

Disclaimer: Review and approval of draft minutes by the BBASC for their July 18-19, 2011, July 28, 2011, August 2-3, 2011, August 16, 2011 and August 29, 2011 meetings did not occur until after the report submittal date of September 1, 2011. Members reviewed and provided comments on the draft minutes which were then presented for approval during the November 17, 2011 BBASC meeting. At this meeting the members agreed by consensus to approve the draft minutes for those meeting dates noted above, with member comments reflected verbatim as part of the minutes, as a reflection of the official record.

**Guadalupe, San Antonio, Mission, and Aransas Rivers and
Mission, Copano, Aransas, and San Antonio Bays
Basin and Bay Area Stakeholder Committee (BBASC)
Monday, July 18, 2011 & Tuesday, July 19, 2011**

San Antonio Water System (SAWS) Customer Service Building, Room CR 145
2800 US Highway 281 North
San Antonio, Texas 78212

MINUTES

Members Present: Suzanne Scott, Chair; Dianne Wassenich, Vice Chair; Tyson Broad; Thurman Clements; Karl Dreher; Paula DiFonzo; Jennifer Ellis; Steve Fotiades; Chris Hale; Jerry James; James Lee Murphy; Mike Mecke; Mike Peters; Con Mims; Jack Campbell; Kim Stoker; Garrett Engelking; Bill Braden; Myron Hess (for Ken Dunton); Josh Gray (for Jay Gray); Walter Womack; Jennifer Youngblood.

I. Introductions:

Roll call was taken and a quorum was reached.

II. Public Comment:

There was no public comment at this time.

III. Discussion and Agreement on Agenda

The agenda was approved.

IV. Approval of Minutes from the June 1, 2011 Meeting

Minutes for the June 1, 2011 meeting were approved.

V. Discussion and Agreement on Interim BBASC Recommendations, Brian Perkins, HDR

Facilitator Presentation (Rozelle)

Marty Rozelle, the Rozelle Group, reviewed the BBASC purpose statement. She reviewed the process that will be used to review each of the gages and the guidelines for a productive group interaction. [She reviewed some points about consensus: the group's meeting rules developed over a year ago defines consensus; consensus doesn't mean unanimity; it means your interests are met to some degree; means you don't have to like it. Red/Yellow/Green cards to indicate where people are. Red means stop. Can't move forward. Red is then asked what do you need to move forward? What would have to change to allow you to move forward? Need to share all relevant information. If it is going to affect things today or down the line, the group needs to know it.](#)

TPWD Response to Subsistence Flows (Mayes)

Kevin Mayes, TPWD, discussed TPWD staff's role in the BBEST process and the TPWD memo generated in response to the BBEST report regarding low subsistence flows recommended in the report. Mr. Mayes responded to questions raised by members about specific issues raised in the response and why TPWD felt these concerns were so critical.

Report on Pulse Implementation Sub-Committee Recommendations

Committee chair Suzanne Scott stated that at the last meeting, members created a subcommittee to review pulse requirements. The workgroup held several conference calls and guided Brian Perkins, HDR/Technical consultant, in preparing a series of concepts on how to approach ~~defining-formulating~~ pulses ~~exemptions~~. Mr. Perkins, presented these concepts and the results from the subcommittee. The two concepts suggested at the last meeting were as follows:

- Concept 1: Diversion Rate-Pulse Peak Ratio Method. Using the pulse magnitude vs. maximum diversion rate authorized, determine which pulses would apply. ~~This idea lead to discussion of Applicable to on-channel reservoirs vs. /off channel reservoirs and-run of the river diversions and off-channel reservoirs;~~
- Concept 2: Permitting Test Method. Using the pulses as a test during the permitting process and not necessarily written into the permit.

Subcommittee members looked at the concepts in more detail and how to implement each. Mr. Perkins presented the results of applying each concept and showed how the results varied.

Mr. Perkins: Concept 1: All five tiers would be in recommendations, but when applicant came in, would be exempt from some or all pulses because the diversion rate of the applicant would be so small that they couldn't actually affect that pulse. Exemption test for each pulse. Therefore applicant wouldn't have to have that requirement in their permit.

Mr. Perkins: For on-channel reservoirs, have in theory a very large diversion/impoundment rate. Therefore, in theory, all pulses would apply. For Run of River however, if higher than ratio, pulse would apply. If lower, would not apply.

Members discussed the different concepts and the advantages/disadvantages of each. Members requested Mr. Perkins to look at the cumulative effects of evaluating multiple simultaneous projects. He reminded members of the effect on priority appropriation on existing and new water rights. Members pointed out that prior appropriation system did not eliminate concerns about cumulative effects, and that multiple projects with pulse exemptions could result in affecting pulses.

Members asked BBEST Chairman Sam Vaugh to discuss the differences between the BBEST recommendations and the two concepts under consideration. Chairman Vaugh stated that the BBEST presented how they thought the pulses could be implemented to maintain a sound ecological environment and the BBEST charge did not extend to evaluating the permitting and operational intricacies as the BBASC has undertaken.

Chair Scott suggested a preliminary vote on the proposed concepts and members favored Concept 1. After further discussion, there was a general agreement to use Concept 1 and determine the standard for the prescribed ratio after further analysis and discussion.

Chair Scott discussed the efforts of the subcommittee to address concerns noted by member

Comment [TB1]: As discussed at BBASC meeting of Oct 11, 2011, the references the pulse exemptions to on-channel reservoirs should be removed.

Mike Peters regarding the complexity of the tiered approach. They discussed the use of the 12 month rolling average to establish what hydrologic trigger applied, and how the hydrologic conditions set at the beginning of the season would be constant for that season. She talked about the subcommittees concern with lack of tools to manage this type of permit and the ongoing efforts to develop one.

Chair Scott said the subcommittee also discussed the tiers of base flows and the management of it. The subcommittee didn't have a specific recommendation on this issue, but did note several things relating to this: BBEST recommended 3 tiered system of base flows based on habitat considerations, the instream flow recommendations for the San Antonio recommended 3 tiered system based on habitat conditions, and Dr. Hardy stated that 3 tiered base flows was necessary for habitat/variability reasons—that some adjustments could be made to the numbers in the boxes, but not to the 3 tier structure.

Continuation of Gage by Gage Review and Discussion

Members evaluated options, using the BBEST recommendations as a starting point, regarding BBASC discussion and follow up analysis. They discussed concerns and conditions, and noted concerns or preliminary approval on each. **No formal decisions were made on recommendations at this meeting. These discussions and preliminary decisions will be revisited prior to adopting recommendations for each site.**

Gage: GUADALUPE at COMFORT

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendations: 2cfs – 10 cfs

Q95

TPWD high concern based on considered this site to haveing minimal habitat

Members **AGREED** to use the Q95 values for fall, winter and spring, and the BBEST numbers for the summer season.

50 % Rule

- Mr. Perkins explained that during a dry hydrologic condition when flow falls below the base flow numbers, the permit holder could divert ½ the flows present down to subsistence.

Members discussed applying the 50% rule to the Q95 numbers. No decision was made.

Base Flows

BBEST recommendations: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving avg.

- Mr. Perkins explained the proposed three tier approach to base flows as follows:
 - o Wet Hydrologic Condition 25% of the time
 - o Average Hydrologic Condition 50% of the time
 - o Dry Hydrologic Condition 25% of the time

Three levels of baseflow determined at the beginning of the season based on a twelve month rolling average of stream flow. During Wet and Average base flows, a new water right cannot divert below the base flows. During the dry conditions, there will be some diversions below subsistence base dry (as yet to be determined). ????

Members **AGREED** to use the three tier approach as described including the values recommended by the BBEST.

Pulse/Overbank Flows

BBEST recommendation: 5 tiers

Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)

Comment [TB2]: Proper definition of 50% rule needs to inserted: Seasonal subsistence flow plus 50 percent of the difference between inflow and the seasonal subsistence...as per 4.1.1.3c

Comment [DCH3]: Per suggestion the following sentence (4.1.1.3c of the report) will be included where noted: Under dry hydrologic conditions, if inflow is less than the seasonal base value and greater than the seasonal subsistence value, then the seasonal subsistence flow plus 50 percent of the difference between inflow and the seasonal subsistence value must be passed, and the balance may be impounded or diverted to the extent available, subject to senior water rights.

Comment [E4]: Although this is what Brian actually said (42.00), I suggest either striking it or correcting it b/c he misspoke (never divert below subsistence)

Members **AGREED** to Concept 1, to use a percentage of the authorized diversion rate and will determine what percent at the 2nd day's meeting. [Mr. Perkins points out that BBASC doesn't need to recommend all 5 tiers, could recommend 3 \(or other\) instead. \(Differentiate high flow pulse from overbank flows\).](#) Members acknowledged a need to make a distinction between high flow pulses and overbank flows. [Another member noted there are no overbank flows at this gage.](#)

Gage: GUADALUPE at SPRING BRANCH

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendations: 1.3 cfs – 6.6 cfs

Q95. [except for summer which is BBEST](#)

Annual Average Across Seasons

TPWD: high concerns, [considered based on](#) this site ~~to have~~ [ing](#) minimal/limited habitat

Members **AGREED** to an annual average across the seasons.

50 % Rule

Members agreed to apply the 50% rule to 18 cfs ~~for all seasons~~. [The 50% rule is defined: Under dry hydrologic conditions, if inflow is less than the seasonal base value and greater than the seasonal subsistence value, then the seasonal subsistence flow plus 50 percent of the difference between inflow and the seasonal subsistence value must be passed, and the balance may be impounded or diverted to the extent available, subject to senior water rights.](#)

Comment [TB5]: Proper definition of 50% rule needed here

Formatted: Font: Georgia

Formatted: Font: Georgia, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Georgia

Formatted: Font: Georgia, 12 pt

Base Flows

BBEST recommendations: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving avg.

Members **AGREED** to use the three tier approach as described including the values recommended by the BBEST.

Pulse/Overbank Flows

BBEST recommendation: 5 tiers

Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)

Specify Overbank Flows

Members **AGREED** to Concept 1, to use a percentage of the authorized diversion rate and will determine what percent at the second day session. Members did not need to make a distinction between high flow pulses and overbank flows since there are no overbank flows at this location.

Gage: BLANCO at WIMBERLY

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendations: 6.7cfs – 7.9 cfs

Q95

TPWD: high concerns, [considered based on](#) this site ~~to have~~ [ing](#) minimal habitat

Members **AGREED** to use the Q95 values for all seasons.

50 % Rule

Members agreed to use the 50% rule to the seasonal Q95 ~~numbers~~ [as recommended by the BBEST.](#)

Comment [TB6]: Proper description needed

Base Flows

BBEST recommendations: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving avg.

Members **AGREED** to use the three tier approach as described including the values recommended by the BBEST and members **AGREED** to the hydrologic conditions as presented by the BBEST.

Pulse/Overbank Flows

BBEST recommendation: 5 tiers (no overbank flows)
Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)

Members **AGREED** to use the BBEST recommendation.

Gage: SAN MARCOS RIVER at LULING

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendations: 73 cfs – 78 cfs
Q95 – Seasonal values for fall, winter, and spring
TPWD: moderate concerns, no habitat modeling available

Members **AGREED** to use the Q95 values for fall, winter and spring, and the BBEST numbers for the summer season.

50 % Rule

Members **AGREED** applying the 50% rule to the Q95 values for fall, winter and spring, and the BBEST numbers for the summer season as recommended by the BBEST.

Comment [TB7]: Proper description needed

Base Flows

BBEST recommendations: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving avg.

Members **AGREED** to use the three tier approach as described including the values recommended by the BBEST and members **AGREED** to the hydrologic conditions as presented by the BBEST.

Pulse/Overbank Flows

BBEST recommendation: 5 tiers (top 3 tiers overbank flows and pulses)
Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)

Members **AGREED** to Concept 1, to use a percentage of the authorized diversion rate and will determine what percent at the second day session.

Members discussed whether to apply Concept 1 to all 5 tiers, whether to reduce the number of tiers, and the liability, or lack of liability of overbank flows. Members talked about the liability and potential financial penalties resulting from property damage caused by these flows. They debated whether these requirements will obligate water right holders to not implement flood control, allow flood flows that result in downstream flooding and a liable situation for the water right holder. Members also discussed the biological benefits of overbank flows that naturally occur. Members discussed the potential of having flood control built into discussion on strategies.

Gage: PLUM CREEK at LULING

Members discussed the water quality issues present at this gage.

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendation: 1.0 cfs
Q95 – Seasonal values for fall, winter, and spring

Members **AGREED** to use the BBEST recommendation.

50 % Rule

Members **AGREED** applying the 50% rule to the BBEST recommendation.

Comment [TB8]: This is a correct description that could be used thru the rest of the minutes.

Base Flows

BBEST recommendations: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving avg.
Members **AGREED** to use the three tier approach as described including the values recommended by the BBEST and members **AGREED** to the hydrologic conditions as presented by the BBEST.

Pulse/Overbank Flows

BBEST recommendation: 5 tiers
Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)
Members **AGREED** to Concept 1, to use a percentage of the authorized diversion rate and will determine what percent at the second day session. Members had the same concerns regarding the number of tiers as were expressed for the gage at San Marcos at Luling.

Gage: SANDIES near WESTHOFF

[Mr. Perkins noted:](#)
[TPWD high level of concern](#)
[No water temperature concerns](#)
[Many DO violations](#)

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendations: 1.0 cfs
Q95
Members **AGREED** to use the Q95 values for all seasons.

50 % Rule

Members **AGREED** to applying the 50% rule ~~to the Q95 values for all seasons:~~
[as recommended by the BBEST](#)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

Base Flows

BBEST recommendations: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving avg.
Members **AGREED** to use the three tier approach as described including the values recommended by the BBEST and members **AGREED** to the hydrologic conditions as presented by the BBEST.

Pulse/Overbank Flows

BBEST recommendation: 5 tiers (top 3 tiers overbank flows and pulses)
Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)
Members **AGREED** to Concept 1, to use a percentage of the authorized diversion rate and will determine what percent at the second day session. Members **AGREED** to apply Concept 1 to the 5 tiers.

Gage: GUADALUPE at GONZALES

Mr. Perkins presented the additional information available from the evaluation of this site. He talked about the supplemental studies done by BBEST member Dr. Thom Hardy on habitat relationships and the adjustments that Dr. Hardy would make to the ~~BBSET~~ BBEST recommendations for base flows. Mr. Perkins presented the results from HDR's additional analysis on base flows and the evaluation of the mid basin project located here.

[\(2:57:00\) Full BBEST: Mid-Basin firm yield = 13,150 acft firm yield](#)

Dry Base down 40cfs and base ave and base wet down 40cfs= 13,525 acft firm yield
Dry Base down 40cfs, base ave and base wet decreased proportionally = 13,650 acft firm yield

GBRA completed some additional work on the data available at this location. Mr. Tony Smith, consultant for GBRA, presented the results of this work to members. GBRA presented their recommendation based on the results of their evaluation of the data used by the BBEST is one level of subsistence, one level of base dry and one level of pulses at this location based on their interpretation of best available science. GBRA is recommending the TCEQ East Texas structure (one level of subsistence, one level of base dry and one level of pulses) for this location.

BBEST member Dr. Norman Johns presented the inflow analysis on the impacts of applying the TCEQ structure to the Guadalupe at Gonzales. His analysis showed that the TCEQ structure applied to this project leaves-causes some change, a decline, in inflows particularly in the summer. Dr. Johns noted that the analysis shows a decrease in the habitat quality (Oysters and *Rangia*).

Members had a very lengthy discussion about the Mid-Basin project and balancing for human water supply needs.

Comment [E9]: There is a major portion of notes missing here. All the discussion about the Mid-Basin project, balancing, where the yield impacts are, the scientific basis for various viewpoints, as well as all the voting on the gage. Did TCEQ's tape end before the meeting was over? I tried to fill in what I could.

Member Jim Murphy stated that bottom line for GBRA is that this project will not harm the estuary or instream. Based on BBEST #s. BBEST: 13,xxx aft. TCEQ structure: 25,xxx. Charge of BBASC is to look at human needs. MDP is most realistic plan. This project 25,000 acft, combining with groundwater adding additional 23,000 to 25,000 acft, used conjunctively. No other plans as close to be built. This project cost if \$2-\$4 Million. Human needs project that can be built with TCEQ East Texas structure without harm. This one will be built. If we are going to look at human needs, this is the place to do it.

Another member noted that yield impact is at base flow tiers, not pulse.

Subsistence Flows:

BBEST recs: no red, 16 green. Lost Jim
No vote on Q95 since no reds on BBEST
50% rule: 2 red, 2 yellow, 18 green

More discussion on 50% rule. Thoughts from Sam Vaugh re: habitat curves showing that there is better quality of habitat at lower flows at this location. Questions from member asked about the other two legs of the stool that are the other two pieces of the science picture. Mr. Vaugh reported not having much data on those other legs (water quality, temperature). Kevin Mayes tries to address why this is counterintuitive, says he would have to delve into the curves. Perhaps because habitat is being moved from one area to another.

Re-vote on 50% rule: 4 reds (??)

Base Flows: 6 reds

Base Flow, one tier structure: 9 reds, 8 yellow, 4 green

More discussion about why people were voting red. Chair Scott noted that all the science the group has seen so far has pointed to the need for three tiers of base flows, that the system needs that variability. Vice-Chair Wassenich notes that the BBASC would like to build such a project, and that she believes we could build, size it and operate it in such a way (3 tiers, 50%

rule etc.) where we could have the project but not take more water from the system at times it really needs it.

Mr. Vaugh goes through additional figures to show where yield gain sits within the flow curves as well as where the environmental impacts are. He notes the flat spots in the curves.

Marty asks if anyone would change their vote. No changes.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

July 19, 2011 - Day 2 Session

Introduction

Chair Suzanne Scott called the second day of the meeting to order. Roll Call was taken and a quorum was reached.

Public Comments: The BBASC were presented with a resolution by the Rockport-Fulton Chamber of Commerce urging members to recommend freshwater inflows sufficient to maintain the health of the bays and estuaries and to support endangered whooping cranes. The resolution is attached to these minutes.

Ron Outen spoke about there being no difference between human and environmental needs, that they are one in the same. Bays are the economic engine of significant economy. Not just for Aransas Co, but for San Antonio and other communities served.

Committee facilitator Marty Rozelle, Rozelle Group, led a discussion on the activities of the previous day session. A member noted being confused about differences between Region L Mid-Basin project and the Mid-Basin project being talked about here, and not being sure whether we were getting an apples to apples comparison. Another member raised concerns about how curves/graphs were being presented. Chair Scott wanted to ask more questions of Ed Oborny about one tier of base flows and the impacts of that vs. the importance of more tiers. Another member noted concerns about the bays not getting enough freshwater inflow at the right times.

Member Mims noted he didn't want to see this process erode surface water projects in Region L plan. So when talking about Mid-Basin project, would like to see how the BBEST recommendations affect the Region L project. A handout was distributed showing the various versions of the Mid-Basin project and various yields based on various environmental criteria. This analysis was discussed in depth by members, looking at yields, costs, reservoir sizes, and environmental criteria.

It was noted that doubling the size of the Mid-Basin Project reservoir would allow you to keep the yield of the reservoir at 25,000 acft and meet the full BBEST environmental flow recommendations with an increase from \$3.32 per 1,000 gallons to \$3.68 per 1,000 gallons.

GBRA noted that their internal cost figures were higher and their customers wouldn't pay such an increase as well as additional concerns about trying to shut down permitting in the basin.

Chair Scott asked Ed Oborny to go into some detail about justifications of three tiers of base flows vs. one tier of base flows. Technical consultant Ed Oborny explained how the projects evaluated during the BBASC review are to determine what effect future projects may have on the basin. He walked thru an example to show how the (a?) project was evaluated and how the results can be applied. He emphasized that when looking at analyses, that we have been just looking at one project. One project may not make a difference in the variability, but when you do multiple projects, you probably will start to impact it. You have to look at cumulative effect.

Members also discussed the justification for the percentages used throughout the recommendations (Hydrologic conditions).

Chair Scott stated that it is the BBASC's charge to consider the human needs in their ultimate recommendation.

Continuation of Gage by Gage Review and Discussion

Gage: GUADALUPE at GONZALES cont.

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendations: 180 cfs – 210 cfs

Q95

TPWD: low/moderate concern

Members **AGREED** to use the BBEST recommendation.

50 % Rule

Members **AGREED** applying the 50% rule to the BBEST recommendation.

Base Flows

BBEST recommendations: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving avg.

GBRA recommendation: one level of base dry

Members **AGREED** to use the three tier approach as described including the values recommended by the BBEST and members and members

Hydrology Conditions

BBEST recommendations: 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving average

Members **AGREED** to the hydrologic conditions as presented by the BBEST.

Tier Flow Volumes

BBEST recommendations values for dry, average, and wet baseflows

Dr. Hardy adjustments: 40 cfs to dry base flow & proportionate adjustment to wet and average base flows

Members **AGREED** to use Dr. Hardy's recommendation for dry/average/wet volumes

Pulse/Overbank Flows

BBEST recommendation: 5 tiers (top 3 tiers overbank flows and 2 pulses)

Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)

Members **AGREED** to Concept 1, to use a percentage of the authorized diversion rate and will determine what percent at the second day session. Members **AGREED** to apply Concept 1 to the 5 tiers.

Gage: GUADALUPE at VICTORIA

Mr. Jerry James discussed his concerns with the 50% rule, the addition of Dr. Hardy's adjustments, and the potential impact to future permits of the City of Victoria.

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendations: 110 cfs – 160 cfs

TPWD: moderate concern

Members **AGREED** to use the BBEST recommendation.

50 % Rule

Members **AGREED** applying the 50% rule to the BBEST recommendation.

Base Flows

BBEST recommendations: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving avg.
GBRA recommendation: one level of dry base flow

Members **AGREED** to use the three tier approach as described including the values recommended by the BBEST and members and members.

Hydrology Conditions

BBEST recommendations: 25%/50%/25% Baseflow 12 mo. moving average

Members **AGREED** to the hydrologic conditions as presented by the BBEST.

Member James Lee Murphy stated that GBRA were of the opinion that the group is not considering human needs as is the charge of the BBASC, and is more concerned with the effects to the environment. He added that the decisions of the BBASC will hinder any possibility of a project being developed for the next 15 years using the present engineering, and showed a lack of confidence in the TCEQ methodology. He requested that the record state that GBRA believes the BBASC failed in its charge to evaluate the structure in human needs.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Georgia, 12 pt

Comment [E10]: I think if we are going to include this (which I think should be included, for the record) we also need to include documentation here of the balancing efforts. That is why I have tried to add some detail of some of these discussions.

Chair Scott stated that she confirmed with Mr. Todd Chenoweth, TCEQ. Mr. Chenoweth stated that the TCEQ did not have a methodology in place for determining "wet, dry and average" conditions. The TCEQ does not have a preference for the necessity of separating a base flow into different hydrological conditions, or how a flow regime must be broken up. The TCEQ would like to see recommendations on these issues from the BBASC. If the BBASC recommends different flows for "wet, dry and average conditions" then the TCEQ would like to see the BBASC's recommendations on how to define those terms for the basin. Mr. Cory Horan, TCEQ, confirmed that TCEQ does not have a specific methodology in place for this basin and will weigh the recommendations and comments of the SAC, BBEST, BBASC and others received throughout this process in the development of standards for this basin. Members were reminded that the purpose of the BBASC to balance environmental flows with human needs.

Tier Flow Volumes

BBEST recommendations values for dry, average, and wet baseflows

Dr. Hardy adjustments: reduce dry base value by 50 cfs, wet base by 75 cfs and average base flows by something between (50 cfs – 75 cfs)

Members **AGREED** to use Dr. Hardy's recommendation for dry/average/wet volumes
Members will further discuss the use of Dr. Hardy's recommendation for dry/average/wet volumes since three members had strongly feelings against the recommendation.

Pulse/Overbank Flows

BBEST recommendation: 5 tiers (top 3 tiers overbank flows and 2 pulses)

Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)

Members **AGREED** to Concept 1, to use a percentage of the authorized diversion rate and will determine what percent at the second day session. Members **AGREED** to apply Concept 1 to the 5 tiers.

Gage: GUADALUPE at CUERO

Mr. Perkins noted that the Cuero-Victoria gage is located downstream of the gage at Victoria Cuero and upstream of the gage at Gonzales. He added that members should bear in mind the groups' decision to reduce the flows at both these gages when considering

recommendations for this gage. Members discussed the geologic differences in the locations.

Subsistence Flows

BBEST recommendations: 86 cfs – 130 cfs

Dr. Hardy adjustments (50-75 cfs shifts for all levels)

TPWD: moderate concern with subsistence flows

Members **AGREED** to use the BBEST recommendation.

50 % Rule

Members **AGREED** applying the 50% rule to the BBEST recommendation.

Chair Scott announced that after consideration of the Guadalupe at Cuero gage, the facilitators will lead a discussion to determine what the “yellow vote actually means.” Members who voted red or yellow must make their concerns known so the BBASC can direct the BBEST and/or contractors to complete any work needed to address those concerns before the formal decision is made at the August 3, 2011 meeting on the BBASC recommendation.

VI. Discussion and Agreement on Strategies to Meet Environmental Flow Standards, Brian Perkins, HDR

San Antonio Basin

Dr. Norman Johns presented the results of his additional work on the mid-basin project presented during the previous day session. He analyzed the project using the TCEQ structure and showed the variations in the results. Members asked numerous questions about the methodology, decision points, and values derived. Ed Oborny stated that the Instream Flow Program did not look at the environmental conditions using the 50% rule because the program does not look at implementation.

Mr. Perkins will perform an additional iteration where the subsistence flows are reduced from 80 cfs to 60 cfs. This additional analysis may result in a change in attainment level.

However, with the 50% rule applied, the change may be minimal. ~~Dr. Mr. ?~~ Oborny stated that existing analysis indicates more iterations are needed. Members postponed voting on this item.

Mr. Perkins gave an overview of the work done on the Guadalupe at Cuero gage before members returned to voting on their recommendation for this gage.

Gage: SAN ANTONIO at GOLIAD

Chair Scott noted that the instream flow committee report [for SB2](#) was an interim report and the review will not be complete until August.

Structure

BBEST structure

SB2 (best available science) structure (Texas Instream Flow Program)

Members **AGREED** to use the SB2 recommendation.

Subsistence Flows with/without 50% Rule

SB2 recommendation: 80 cfs

Alternate recommendation: 60 cfs with 50% rule

Members **AGREED** to use the alternate recommendation of 60 cfs with the 50% rule.

Base Flows and Hydrologic Conditions

Recommendation: 3 tiers 25%/50%/25% Baseflow, seasonal average

Formatted: Font: (Default) Georgia, 12 pt, Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) Georgia, 12 pt, Highlight

GBRA recommendation: one level of dry base flow
Members **AGREED** to the three tier 25%/50%/25% base flow based on seasonal averages.

High Flow Pulses

Recommendation: as presented on the handout

Concept 1: % of authorized diversion rate (% to be determined)

Members **AGREED** to recommendation as presented on the handout...[brief explanation of handout or better identify](#)

Overbank Flows

Recommendation: as presented on the handout

Members **AGREED** to recommendation as presented on the handout

Gage: SAN ANTONIO at FALLS CITY and SAN ANTONIO at ELMENDORF

Members agreed to use the same recommendations at the Falls City and Elmendorf gages as was agreed to for the gage at Goliad.

VII. Meeting Dates, Times and Locations

The next meeting will be held at 1:00 on Tuesday, August 2, 2011 and at 8:30 on Wednesday, August 3, 2011 at SAWS.

IX. Public Comment

X. Adjourn



Rockport Fulton

Chamber of Commerce

Resolution concerning the health and productivity of the bays and estuaries in and surrounding Aransas County Texas:

Whereas, the main mission of the Rockport-Fulton Chamber of Commerce is to promote the profitability and growth of businesses in Aransas County,

Whereas, the well being, profitability and growth of these businesses is dependent on the one million visitors, including Winter Texans, who regard the city of Rockport and the town of Fulton as a prime destination for the enjoyment of vacation time and water based recreational activities which include fishing, boating, kayaking, and the enjoyment of beaches and waterfronts,

Whereas, these activities are dependent on the health of the county's bays and estuaries,

Whereas, an endangered species, the Whooping Crane, winters in the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge and surrounding areas in Aransas County,

Whereas, a high number of these waterfowl died as a result of the drought of 2009 due to the lack of sufficient blue crabs, one of their main food sources,

Whereas, the blue crab is dependent on sufficient freshwater inflows,

Whereas, the numbers of redfish, speckled sea trout and flounder have declined in periods of drought to the extent that local fishing guides are forced to other areas of the coastal bend in order to satisfy catch requirements of their clients,

Whereas, the harvest of oysters and shrimp normally taken in these bays has been much reduced,

Whereas, the legislative intent of Senate Bill 3 was to provide for sufficient fresh water inflows to provide for the viability of our bays and estuaries and comply with the Texas Water Code,

On this 21st day of June, 2011, then be it resolved that the Rockport- Fulton Chamber of Commerce does support and urges the Guadalupe, San Antonio, Mission, and Aransas Rivers and Mission, Copano, Aransas, and San Antonio Bays Basin and Bay Area Stakeholder Committee to recommend freshwater flows which are sufficient to maintain the health of these bays and in particular provide for support of the endangered Whooping Crane which winters in the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge.



President/CEO



404 BROADWAY, ROCKPORT, TX 78382 • 1.800.242.0071 • 361.729.6445 • FAX 361.729.7681
www.rockport-fulton.org