr. Patrick Nye	Ms. Melba Barrera (TDA)

### **Agenda Item III – Consider Approval of Minutes of the February 20, 2020 Meeting of the Coastal Bend Regional Water Planning Group.**

Ms. Serrato asked for approval of the minutes of the February 20, 2020 meeting of the Coastal Bend Regional Water Planning Group.

Mr. Carl Crull made a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Lonnie Stewart seconded it.

Ms. Serrato stated before we take a vote, she asked Ms. Kristi Shaw if she had corrections on the minutes for discussion. Ms. Shaw provided her comments, sent previously to the Nueces River Authority.

Ms. Serrato requested confirmation that it was Mr. Crull who made the motion. Mr. Crull replied that he would like to restate the motion to approve the minute corrections provided by Ms. Shaw. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion. Ms. Serrato requested any further questions or comments. Ms. Barbara Reaves asked if the minutes being voted on include the January revisions as well. Ms. Serrato replied that they should as well.

Ms. Serrato confirmed a quorum was established during roll call. There was no further discussion, and the minutes were approved by a unanimous voice vote.

### **Agenda Item IV - Legislative and Regional Policy Subcommittee Recommendations in Response to Public Comments Received on Chapter 8 of the Initially Prepared Plan**

Ms. Shaw provided background on this item. There were comments provided by Ms. Rosson (Public Representative) as well as a local attorney Ms. Sally Ferris with respect to legislative and policy recommendations (Chapter 8) of the Initially Prepared Plan. The comments were discussed at the February 20<sup>th</sup> Region N Meeting at which time the Regional Water Planning Group decided to reconvene the Legislative and Policy Subcommittee previously formed in February of 2019 to consider these comments. Those that served on the subcommittee included Mr. Bledsoe, Ms. Carrillo, Mr. Crull, and Ms. Serrato. The Legislative and Policy Subcommittee met in an open meeting on July 23<sup>rd</sup> and considered the comments provided by Ms. Rosson and Ms. Ferris, reviewed preliminary language from consultant, and prepared a recommendation. Ms. Shaw discussed the proposed subcommittee responses included in the packet materials. On August 7<sup>th</sup>, the Texas Parks and Wildlife (TPWD) sent comments on the Regional Plan with mention of House Bill 2031 passed by the 84<sup>th</sup> Legislature that had directed TPWD to work with the General Land Office and resulted in a report which identified off-shore zones in the Gulf of Mexico for the diversion of marine sea water and for discharge of brine concentrate in deep waters. Ms. Shaw stated that the subcommittee recommendation ends up serving two purposes, both in addressing the comments that were received by Ms. Rosson as well as the TPWD comments.

Ms. Shaw reviewed the subcommittee recommendations. All proposed revisions focused on Section 8.1.3 Desalination included in Chapter 8. All other legislative and

policy recommendations have been approved and were included in the Initially Prepared Plan which will stand as is.

Dr. Tolan inquired about the meaning of byproduct discharge included in the first recommendation. Ms. Serrato stated that various industries use the term for discharge, or brine discharge.

Ms. Shaw stated that the first bulleted item adds language that TCEQ is encouraged to promulgate regulations to define the standards related to quality and quantity of discharge and location. The second bulleted item addresses coordination efforts between the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Corps of Engineers, and National Marines and Fishery Services to develop information and guidance on potential impacts from concentrate discharges. Furthermore, the proposed update includes a statement that relates directly back to the 2018 Marine Sea Water Desalination Diversion and Discharge Zones Study by the TPWD and GLO. Bulleted item three would stand as written in the Initially Prepared Plan. The fourth bulleted item adds a sentence that environmentally sensitive bay and estuary ecological systems should be considered during planning and evaluation of brine disposal options which may include deep well injection and desalination of brackish groundwater as an option to that produce less brine. The remaining bulleted items in Section 8.1.3- Desalination, stand as written in the Initially Prepared Plan. Ms. Shaw asked for discussion by the planning group members.

Dr. Tolan requested a copy of the packet materials that had been sent by NRA that included subcommittee recommendations. It was forwarded by Ms. Shaw during the meeting. Ms. Serrato asked if there were any further questions or comments hearing none, Ms. Serrato as for a motion to consider approval of the subcommittee recommendations.

Ms. Kathryn Mastyn stated that she had sent a resolution that was just passed by the Ingleside on the Bay City Council on September 1<sup>st</sup> and requested consideration of additional language in the Plan that desalination projects should not receive SWIFT funding unless the governing bodies of affected incorporated cities regardless of population size have provided their written support. Ingleside on the Bay is not in the Legislation to be notified of regional planning efforts. The resolution requests that affected entities be required to provide written support for projects that affect them, such as the three desalination projects on La Quinta Channel.

Ms. Serrato asked Ms. Mastyn if she wanted to read the resolution and make it part of the record, with clarification that the resolution is not related to the legislative recommendation's agenda item currently under consideration. Ms. Mastyn read the two-page resolution, Resolution No. 20-327 of the City of Ingleside on the Bay and its position regarding desalination plants on the La Quinta Channel.

Ms. Serrato asked for a motion to approve the updates to Section 8.1.3 recommended by the Region N legislative and regional policy subcommittee.

Ms. Reaves made a motion to approve the changes. Ms. Rosson seconded the motion.

Mr. Crull asked if the changes included Texas Parks and Wildlife comments. Ms. Shaw stated that the updates included reference to the TPWD and GLO study.

Ms. Serrato asked if there were any further questions or comments from the members.

Hearing none, Mr. Byrum started the roll call. All present members voted yes. Mr. Byrum stated the motion carried unanimously.

**Agenda Item V - Prioritization of Recommended Water Management Strategy Projects for the 2021 Regional Water Plan and Subcommittee Recommendations.**

Ms. Shaw provided background on this item. She stated that at the February 20, 2020 meeting, Region N appointed a Subcommittee to prioritize the Recommended Water Management Strategy Projects from the 2021 Region N Plan. The Subcommittee consisting of Mr. Bledsoe, Ms. Carrillo, Dr. Hubert, Mr. Stewart, and Ms. Serrato met on July 23<sup>rd</sup> to discuss the Recommended Water Management Strategies shown in the Initially Prepared Plan to meet future water needs and prioritization of these strategies. The process ranks the strategies using a very standard and prescriptive method and is governed by legislation. For instance, if the project need comes on in 2020 it will receive a different score than if it is in a later during the decadal cycles. The subcommittee considered preliminary scoring provided by HDR and provided feedback and revisions during the July 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. The subcommittee recommendation was included in the packet for planning group consideration. Ms. Shaw requested the planning group consider the subcommittee's recommendation for approval and or any comments or adjustments that need to be made so that this could be sent with the final water plan to the Texas Water Development Board.

Ms. Serrato reiterated that the criteria identified in the spreadsheet include criteria established by the State Legislature. Ms. Shaw reviewed the format of the spreadsheet. The criteria include timeframe for which each water management strategies are anticipated to come on-line, project feasibility, project liability, project sustainability, and project cost effectiveness. A total score of one thousand points is eligible. The total score is calculated as shown in the table included in the packet. Ms. Shaw stated that one distinction that she wanted to make is that after submittal of the Initially Prepared Plan, she contacted to water providers as well as the water user groups that have recommended strategies in 2020 to gather additional information on project status and confirm the time line of estimated project delivery. The TWDB guidance states that if a project is not delivering water by January of 2023 then it should be deferred to a subsequent decade in 2030 or beyond, and not shown as a 2020 supply. This information was shared with sponsors of projects and several projects were revised to later decades based on feedback. For instance, the Seawater Desalination Projects that were originally shown in 2020 were deferred to 2030. Also, the Evangeline Laguna Groundwater Project was revised to 2030. Ms. Shaw solicited questions and comments from the subcommittee or planning group.

Mr. Stewart asked if these changes from 2020 to 2030 for the Evangeline Laguna Groundwater Project and Seawater Desalination Projects were the only changes since the subcommittee meeting. Ms. Shaw replied yes those were the only changes, and all this information was reflected in the packet. There were no changes in the packet materials since distribution.

Ms. Rosson asked how the deferral of start date affects SWIFT funding. Ms. Shaw replied it is not anticipated to affect the ability for sponsors to apply for SWIFT loans, and it simply means that the project is not identified to show up online until 2030. It is reasonable that many of the sponsors, especially large projects, may seek funding before 2030. Ms. Rosson and Mr. Garza both mentioned that they did not receive packet materials sent previously by the Nueces River Authority. Ms. Serrato stated it was a rather large attachment with ninety-five pages. Ms. Shaw shared the packet materials on the screen, including a brief summary on the background in the TWDB guidance to provide uniformity in final prioritization submissions which was considered by the subcommittee during the scoring process. Tables that show every Recommended Water Management Strategy with a cost and each of the criteria scored including the final score of each project were included in the packet.

Ms. Serrato stated that the scoring does not have any bearing on if a project will be implemented. The planning group is simply complying with the Legislative Requirement. The sponsor decides whether the project will be developed, and that implementation issues such as permitting and environmental evaluations is performed at a later stage outside of the planning process which includes a public participation process and other aspects required by agencies. The narrow focus of the regional water planning group is to use uniform standards and score them in a very specific way. Ms. Shaw stated that Texas Administrative Code Chapter 357.46 has detailed language regarding prioritization and scoring criteria and the template used came from the TWDB populated for Region N. Ms. Rosson requested the packet materials by email. Ms. Shaw sent the packet to both Ms. Rosson and Mr. Garza.

Ms. Serrato asked for a motion to consider approval of Prioritization of Recommended Water Management Strategies for 2021 Regional Water Plan.

Mr. Burris moved to approve the prioritization of recommended water management strategies. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion.

Ms. Serrato asked for any comments or questions from group members. Dr. Tolan stated that the prioritization process and scoring is something that the planning groups are required to do and that the planning groups have discussed this in the past. The sponsors drive the process on which strategies will ultimately be constructed.

Ms. Serrato asked for roll call vote.

Mr. Byrum started the roll call vote. All members present voted yes. There was no further discussion and motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

## **Agenda Item VI - Infrastructure Financing Survey (IFR) and Responses**

Ms. Shaw stated that this is a requirement for the Regional Water Plans based on the Texas Administrative Code 357.44 and requires the Planning Groups to report on how sponsors plan to finance projects. This is not an obligation to build a project but rather helps the TWDB anticipate potential funding requests that may be submitted to them in the future through SWIFT, State Revolving Fund, or other programs. HDR reached out to 23 sponsors showing recommended water management strategy projects in the plan. As of the time that the packet was mailed out, comments had been received by the City of Alice, a partial response from the City of Beeville, City of Bishop, City of Corpus Christi, Nueces WSC, Port of Corpus Christi Authority, Poseidon and the City of Ingleside, and the San Patricio Municipal Water District. In all, 7 of the 23 entities that responded comprises roughly 80% of the total cost of projects in the Regional Water Plan. The TWDB asked that this information be included in the final plan in Chapter 9, which had a place holder in the Initially Prepared Plan. The TWDB provided a spreadsheet for submitting the infrastructure financing information. We are asking for the Planning Group to consider this chapter being submitted to the Water Development Board for their review and to be included in the final plan that the planning group will consider for adoption at the September 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Crull questioned if they were voting on all the requested responses and not just the ones that have already responded. Ms. Shaw stated that was correct. The time frame for any remaining responses is the following week, and any additional information that she receives will be included in the spreadsheet to TWDB. Ms. Shaw showed an example of IFR survey that was received by the City of Corpus Christi. A few water user groups are county wide (i.e. Bee County mining) and that information is impractical to capture due to the lack of contact information associated for county wide users. The respondent contact name is information that has either been provided by Nueces River Authority's records, or from by Planning Group Members, or past correspondence from previous surveys. For those sponsors that are not intending to request any state money, the form would show the request at zero dollars. Ms. Shaw stated that Chapter 9 will include a summary of the Infrastructure Financing Survey responses and the TWDB spreadsheet template would be completed with this information and included with Final Plan submittal. Ms. Serrato requested any further questions or comments by the planning group members. Upon hearing none, she requested a motion to consider approving submittal of the Infrastructure Financing Survey results to the TWDB for review and approval.

Mr. Garza moved to approve the submittal of the IFS results to the TWDB. Mr. Crull seconded the motion.

Ms. Serrato requested a roll call vote. Mr. Byrum proceeded to take the roll call votes. All members present voted yes. There was no further discussion and motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

**Agenda Item VII - Consider Comments Received from TWDB and others on the Region N Initially Prepared Plan, Proposed Responses, and Authorizing HDR to Update Initially Prepared Plan accordingly**

Ms. Shaw explained that Region N Initially Prepared Plan was adopted at the last meeting on February 20, 2020 and submitted to TWDB in March according to schedule. At the February 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, the public meeting was scheduled for April 23<sup>rd</sup> and after the pandemic took form there were requests from planning group members and other stakeholders to have more time for public review of the Draft Plan. The public meeting, using a virtual format, and in compliance with the Governor's Orders, was rescheduled for June 2<sup>nd</sup>. The TWDB has specific guidelines on the time frame for public comment based on Legislature and Texas Administrative Code statute. The revised public hearing schedule gave the public an extra six weeks for public review of the Initially Prepared Plan prior to the Public Hearing. The public comment period closed on August 1<sup>st</sup>, sixty days after the hearing. State and Federal Agencies had a bit longer to provide feedback. Comments were received from the TWDB, the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board, and TPWD.

Ms. Shaw presented a table showing all the comments that were received on the Initially Prepared Plan. The TWDB provided Tier One and Tier Two Level comments. Tier One comments are comments that need to be satisfactorily addressed to meet Statutory Agency Rule or Contract Requirements. Tier Two are recommended for clarity, such as typographical changes or just in a discussion matter that if there is information that might help facilitate an understanding of a section. Ms. Shaw stated that they worked with the TWDB after the packet was mailed out to verify that the proposed responses satisfactorily address TWDB comments. Ms. Shaw mentioned minor updates to packet information based on feedback that she received from TWDB. With respect to the public comments that were received, Ms. Shaw stated, as mentioned earlier, the comment period was closed on August 1<sup>st</sup>. We received comments from Ms. Rosson, that were mentioned previously regarding the Legislative and Policy Recommendations as well as comments from Ms. Ferris. We received comments from Mr. Marvin Townsend regarding Three Rivers. On the public hearing format, Mr. Errol Summerlin, Ms. Donna Rosson, and Ms. Teresa Carrillo requested more time for public comment and for review of the Initially Prepared Plan. We also received comments from Mr. Serna regarding population growth in the area. Desalination comments were received from Mr. Hamlet Newsom, Mr. Randy Cain, Ms. Emily Nye, Mr. Patrick Nye, Mr. Serna, Mr. Errol Summerlin, Ms. Kathryn Mastyn, Ms. Mastyn on behalf of Ingleside on the Bay Coastal Watch Association, Surfrider Foundation, Ms. Wendy Hughes and Ms. Jennifer Hillard. Mr. Andrew Sowder provided a comment on Atmospheric Water Generation Technology. Ms. Shaw stated with respect to the comment on the packet materials there are a couple of notable changes. One is with respect to the TWDB on their request for additional clarification. Ms. Shaw shared the TWDB comments with the group. The TWDB inquired about Nueces County WCID 3 which shows a project coming on in Year 2020. Several attempts were made to reach out to WCID 3 but as of yet, no responses have been received. The Nueces County WCID 3 local balancing storage project will continue to be shown for the year 2020. The City of Alice Brackish Groundwater Desalination Project continues to be shown for 2020, as well as the O.N. Stevens Water Treatment Plant

Improvements, because both of those projects are actively moving forward and are anticipated to be fully completed by 2023. The following projects are scheduled to come on-line in 2030, which is a change from the Initially Prepared Plan: City of Corpus Christi ASR, Sea Water Desalination for the Port at Harbor Island, Sea Water Desalination for the City of Corpus Christi at Inner Harbor, and Evangeline Laguna Treated Groundwater Project. The TWDB clarified that the new TAC provisions, did not apply to Table 2.11. There was a comment regarding the local surface water supplies for livestock purposes and whether those are firm supplies under drought conditions. The data we used was based on 2010 Groundwater Use which was during drought conditions, so those are considered firm and will be updated in the plan. Ms. Shaw stated there were two minor corrections related to the TWDB DB 22 information related to the Secondary Needs Analysis as well as the Management Supply Factors. The Board presented that information for the water use groups, but HDR is compiling and summarizing on the major water provider level. Other than that, everything remains the same as presented in the packet. One TWDB comment had to do with the new provision in Texas Water Code and Texas Administrative Code, effective at the end of June 2020, in response to House Bill 807 that requires Planning Groups to look at a threshold to determine whether or not there are significant water needs for assessing the potential for aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) projects. Planning Groups are to determine what constitutes a "Significant Water Need", and report back to the TWDB.

Ms. Shaw summarized content related to defining significant water needs. The total water needs relating to the 11-county area in Region N is just over 30,000 acre feet a year in 2030. It increases to over 49,000 acre feet a year in 2070. About 52% of the overall regional water need in 2030 is attributable to manufacturing needs in Nueces and San Patricio counties associated with industrial growth. In 2070, the manufacturing water need for these two counties comprises about 69% percent of the overall Region N water need. The City of Corpus Christi and San Patricio Municipal Water District currently provide water supplies for Nueces and San Patricio Manufacturing Water Users. In the Initially Prepared Region N Planning, Aquifer Storage and Recovery is included as an evaluated and recommended water management strategy to meet future manufacturing needs in Nueces County and sponsored by the City of Corpus Christi. A suggestion for Region N consideration is to define Significant Water Needs that are equal to or greater than 20,000 acre feet a year. According to modeled available groundwater values and current groundwater use, smaller municipal and rural Region N utilities have sufficient groundwater availability for traditional groundwater development at a more economical cost. The non-municipal county wide water users are less likely to develop ASR without major water provider sponsorship. The City of Corpus Christi and the San Patricio Municipal Water District projected needs are roughly under 20,000 acre feet per year for San Patricio and over 20,000 acre feet per year for the City of Corpus Christi. Ms. Shaw asked if there were any questions or comments from planning group members on this topic.

Ms. Reaves replied regarding the City of Alice Brackish Groundwater Project, their project is divided into two phases. Phase I includes the design, environmental, and construction of a test well which will then become a production well, and that is underway right now. They had already taken a water sample, and another would be



taken she believed that week. This board action related to Seven Seas pertains to Phase II focused on the RO Plant. The City of Alice is still looking at other options with TWDB for Phase II. Ms. Shaw deferred to Mr. Kevin Smith from TWDB to see if they needed this detailed information on the City of Alice's plans to justify the project being shown in Year 2020. Ms. Reaves stated that she knew TWDB had the information because Ms. Mireya Loewe had called her after the City Council Meeting on August 24<sup>th</sup>. The City of Alice received State Revolving Fund Financing from the Board for Phase I and have continued to make strides to implementing that project.

Mr. Smith requested that the plan include any information readily available on project schedule related to 2020 projects. Mr. Smith asked if the SRF funds is for planning and implementation of Phase I. Ms. Reaves replied that the SRF was for Phase I, and that they had also submitted an application for Phase 2 but withdrew the application. Mr. Smith stated that he would follow-up with Ms. Mireya Loewe and report back if TWDB needed more information. He stated that what he has seen with other plans justifies including the information for 2020.

Ms. Shaw mentioned to Ms. Reaves that she would work with her after the call and send her this language for her to modify it based on additional information that the City of Alice might want to provide to keep this project in 2020.

Ms. Shaw stated that the TPWD provided a letter on August 7<sup>th</sup> that was specific to Region N. The TPWD letter thank Region N for looking at the diversification for Water Management Strategies, in addition to enumerating some of the issues with respect to natural resources, threatened and endangered species, and water quality issues. TPWD made a recommendation to remove one of the segments that was shown in Chapter 1.7 that was part of Willacy County and outside Region N. Also, that the TPWD has a new Federal and State Threatened and Endangered Species List that was published at the end of March after the Initially Prepared Plan was delivered and requested update to this information. There was a comment about including the information about the TPWD and GLO study associated with House Bill 2031, discussed in an earlier agenda item.

Ms. Shaw asked Dr. Tolan, from TPWD, if he would like to discuss anything else pertinent to TPWD comments. Dr. Tolan replied no that he believed she covered pretty much everything that they had sent in the letter. The ecologically significant streams that TPWD has designated in the Region N area were discussed during the 2021 Planning process.

Ms. Shaw stated that the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board provided feedback on the Plan, focused on Land Management and Brush Management. Region N has discussed brush management in the previous planning cycles. Based on TWDB guidance, there are specific metrics such as the firm yield during drought to be included as a Water Management Strategy, and Brush Management is not an applicable strategy with respect to the current tools that we have. Perhaps at a future date that would be able to be quantified. The Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board have made presentations to the group and Region N supports land stewardship best practices even though Brush Management is not included as a Recommended Strategy.

Ms. Shaw then moved on to the public comments for the Legislative and Policies. We have already talked about these it was brought to the Planning Group at the February meeting. These were the plans that were considered by the Subcommittee in regard to formulating the regulations which was adopted.

Mr. Marvin Townsend provided a comment on the City of Three Rivers Water Right, and there is a minor change with that. After preparing the packet materials, HDR looked a bit deeper into the Water Rights associated with 3214 and 3215 and made a minor clarification to Table 3.1 footnote describing those rights. Mr. Townsend stated the proposed responses to the table satisfactorily addressed his comments.

Ms. Shaw stated that couple of comments were received in regard to the Public Hearing. A comment was received on population growth and alterative projections regarding future growth. The proposed response discusses the basis of population projections in the Plan and Region N's assessment of population estimates at the beginning of the planning cycle and comments provided to the TWDB.

There were desalination comments submitted, some of which were editorial and others that inquired specifically on the location of brine disposal, the types of desalination projects, and the environmental impacts in permitting. Ms. Shaw summarized the responsibilities of the Regional Water Planning Group with regards to a Long-Term Water Supply Plan and Recommended Strategies. The implementation, permitting processes, and public notification process is separate from the planning process and included in additional studies by the sponsors to move their desired projects toward implementation and within the law. Every comment provided was considered. Ms. Shaw explained that each Water Management Strategy is evaluated with the same level of detail for consistency that is required by the TWDB. Environmental issues related to brine discharge are described in Chapter 5 D 10. All comments will be included in the initial Final Plan in an Appendix. The proposed response to desalination comments is included on page 89 through 95 in the packet.

Ms. Emily Nye provided a public comment related to the purview of Regional Water Planning Activities associated with planning and not project implementation. Ms. Nye mentioned Texas Administrative Code Chapter 357.35 about cost affective and environmentally sensitive projects.

Ms. Shaw stated that the final comment that was received by the public related to Atmospheric Water Generation Technology. Ms. Serrato provided the direct response to Mr. Sowder with respect to the Water Planning Strategies and those selected for evaluation during the Region N planning process.

Ms. Shaw asked if anyone on the planning group would like to discuss these comments.

Upon receiving no further comments or requests for discussion, Ms. Serrato asked for a motion to consider the responses to comments for adoption for HDR to submit to the Texas Water Development Board and relevant Water Development Board for consideration prior to the Regional Water Plan adoption.

Mr. Crull made the motion. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion.

Dr. Tolan stated that water management strategy selection raised by Ms. Nye will be addressed at a different level, but in terms of the Regional Water Planning Group, it has addressed everything sufficiently up to this point. Dr. Tolan complemented Ms. Shaw on job well done. Dr. Tolan reinforced that Ms. Nye's comments are not being ignored, they just are not appropriate on the Regional Water Planning Group level.

Ms. Serrato requested a roll call vote. Mr. Byrum proceeded to take the roll call votes. All members present voted yes. There was no further discussion and motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

#### **Agenda Item VIII - RWPG/TWDB Administrative and Other Issues**

Mr. Kevin Smith provided information on RWP rulemaking, final RWP deadline extensions, interregional planning council status, new RWP educational document on water availability and existing supply, RWP area boundary review process, RFA 6<sup>th</sup> cycle deadlines, and flood planning update.

Ms. Serrato asked Mr. Byrum for an NRA update. Mr. Byrum introduced Mr. Travis Pruski. Mr. Pruski started September 1<sup>st</sup>. He brings experience of public service. He served as Mayor of Poth, Texas. He will be NRA administrator for Region N RWPG.

Mr. Pruski thanked the board for allowing him to join the team and that he looked forward to working with the Region N RWPG.

#### **Agenda Item IX - General Public Comment**

Ms. Serrato opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. Patrick Nye stated that he submitted comments to the Region N Water Board on August 1<sup>st</sup> at 4:36 and they were not in the packet. He resent them this week to Mr. Byrum. Mr. Patrick Nye requested that Ms. Shaw send him her email so that he could send the information previously sent to Mr. Byrum.

Ms. Mastyn thanked the Regional Water Planning Group on their hard work they have done a great job and we really appreciate it.

#### **Agenda Item X - Confirm Next Meeting Date – September 24, 2020 1:30pm**

Ms. Serrato stated that the next meeting is scheduled for September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at 1:30pm.

#### **XI Adjourn**

Mr. Stewart moved for the meeting to be adjourned. It was seconded by Mr. Reding.

Ms. Serrato adjourned the meeting at 3:39 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Mr. Travis Pruski

Minutes Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Lonnie Stewart  
Secretary, Coastal Bend RWPG

Date