

## Summarized Comments Received Regarding the GMA 12 Planning Effort

### **Comments: City of Bryan**

**Comment 1:** The comment states the requirement of groundwater conservation districts (GCDs) is to utilize “best available science” as the overall arching principal for many GCDs in the development of the groundwater management area (GMA) water planning process. The conclusion is the distribution of current pumping in Brazos and Robertson counties in the PS6 simulation is outdated and incorrect information.

**Comment 2:** The comment is regarding pumping and the PS6 simulation for the period 2011 through 2015, when actual pumping in northern Brazos County was greater than the amount represented in the simulation for the Simsboro Aquifer.

**Comment 3:** A series of comments that include requested revisions to the PS6 information are summarized as follows:

- a. Modify the simulated pumping at the City of Bryan well field to reflect the reported pumping values from 2011 to 2015 and to also reflect anticipated growth in pumping to meet demands within the planning cycle of 2016 to 2070.
- b. Remove pumping in the southern part of Robertson County, apparently associated with the City of Bryan.
- c. Modify the simulated pumping at the Skiles Family Partnership to reflect the reported values in 2011 to 2015 and the permitted amount after that year.
- d. Reduce the amount of predicted pumping at the Calvert Mine so that the overall modeled available groundwater (MAG) for the BVGCD remains the same, but there is a resulting 8,700 ac-ft/yr increase in the MAG in Brazos County and a commensurate decrease in Robertson County.

### **Comment: Cathy Lazarus**

**Comment 4:** The comment questions why the MAG for the Hooper Aquifer was set at 316 ac-ft/yr for the GMA 12 2010 planning cycle and is set at 2,001 ac-ft/yr for the 2016 planning cycle.

