GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 12 MEETING
This meeting was held in person with virtual attendance and participation.
The meeting recording may be viewed at
posgcd.link/gma12

April 27, 2026 – 10:00 a.m.

GMA 12 Members Present in Person

Gary Westbrook	POSGCD
Elvis Hernandez	LPGCD
David Bailey	METGCD
Alan Day	BVGCD
David Van Dresar	FCGCD

GMA 12 Members Absent
None

Others Present in person	**Entity**
Gretchen Miller	Spheros Environmental
Jim Totten	Wellspring
Scott Carlson	MetWater
Liz Ferry	RW Harden & Associates
Paul Kirby	DBS & A
Andy Wier	SAWDF
Robert Bradley	TWDB
Claire Marks	LPGCD
Alan Gardenhire	SLR
James Beach	AGS
Tom Delamater	Landowner
John DeGomez	Landowner
George Chmelar	Landowner
Tom Clapper	Recharge
Gary Easter	Caldwell City Council
David Lynch	VWBF

Others Present online
Andrew Osborne
Gregory Perry
Kathy Polzer
Nancii Phillip-Burgess
Steve Box, Environmental Stewardship
Steve Young
Adam Foster
Brent Covert
Casey Cooper
Chris Drabek
Cynthia Lopez
Dacy Cameron, Aqua WSC

Elizabeth Klenz
Emily O'Leary
FCGCD
Heather Tucker, AWSC
Jake Steen | Lloyd Gosselink, P.C.
James Bené
Jayson
Jim Matthews
John Elliott
Lisa Rolke
Mason Wood
Michael Keester
Monique Norman
Nick Lamkey
Patrick Bobbitt
Peggy Campion
Philip Webster
Preston Martin
Ryan Harmon
Sydney McCarthy
Tom Arsuffi
Ty Embrey
Vince Clause - FNI
Wally Darling
Ye Hong Chen
(512) 300-6609
(512) 617-3122
(512) 635-0059
(512) 796-1580
(512) 923-1030
(512) 971-3684
(773) 680-0990

MINUTES

1. **Invocation**
   Gary Westbrook gave the invocation.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
   Alan Day led the pledges to the flags of the United States and Texas.

3. **Call meeting to order and establish quorum**
   Mr. Westbrook called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and noted that all GMA 12 members were present.

4. **Welcome and introductions**

Each GMA 12 member introduced themselves. Mr. Hernandez introduced Claire Marks of Lost Pines GCD. Mr. Westbrook introduced Robert Bradley with Texas Water Development Board.

5. **Public Comment on agenda items**
John DeGomez made comment on previous mitigation of his well and loss of water he's currently experiencing.

Robert Bradley, TWDB, made comment on proposed DFCs and legislative interest in GMA 13 and GMA 11.

Alan Gardenhire made comment on curtailment and development of DFCs in GMA 12.

George Chmelar made comment on growth of Brazos Valley and usage of water to keep up with such growth. He asked GMA 12 members about Vista Ridge pumping.

Mr. Westbrook made note of comments received via email from Aqua Water Supply, Environmental Stewardship, UW Brazos Valley Farms, Lloyd Gosselink on behalf of BVGCD, Nancy McKee, Claydeen Harrell, and Mike Orosco. These comments were posted and are available on the POSGCD website. Mr. Day made note of comments received and stated he will send them to Mr. Westbrook for posting to the POSGCD website.

6. **Minutes of April 16, 2026 GMA 12 Meeting**
Mr. Day moved to approve April 16, 2026 GMA 12 meeting minutes as presented. He was seconded by David Bailey. The motion passed unanimously of all present.

7. **Discussion and possible action on activities by consultants of GMA 12 GCDs on modifications and updates made to groundwater availability model (GAM) Run PS4-2 for use in establishing DFCs for the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, and Sparta aquifers in GMA 12, and considerations using requirements of Chapter 36.108 (d-2) in adopting DFCs during the fourth round of joint planning:**

(1) aquifer uses or conditions within the management area, including conditions that differ substantially from one geographic area to another;
David Van Dresar stated that FCGCD is performing sensitivity model runs to look at DFCs. They took out all of FCGCD's pumping in one model run. They did another model run for only their pumping. Once the model run is complete and reviewed by the FCGCD Board, he will present results at a future GMA 12 meeting.

(2) the water supply needs and water management strategies included in the state water plan;
Mr. Westbrook invited comment or presentation on this item. No discussion was offered on this item.

(3) hydrological conditions, including for each aquifer in the management area the total estimated recoverable storage as provided by the executive administrator, and the average annual recharge, inflows, and discharge;

Mr. Westbrook invited comment or presentation on this item. No discussion was offered on this item.

(4) other environmental impacts, including impacts on spring flow and other interactions between groundwater and surface water;
Mr. Westbrook invited comment or presentation on this item. No discussion was offered on this item.

(5) the impact on subsidence;
Mr. Westbrook invited comment or presentation on this item. No discussion was offered on this item.

(6) socioeconomic impacts reasonably expected to occur;
Mr. Westbrook referenced the recent presentation from Intera on this subject and asked Mr. Day if there is a metric or tool BVGCD uses to determine limits to permitting based on evaluating the need for future mitigation. Mr. Day cited recent work by BVGCD in identifying over 700 Simsboro and Calvert Bluff wells they believe will be affected. Future pumping has been modeled as best they can and contours evaluated, and approximately 200 of those affected wells will need to be redrilled due to improper construction or needing a pump resized or lowered. All pumping was included and has shown they are not capable of mitigating each well. Mr. Westbrook asked if some metric will be developed to evaluate limits to production. Mr. Westbrook and Mr. Day then discussed responsibilities for mitigation efforts across the GMA.

Mr. Westbrook thanked Mr. Day for the clarification and discussion.

(7) the impact on the interests and rights in private property, including ownership and the rights of management area landowners and their lessees and assigns in groundwater as recognized under Section 36.002;
Mr. Westbrook invited comment or presentation on this item. No discussion was offered on this item.

(8) the feasibility of achieving the desired future condition; and
Mr. Westbrook invited comment or presentation on this item. No discussion was offered on this item.

(9) any other information relevant to the specific desired future conditions.
Mr. Westbrook invited comment or presentation on this item. No discussion was offered on this item.

8. **Discussion and possible actions on additional GAM Runs for use in establishing DFCs for the aquifers in GMA 12**
James Beach, AGS, provided a presentation on behalf of BVGCD entitled GMA 12 Pumping Comparison between PS4-2 Version 8 and PS3-19. He answered questions from GMA 12 members.

Mr. Westbrook answered Mr. Chmelar's questions from public comment about production in BVGCD and POSGCD.

Mr. Day stated that at the last GMA 12 meeting, it was said that pumping from BVGCD is affecting LPGCD through POSGCD but pumping hasn't changed, and if anything, has gone down. He stated that Mr. DeGomez's well is not being affected by BVGCD pumping. He spoke about ways to mitigate the effects of Vista Ridge. Mr. Hernandez agreed with Mr. Day and noted that affects in LPGCD are from Vista Ridge.

Mr. Westbrook stated that production from each GCD affects neighboring GCDs and he noted that when looking at the water budgets recently reviewed by GMA 12 under Agenda item 7(3), that the model runs show a large volume of water in the Simsboro moving from LPGCD into POSGCD, and from POSGCD into BVGCD, and that water in the GAM and in reality flows from west to east.

9. **Discussion and possible action regarding existing DFCs, alternate DFC methods and parallel tracks, and expression of DFCs including methodology for determining and calculating DFCs from GAM runs and possible use of variances in GMA 12 for the fourth round of joint planning**

   Mr. Westbrook invited comment or presentation on this item. No discussion was offered on this item. No action was taken.

10. **Declaration of non-relevant aquifers for the fourth round of joint planning for GMA 12:**
    a. **Trinity Aquifer in Lost Pines GCD**
    b. **Yegua-Jackson Aquifer in Lost Pines GCD**
    c. **Calvert Bluff Aquifer in Fayette County GCD**
    d. **Simsboro Aquifer in Fayette County GCD**
    e. **Hooper Aquifer in Fayette County GCD**
    f. **Gulf Coast Aquifer in Brazos Valley GCD**

    Mr. Westbrook noted that this item had already been addressed at the last GMA 12 meeting. No action was taken.

11. **Discussion and possible action on adoption of Proposed Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) for the aquifers in GMA 12 for the fourth round of joint planning:**
    a. **Sparta**
    b. **Queen City**
    c. **Carrizo**
    d. **Calvert Bluff**
    e. **Simsboro**
    f. **Hooper**
    g. **Yegua-Jackson Aquifer**
    h. **Brazos River Alluvium**

    GMA members took a recess at 10:55 am

    GMA members reconvened at 11:03 am

    Steve Box made comment on this agenda item and stated his concern about pumping. He asked for the Colorado River Alluvium to be added to the list of relevant aquifers in GMA

After discussion, it was clarified that the Colorado River Alluvium could not be included in this round to have a DFC set because of lack of science and the formation had not been reviewed using the 9-factors in Section 36.108 and there is not ample time to do so this planning cycle.

Mr. Bradley answered clarifying questions from the GMA 12 members in regards to amending the DFCs at the beginning of the next cycle to include the Colorado River Alluvium, making sure that there is sufficient monitoring data, designating the alluvial as a minor aquifer, or to declare it relevant.

Dr. Miller noted that the local model for LPGCD was being modified and that the Colorado River Alluvium was going to be included in that future model.

Mr. Hernandez gave presentation recapping the process so far that GMA 12 has taken and asked BVGCD questions regarding the pumping file and the permit amounts that may or may not expire in September 2026.

Mr. Hernandez gave comment that the Districts were not close in reaching the Simsboro DFC and DFCs will not be reached in the next 5 years, therefore the LPGCD production would not be changed for the next 5 years. Mr. Hernandez stated that there was no disadvantages in keeping the current DFCs and then re-evaluating them in the next cycle.

Mr. Westbrook noted that part of Mr. DeGomez questions were answered as to why Vista Ridge permit hasn't been adjusted, and the answer was that the DFC hasn't been approached yet.

Mr. Westbrook recapped slides from a presentation from the March 17th GMA 12 meeting submitted by Intera. GMA 12 members discussed. Mr. Westbrook expressed the desire that POSGCD stay as close to current DFCs as possible.

GMA 12 members discussed which model run to present to their individual boards.

Andy Wier made comment on BVGCD pumping, future pumping, pumping affects from one GCD to another and mitigation. Mr. Wier asked the members to approve the PS4-2modv8 results as Proposed DFCs.

Agenda item 12 was opened simultaneously with agenda item 11.

12. Discussion and possible action on GMA 12 Resolution adopting Proposed Desired Future Conditions for relevant aquifers in GMA 12 for the fourth round of joint planning

Mr. Westbrook asked for discussion or action on this item. It was agreed to take one aquifer at a time for action as listed under the previous agenda item. Those are as follows:

g. PROPOSED DFC FOR THE YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER

After discussion, Mr. Van Dresar moved that GMA 12 maintain the Yegua Jackson DFCs at the current levels recently discussed within the GMA for the proposed DFCs for this round. He was seconded by Mr. Day.

Mr. Westbrook asked for some clarification regarding the motion. It was agreed the Proposed DFCs to be considered would be the updated DFCs presented most recently at GMA 12 that are the same as the current DFCs.

The DFC values in this motion for the Yegua-Jackson aquifer are expressed in average water level drawdown across each entire district from 2011 through 2079 as follows: METGCD 9; BVGCD 68; POSGCD 60; LPGCD Non-relevant; FCGCD 83.

There was no further discussion.

The motion passed unanimously of all present.

h. PROPOSED DFC FOR THE BRAZOS VALLEY ALLUVIUM

Mr. Day moved to adopt Proposed DFCs most recently presented to GMA 12 for the Brazos River Alluvium in POSGCD and BVGCD. He was seconded by Mr. Westbrook.

The DFC values in this motion for the Brazos River Alluvium aquifer are expressed in average water level drawdown across each entire district as follows:

For BVGCD –
-North of State Highway 21: Percent Saturation shall average at least 30 percent of total well depth from 2013 to 2080
-South of State Highway 21: Percent Saturation shall average at least 40 percent of total well depth from 2013 to 2080

For POSGCD-
Average Decrease in Saturated Thickness expressed in feet between January 2010 and December 2079:
-5 feet in Milam County in GMA 12
-6 feet in Burleson County in GMA 12

Mr. Westbrook asked for discussion. There was no further discussion.

The motion passed unanimously of all present.

a. PROPOSED DFC FOR THE SPARTA AQUIFER

Mr. Day moved to adopt the most recently proposed DFCs for the Sparta Aquifer based on PS4-2 mov v8. He was seconded by Mr. Hernandez.

The motion failed with 3 voting in favor with POSGCD and FCGCD voting against.

Mr. Westbrook moved that DFCs for Sparta Aquifer be based on PS3-19 pumping file extended through 2079 and included in a presentation to GMA 12 by Intera dated March 17, 2026.

The motion died for lack of a second.

After discussion, Mr. Van Dresar moved that proposed DFCs for the Sparta Aquifer be based on results of the PS4-2 mod v8 pumping file, recently presented by Spheros and as read by Mr. Hernandez, and was seconded by Mr. Bailey.

The DFC values in this motion for the Sparta aquifer are expressed in average water level drawdown across each entire district from 2011 through 2079 as follows: METGCD 22; BVGCD 57; POSGCD 46; LPGCD 22; FCGCD 57.

There was no further discussion.

The motion passed with 4 voting in favor with POSGCD voting against.

b. PROPOSED DFC FOR THE QUEEN CITY AQUIFER

Mr. Hernandez moved to adopt Queen City Aquifer DFCs based on the PS4-2 mod v8 presented by Spheros at the last meeting and was seconded by Mr. Bailey.

The DFC values in this motion for the Queen City aquifer are expressed in average water level drawdown across each entire district from 2011 through 2079 as follows: METGCD 19; BVGCD 46; POSGCD 30; LPGCD 31; FCGCD 96.

There was no further discussion.
The motion passed with 4 voting in favor with FCGCD voting against.

c. PROPOSED DFC FOR THE CARRIZO AQUIFER

Mr. Hernandez moved to adopt Carrizo Aquifer DFCs based on the PS4-2 mod v8 and was seconded by Mr. Bailey.

Mr. Westbrook provided comment regarding application of the variance that POSGCD used in the last round of joint planning, and how that affects the impacts in the Carrizo which has delayed management efforts by POSGCD to address impacts in wells across the area. Mr. Westbrook also noted that continuing to increase impacts will lead to more wells being affected.

Mr. Bailey asked a clarification question regarding the PS3-19 model run and whether the numbers were from the 2070 period or 2080 period. Mr. Westbrook clarified the numbers he is referencing extend through 2079. Mr. Bailey also asked about discussing variances during the 90-day public comment period.

Mr. Van Dresar commented that drawdown in FCGCD is not just due to one side but also from another GMA that they do not get to plan with and that it was out of FCGCD's control.

Mr. Day asked for a roll call vote.

Mr. Van Dresar– Yes
Mr. Hernandez – Yes
Mr. Westbrook – No
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Bailey – Yes

The motion failed with 3 voting in favor with 2 voting against.

Mr. Hernandez asked a clarification question regarding POSGCDs differences in DFCs between currently adopted and PS3-19 model run extended through 2080.

Mr. Van Dresar moved to adopt the current DFCs for the Carrizo Aquifer and was seconded by Mr. Westbrook.

Mr. Day asked clarifying question whether or not the PS3-19 model run DFCs were the 2070 DFCs or the extended 2080 DFCs.

Mr. Bailey – Yes
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – Yes
Mr. Hernandez asked a clarifying question to Mr. Bradley on whether or not using 2 different model runs in the model would cause issues for TWDB. Mr. Bradley commented that it could cause some issues.
Mr. Hernandez – No
Mr. Van Dresar – Yes

The motion failed with 3 voting in favor with 2 voting against.

After discussion of information provided by Mr. Bradley, Mr. Hernandez moved again to adopt Carrizo Aquifer DFCs based on the PS4-2 mod v8 and was seconded by Mr. Bailey.

Mr. Bailey – Yes
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – No
Mr. Hernandez – Yes
Mr. Van Dresar – No

The motion failed again with 3 voting against and 2 voting in favor.

Mr. Westbrook asked a clarifying question of Mr. Bradley regarding the pumping files and a variance allowed and whether or not it would be acceptable to Texas Water Development Board (TWDB). Mr. Bradley commented that there would have to be clarification given by the GMA. Mr. Bradley provided history on why variances were used. Mr. Westbrook made comments regarding making adjustments to POSGCD's pumping file to achieve the current adopted DFCs. Mr. Westbrook also commented that pumping

files should not be what drives a DFC, but that other factors such as aquifer conditions and management goals should be the driving factors. Mr. Beach asked a clarifying question regarding which decade was to be used. Dr. Young made clarifying comments regarding the use of variances in previous GMA 12 Explanatory Reports. Mr. Westbrook asked Dr. Young if the pumping file could be adjusted to match the currently adopted DFCs. Dr. Young commented saying the adjustment could be done for the Carrizo if adjustments were made to change the location and timing of production.

Mr. Westbrook moved to adopt DFCs currently in place for the Carrizo Aquifer using the PS3-19 with modifications from POSGCD pumping files and was seconded by Mr. Van Dresar.

Mr. Bailey asked for clarification on the pumping files in regard to using PS3-19 and PS4-2 mod v8 and adjusting POSGCDs file to fulfill the currently adopted DFC just for POSGCD.

After discussion, Mr. Westbrook and Mr. Van Dresar rescinded the motion and second.

Mr. Westbrook moved to adopt DFCs currently in place for the Carrizo Aquifer using the PS4-2 mod v8 with modifications to POSGCD pumping files as discussed to maintain current POSGCD DFC values and was seconded by Mr. Bailey.

The DFC values in this motion for the Carrizo aquifer are expressed in average water level drawdown across each entire district from 2011 through 2079 as follows: METGCD 48; BVGCD 84; POSGCD 146; LPGCD 139; FCGCD 140.

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Bailey – Yes
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – Yes
Mr. Hernandez – Yes
Mr. Van Dresar – Yes

The motion passed with 4 votes in favor and 1 against.

d. PROPOSED DFC FOR THE CALVERT BLUFF AQUIFER

Mr. Hernandez moved to adopt DFCs for the Calvert Bluff Aquifer based on results from the PS4-2 mod v8 pumping file.

Mr. Bailey asked for clarification if the same idea used for the Carrizo Aquifer could be used for the Calvert Bluff in adjusting pumping files.

Mr. Hernandez moved to adopt DFCs for the Calvert Bluff Aquifer based on results from the PS4-2 mod v8 pumping file and was seconded by Mr. Van Dresar.

Mr. Bailey – Yes

Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – No
Mr. Hernandez – Yes
Mr. Van Dresar – Yes

The motion failed with 3 votes in favor and 2 against.

Mr. Westbrook asked other members if it would be acceptable to them for him to rescind his vote and vote Yes for the motion. Each of the other members agreed this was acceptable to them. Mr. Westbrook rescinded his No vote and voted Yes.

The DFC values in this motion for the Calvert Bluff aquifer are expressed in average water level drawdown across each entire district from 2011 through 2079 as follows: METGCD 58; BVGCD 119; POSGCD 189; LPGCD 141; FCGCD Non-relevant.

The motion passed with 4 votes in favor and 1 against.

GMA Members recessed at 1:04 pm.

GMA members reconvened at 1:25 pm.

PROPOSED DFC FOR THE HOOPER AQUIFER

Mr. Hernandez moved to adopt DFCs for the Hooper Aquifer based on the PS4-2 mod v8 well file and was seconded by Mr. Van Dresar.

Mr. Bailey asked a clarifying question regarding whether or not the motion would also include the same well file modifications as those for the Carrizo Aquifer that were approved to be gathered during 90-day comment period. Mr. Hernandez amended his original motion to include that this is subject to well file modifications based on input from the 90-day comment period. Mr. Van Dresar seconded.

Mr. Bailey – Yes
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – No
Mr. Hernandez – Yes
Mr. Van Dresar – Yes

The motion failed with 3 votes in favor and 2 against.

Mr. Westbrook moved to use the values for the Hooper Aquifer as presented in the Intera presentation from March 17th.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Westbrook moved to use the PS4-2 mod v8 pumping file and modify as discussed in the Calvert Bluff and Carrizo motions.

After discussion, he withdrew this motion.

Mr. Hernandez moved to adopt proposed DFCs for the Hooper Aquifer based on PS4-2 mod v8, allowing POSGCD the ability to change its pumping file within the 90-day comment period. He was seconded by Mr. Bailey.

Mr. Westbrook asked clarifying questions about the motion and which DFCs were being voted on.

Mr. Bailey – Yes
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – No
Mr. Hernandez – Yes
Mr. Van Dresar – Yes

The motion failed with 3 votes in favor and 2 against.

Mr. Totten provided comment that Simsboro pumping can affect the Hooper aquifer and that the members may want to approve the Simsboro DFCs, with the caveat that they may be modified and may be lower due to the modification, first so that the Hooper DFCs may be modified along the way.

James Beach provided comment regarding the Water Journal article written by Steve Young and the redistribution of pumping and that clarification to the redistribution of pumping may need to be considered.

Mr. Van Dresar moved that the Districts that have a need for DFCs in the Hooper Aquifer state what their DFC is, make that the proposed DFC and let TWDB decide if it's reasonable/feasible and move forward.

Mr. Hernandez provided comment that there would be issues with mixing the different pumping files into the model. He also commented that when creating PS4-2, the goal was to keep the DFCs the same and that POSGCD had the opportunity to pick lower numbers.

Mr. Westbrook commented that the PS4-2 run was intended to be a best estimate run, and not necessarily with the goal to achieve the same DFCs, and LPGCD was the only District that modified its pumping numbers in PS4-2 to achieve the original DFCs. Mr. Day agreed.
Mr. Hernandez stated that LPGCD thought the goal of the model run was to achieve the same DFCs and that is why they modified their pumping file the way they did.

Mr. Van Dresar provided clarifying comment regarding his motion that his motion did not include a model run as part of the motion.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mrs. Ferry provided comment that after reading the summary for the 2010 GAM Run, the TWDB was given DFC numbers and that the TWDB was to provide the well file. However, when modifying the Simsboro Aquifer, drawdowns in the Hooper Aquifer changed and could not match the DFC provided for the Hooper. The condition of no drawdown exceeding the DFCs by more than 1 foot in scenario 33, was made possible by eliminating pumping from the Hooper formation in POSGCD. A good match for most of the DFCs that can be achieved if one of the DFCs deviates significantly.

Mr. Totten provided comment that the pumping file submitted does not have to be in support of the DFCs, so there is time to make the modifications until January 5 to get to the final pumping file. Instead of getting caught up with the pumping file, pick numbers that work and move on.

Mr. Bradley suggested that the members state what they want and let the consultants figure it out so that the GMA members have stated a proposed DFC.

Mr. Day asked for clarifying question regarding if the number had to be a run that was already done or if it could just be a number.

Mr. Bradley provided comment to Mr. Days question.

Mr. Westbrook moved to adopt DFCs for the Hooper Aquifer based on slide 8 from the Intera presentation given on March 17th, under the PS3-19 model run column. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bailey.

Mr. Van Dresar made comment that the Hooper Aquifer was non-relevant for FCGCD.

Mr. Hernandez asked if the motion could be amended to let LPGCD set their proposed DFC at 157. After discussion, Mr. Hernandez rescinded his amendment.

The DFC values in this motion for the Hooper aquifer are expressed in average water level drawdown across each entire district from 2011 through 2079 as follows: METGCD 74; BVGCD 146; POSGCD 190; LPGCD 147; FCGCD Non-relevant.

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Bailey – Yes
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – Yes
Mr. Hernandez – Yes
Mr. Van Dresar – Yes

The motion passed with 4 votes in favor and 1 against.

e. PROPOSED DFC FOR THE SIMSBORO AQUIFER

Mr. Westbrook moved to adopt DFCs for the Simsboro Aquifer based on slide 8 from the Intera presentation given on March 17th, under the PS3-19 model run column. He was seconded by Mr. Bailey.

Mr. Day BVGCD had trimmed the pumping files in the last round and that they would not support that again.

Mr. Hernandez stated that LPGCD could not support PS3-19 model run because the pumping file did not include the Gatehouse permits.

Mr. Bailey – Yes
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – Yes
Mr. Hernandez – No
Mr. Van Dresar– No

The motion failed with 3 votes against and 2 in favor.

Mr. Van Dresar moved that each District that has a need for a DFC in the Simsboro Aquifer state their proposed DFC without reference to a model and submit for proposal and given to public for comment and action. He was seconded by Mr. Hernandez.

The motion was clarified that before voting each GCD would need to state their value so the values to be considered would be known. LPGCD proposed a DFC of 261 which is consistent with PS4-mod v8 file. FCGCD would be deemed as non-relevant in the Simsboro Aquifer. POSGCD proposed a DFC of 288 consistent with slide 8 from the Intera presentation given on March 17th, 2026 under the PS3-19 model run column. Mr. Day stated his disagreement with this process, but if forced stated that BVGCD proposed a DFC of 330. METGCD proposed a DFC of 85.

The DFC values in this motion for the Simsboro aquifer are expressed in average water level drawdown across each entire district from 2011 through 2079 as follows: METGCD 85; BVGCD 330; POSGCD 288; LPGCD 261; FCGCD Non-relevant.

Mr. Bailey – Yes
Mr. Day – No
Mr. Westbrook – Yes
Mr. Hernandez – Yes
Mr. Van Dresar – Yes

The motion passed with 4 in favor and 1 against.

Mr. Westbrook asked if the members would like to use the resolution which had been prepared for the meeting. It was agreed that a cover letter would suffice in lieu of a resolution.

Mr. Van Dresar moved that the Chairman of GMA 12 issue a cover letter with Proposed DFCs and other information as required and proceed with notice as required. He was seconded by Mr. Bailey. The motion passed unanimously of all present.

13. Discussion and possible action on Explanatory Report for GMA 12 for the fourth round of joint planning

Dr. Miller asked what GMA 12 members would like to see from consultants for the Explanatory Report during the 90-day public comment period. Mr. Westbrook advised consultants to begin putting together a packet of all the relevant information that is readily accessible by GMA 12 members and the public.

She also asked how consultants should approach the well file for agenda item 12. Mr. Westbrook stated POSGCD will have Intera evaluate their proposed DFCs/pumping files for consideration by the POSGCD Board. He advised others to do the same.

Mr. Beach asked a clarifying question regarding the 90-day timeline and adjustments of well files and discussions amongst consultants. GMA 12 members agreed that consultants should communicate with each other.

Mrs. Ferry asked a clarifying question regarding how the pumping files will be evaluated since no pumping files will be submitted with the proposed DFCs.

14. Update from Texas Water Development Board

Robert Bradley gave updates. GMA 12 is the 12th GMA to propose DFCs. He stated that the draft State Water Plan is out, phase 1 is the slimmed down version of State Water Plan so that it can be approved. Phase 2, which is the entire State Water Plan, will be out next year. Chapter 356 Groundwater Management Rules are still posted and comments will be allowed until May 17th. He reminded GMA 12 members methodology to track and achieve DFCs has to be in the explanatory report and management plans. Mr. Day asked about the GCD grants and notice provided from TWDB. Mr. Bradley stated that the Trinity River Alluvium model is still in the works.

15. Public Comment on items not included on the agenda

Mr. Wier asked if some items could be included in the table of proposed DFCs, 1) an explanation of what the average drawdown is, the amount of pumping that is included in the drawdown numbers, drawdown maps, and percent of remaining available drawdown.

16. Agenda items and date for next meeting

Mr. Totten provided comment that at least 1 meeting be held during the public comment period to review the modifications to the pumping files.

There is no GMA 12 meeting scheduled at this time. They will be scheduled as needed moving forward.

17. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

THE ABOVE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT AREA 12 HELD ON APRIL 27, 2026 WERE APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY GMA 12 ON_____.

ATTEST:

_____
Post Oak Savannah Groundwater Conservation District

_____
Mid-East Texas Groundwater Conservation District

_____
Fayette County Groundwater Conservation District

_____
Brazos Valley Groundwater Conservation District

_____
Lost Pines Groundwater Conservation District