

## Alan Day

---

**From:** Gary Westbrook <posgcd@tconline.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 01, 2015 11:05 AM  
**To:** Alan Day; "Jim Totten"; David Bailey; David Van Dresar  
**Cc:** 'John Seifert'; 'Steve Young'; 'Donnelly, Andrew'; 'Matthew M. Uliana, PG'  
**Subject:** FW: March 27, 2015meeting in Milano  
**Attachments:** SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT WATER.docx

---

**From:** Larry [<mailto:larryhoffmann32@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 30, 2015 5:18 PM  
**To:** [posgcd@tconline.net](mailto:posgcd@tconline.net)  
**Subject:** March 27, 2015meeting in Milano

Dear Mr. Westbrook,

Re: Comment on Desired Future Conditions Program Review Meeting, March 27, 2015

I attended the meeting to listen and learn, but was a bit disappointed at what might be called "shallowness" in most of the discussion between the assembled board managers and general managers from the various groundwater conservation districts.

As we all potentially face water shortages due to exponential population growth, it is clear to me that managing future water shortage situations requires consideration of several important factors. One of these is the need to think and plan for the long term and beyond our particular interests rather than for the short term. Another is to evaluate potential projects thoroughly to assess both positive and negative aspects of such projects.

Among the important elements that were not adequately discussed at the meeting are the following:

- a. The need to assure sustainability of our underground aquifers. If discharge exceeds recharge, we will in fact mine our aquifers. Whether the time to depletion is five years, 50 years or more, the result is the same. People will simply run low of dependable water. Then they will struggle over the dwindling supply creating crisis situations with little likelihood for a decent solution.
- b. Stakeholders (any one who is impacted by a proposed water marketing project or any pumping deemed excessive) should be identified and given the opportunity to comment on the reasonableness of their desired future conditions. Lowered water levels, default to lowering pumps, increased cost of pumping, and possible complete loss of water are things that current water managers and politicians should not defer until after they are gone.
- c. The concept of establishing DFCs and MAGs does not assure sustainability into the future. Yet, what do the words DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS really mean to people residing in an area - rural, suburban, or a city? How do DFCs relate to the volume and quality of water needed for quality of life in diverse communities? When Modeled Available Groundwater is still uncertain due to the lack of hard data for the

modeling programs, and DFCs are interpreted as a means to pump aquifers into declines for relatively short-term economic development, what happens then?

d. Who will bear the cost of proposed projects? Should new ratepayers be responsible? Current ratepayers? Who pays for the cost of lowering pumps to accommodate lowered water levels?

e. Often there are interactions between surface water and ground water. How are such interactions to be handled?

f. What about adverse environmental impacts that occur as a result of declining water levels?

I solicit your consideration of these comments and ask for your written response as you make decisions regarding permitting of water and would appreciate you forwarding this e-mail to the other GCD general managers.

Sincerely,

Larry Hoffmann  
Retired Civil Engineer/ Concerned Citizen  
4133 Bee Creek Rd.  
Spicewood, TX 78669