

MEETING MINUTES

OF THE

SOUTHWESTERN TRAVIS COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Via Telephone Conference

In accordance with the order of the Office of the Governor issued March 16, 2020, the SWTCGCD Board of Directors conducted the June Board Meeting as a remote access only meeting in order to advance the public health goal of limiting face-to-face meetings (also called “social distancing”) to slow the spread of the Coronavirus (COVID-19). The meeting was open to the public and instructions for accessing the conference call were provided with the Notice of Meeting

Wednesday, August 12, 2020 at 10:00 am

1. Call to order, declare meeting open to the public, take roll and declare quorum status

Director and Board President Scadden called the meeting of the Southwestern Travis County Groundwater Conservation District (SWTCGCD or District) Board of Directors to order at 10:00 AM on Wednesday August 12, 2020. Six District Directors were present on the conference call constituting a quorum, including Directors Hennings, Dower, Davis, Scadden, Hunt and Van Ackeren. Also present were Kodi Sawin, Kirk Holland, Legal Counsel Embry, visitors Carrol Norrell, Danny Dawdy and Pete Golde.

At the request of Director Scadden all present introduced themselves.

The meeting sign-in sheet is attached as Exhibit A

2. Public comments

Director Scadden called for public comments and Carrol Norrell asked when the SWTCGCD was created. Director Scadden explained that the enabling legislation was passed in 2017 and the required confirmation election was held in November of 2019.

Director Urie joined the conference call at 10:03 AM.

3. Discuss, consider, and possibly act on approving the previous meeting minutes

July 8, 2020 Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes as drafted.

On a motion by Director Van Ackeren and a second by Director Hennings the Board approved the minutes for the July 8, 2020 Board Meeting – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays

July 21, 2020 Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes as drafted.

On a motion by Director Hunt and a second by Director Dower the Board approved the minutes for the July 21, 2020 Board Meeting – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays

The minutes for both meetings are attached as Exhibit B

Approval of the minutes from the July 29th meeting was postponed until the September Regular Board Meeting.

4. General Manager's Report

General Manager Sawin provided and reviewed the General Manager's Report. She discussed Stakeholder communications and public inquiries and outreach efforts to the largest potential permittees. Her presentation was interrupted at 10:10 AM by the scheduled Public Hearing on Fees.

5. Receive, discuss, and take action as necessary for Board Committee Reports.

- a. Finance – Deferred until later in the meeting
- b. Legislative – Deferred until later in the meeting
- c. Science-Outreach – Deferred until later in the meeting

6. Time Set at 10:10 AM – Conduct Public Hearing to receive input from public regarding the SWTCGCD Fee Schedule for Fiscal Year 2021

Director Scadden suspended the regular meeting and opened the scheduled Public Hearing at 10:11 AM

Mr. Kirk Holland explained that the hearing would consist of two parts. Part I being a Staff presentation and Part II being comments and questions from the Directors and the public.

Mr. Holland presented the Part 1 – Staff Presentation on Contents of Proposed Fee Schedule.

The Part 1 – Staff Presentation on Contents of Proposed Fee Schedule outline document is attached as Exhibit C

Director Scadden then initiated Part II by asking if the Directors needed any clarifications. Director Davis asked for clarification of which wells will require meters. Mr. Holland explained that only wells with an operating permit which must pay production fees will require a meter. General Permit wells do not require meters.

Director Scadden next asked if there were any comments or questions from the public. Ms. Norrell asked if she could get a copy of Mr. Hollands presentation and Director Scadden said that this might get posted on the website, but we would get her a copy. Mr. Dawdy asked if this only applies to the Trinity Aquifer and Mr. Holland explained that the District rules and fees apply to all wells in all aquifers in the District. All wells in the District are in the Trinity Aquifer except possibly very deep Paleozoic wells which typically do not produce.

There were no further comments or questions from the public participants.

Director Scadden closed the Public Hearing at 10:47 AM

7. Discuss and possibly act on matters related to proposed Fee Schedule for FY2021

Director Scadden advised that there is a Public Hearing regarding the Fee Schedule scheduled for Monday August 17th at 6:00 PM to provide an additional time of day for the Public Hearing. He said there will be further discussion and the Fee Schedule will be adopted by the Board at a future date but this is an opportunity for the Directors to ask questions and deliberate over the content of the current Fee Schedule. The Board had no questions or comments and there was no further discussion of the Fee Schedule at this time.

8. Discuss, and possibly act on matters related to formulating District Rules

Director Scadden asked GM Sawin and Mr. Holland to update the Board on where we are on development of District Rules. Mr. Holland advised that the Rules Committee has met several times and has gone through and gotten comfortable with Rules 1 and 2, and 3 except regarding the definition of what Major and Minor Permit Modifications are. The Rules Committee had progressed through about half of Rule 5 which is Groundwater Protection. At the next meeting which will be August 20th the Committee will review the rest of Rule 5 and also Rules 4, 6 and 7. On August 20th the Rules Committee will come to closure on Rules 1 through 7 and send a recommendation to the Board on the 21st or the 22nd. At the August 26th meeting, the Board will need to authorize the Proposed Rules for the Public Hearing and the notice for the Public Hearing will have to be posted right after that Board meeting. We plan to have an evening Public Hearing on September 22nd and a second Public Hearing during a Special Board meeting on September 23rd when the board will adopt the Proposed Rules with an effective date of October 1st. Mr. Holland said the Rules Committee has made good progress and has gone through the more complex issues. He added that the Budget Committee is also meeting on the 22nd and we are trying to schedule meetings with stakeholders and permittees during the first 10 days of September to go over the proposed Rules and the Fee Schedule.

GM Sawin advised that we need to post a Public Notice in the newspaper and General Counsel Embrey said it needs to be 20 days in advance of the Public Hearing.

Director Davis said it is important for us to reach out as much as we can to educate landowners. She suggested direct mailings but acknowledged the cost may be prohibitive. Mr. Holland suggested adding an invitation to the website to have interested parties submit contact information. Director Scadden suggested Community Impact Newspaper press releases. Director Hennings said that contact data collection should be part of the registration process. General Counsel Embrey suggested the Farm Bureau and Ag. Extension for communications. Director Scadden warned that the Board needs to be prepared that there will be members of the public who are surprised regardless of our best efforts. We will do everything we can withing the limits of our resources.

On a motion by Director Scadden and a second by Director Dower, the Board approved a Special Board Meeting for September 23, 2020 at 10:00 AM and setting Public Hearings for the District Rules and Budget on September 22, 2020 at 6:00 PM and September 23, 2020 at 10:00 AM during the Special Board Meeting – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays

9. Discuss and possibly act on setting a date for a Board Work Session to discuss District Rules

On a motion by Director Scadden and a second by Director Hennings, the Board approved a Special Board Meeting for August 26, 2020 at 10:00 AM – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays

10. Discuss and possibly act on District budget for FY2021

Director Scadden thanked Director Dower and GM Sawin for their work on the Budget, as well as INTERA Inc. efforts to help estimate annual revenues.

Director Dower reviewed the Draft Budget and reminded the board that it assumes \$100,000 is provided by Travis County. Director Scadden then reviewed the budgeted expenses.

The Draft Budget is attached as Exhibit D

11. Discuss and possibly act on renewing Bonding for District Directors

Director Van Ackeren explained that the Bond for the Directors is up for renewal and the insurance company has offered a discount for payment of three years premium. The premium for one year is \$280 but if we pay for three years the second and third years are discounted 20%. The total payment for the three years would be \$728 which is an additional \$448 now versus the one-year payment. The three-year savings would be \$112. Considering the present financial situation, he recommended just paying the one-year premium. Director Urie said that he agreed.

On a motion by Director Van Ackeren and a second by Director Urie the Board approved paying the one-year un-discounted premium of \$280.00 – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays

Director Urie left the conference call at 12:30 PM and Dower left the conference call at 12:31 PM.

12. Discuss and possibly act on matters related to attendance at the Virtual TAGD Groundwater Summit

Director Scadden recommended paying for GM Sawin to attend the 2020 TAGD Virtual Groundwater Summit at a cost of \$275.

On a motion by Director Scadden and a second by Director Hennings, the Board approved paying the \$275 fee for GM Sawin to attend the 2020 TAGD Virtual Groundwater Summit 5 Ayes to 0 Nays

Item 4. General Manager's Report was now continued

General Manager Sawin completed the presentation of her report covering:

- Regulatory Items and Updates including TWDB, TCEQ, GMA 8 and GMA 9
- Hours Tracking
- Items of Interest

Item 5. Board Committee Reports were now taken up

- a. Finance – Director Scadden reviewed the Financial Report that was prepared by Director Urie.

The Financial Report is attached as Exhibit E

- b. Legislative – Director Davis said that was nothing to report this month
- c. Science-Outreach – Director Hennings advised that the West Lake Hills October Neighborhood Night Out has been cancelled. Director Scadden said that Christy Muse sent a notice that the Dripping Springs Rainwater Revival is going to be virtual. Director Hunt advised that BSEACD and Travis County are wrapping up the Phase 2 Report and the Atlas is now on the UT Dataverse and he will send a link to get to it.

13. Discuss and establish agenda items for the next Board meeting

- August 26th Special Meeting – Rules and Fees Work Session
- Budget, Fees and Rules will dominate through September

14. Discuss, consider, and possibly act on setting the date, time, and location for the next Board meeting

The next Regular Board Meeting was set for September 9th, 2020 at 10:00 AM and will be a virtual meeting.

15. Adjourn

On a motion by Director Hunt and a second by Director Hennings the Board voted to adjourn the meeting – 5 Ayes to 0 Nays. The meeting was adjourned at 12:47 PM.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 9th day of September 2020


Tim Van Ackeren, Secretary

Exhibit A

Attendee Sign-in Sheet

BOARD MEETING
OF THE
SOUTHWESTERN TRAVIS COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Teleconference Meeting

Wednesday July 8, 2020 at 10:00 AM

ATTENDEES

Name	Affiliation	Email Address
Rick Scadden	SWTCGCD Director - President	
Juli Hennings	SWTCGCD Director	
Jim Dower	SWTCGCD Director	
Jim Urie	SWTCGCD Director - Treasurer	
Tricia Davis	SWTCGCD Director - Vice President	
Tim Van Ackeren	SWTCGCD Director - Secretary	
Brian Hunt	SWTCGCD Director	
Kodi Sawin	SWTCGCD General Manager	
Kirk Holland	Consultant	
Ty Embrey	Lloyd Gosselink - Legal Counsel	
Carrol Norrell	Visitor	
Danny Dawdy	Visitor	
Pete Golde	Volunteer	

Exhibit B

Approved Minutes from July 8, 2020 and June 21, 2020
Board Meetings



MEETING MINUTES

OF THE

SOUTHWESTERN TRAVIS COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Via Telephone Conference

In accordance with the order of the Office of the Governor issued March 16, 2020, the SWTCGCD Board of Directors conducted the June Board Meeting as a remote access only meeting in order to advance the public health goal of limiting face-to-face meetings (also called “social distancing”) to slow the spread of the Coronavirus (COVID-19). The meeting was open to the public and instructions for accessing the conference call were provided with the Notice of Meeting

Wednesday, July 8, 2020 at 10:00 am

1. Call to order, declare meeting open to the public, take roll and declare quorum status

Director and Board President Scadden called the meeting of the Southwestern Travis County Groundwater Conservation District (SWTCGCD or District) Board of Directors to order at 10:01 AM on Wednesday May 13, 2020. Seven District Directors were present on the conference call constituting a quorum, including Directors Hennings, Dower, Davis, Scadden, Hunt, Urie and Van Ackeren. Also present were Kodi Sawin, Kirk Holland, Legal Counsel Embry, Vicki Kennedy from Travis County and Pete Golde.

At the request of Director Scadden all present introduced themselves.

The meeting sign-in sheet is attached as Exhibit A

2. Public comments

Director Scadden called for public comments there were no public comments.

3. Discuss, consider and possibly act on approving the previous meeting minutes

May 13, 2020 Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes as drafted.

On a motion by Director Dower and a second by Director Van Ackeren the Board approved the minutes for the May 13, 2020 Board Meeting – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays

June 10, 2020 Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes as drafted.



On a motion by Director Van Ackeren and a second by Director Dower the Board approved the minutes for the June 10, 2020 Board Meeting – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays

The minutes for both meetings are attached as Exhibit B

A discussion of the level of detail in the minutes ensued with the concern expressed about the amount of work required to prepare the minutes and several Directors expressing the opinion that this level of detail is desirable. It was agreed to keep the current level of detail.

4. General Manager's Report

General Manager Sawin provided and reviewed the General Manager's Report.

The General Manager's Report is attached as Exhibit C

5. Receive, discuss and take action as necessary for Board Committee Reports.

- a. Finance – Director Urie reviewed the Financial Report. For the period ending 6/30/20 two checks were written, one to Sawin Group for \$2,000 and the other to Spectrum for \$82.59. Three deposits were made for \$22.01 from Director Scadden, \$1,000 from Hamilton Pool Road Matters and \$0.04 in interest. The ending balance as of 6/30 was \$315.26.

The Financial Report is attached as Exhibit D

Director Van Ackeren asked how often we bill Travis County. Director Scadden said that we have billed for June and July and we are projecting August and will bill for that. Director Van Ackeren asked if Travis County has agreed to pay based on projections. Director Scadden said yes, they have. Vicky Kennedy approves the payments and they are supposed to be monthly, but they are trying to get caught up with two-month projections. He added that there are two invoices from Lloyd Gosselink, and another is expected in July. Vicky Kennedy stated that the District's invoices need to be submitted every month to help assist with process. Director Dower said that he would like to see the Lloyd Gosselink invoice detail when it is received. Director Scadden committed to send the new Lloyd Gosselink invoice to the Board when it is received. Legal Counsel Embrey explained that most of the legal time is spent up front, mostly for getting the Rules in place with an occasional drafting of a resolution for the Board.

- b. Legislative – Director Davis provided an update on State activities. She said the TCEQ is working on Produced Water and lots is going on regarding Flooding and River Authorities
- c. Science-Outreach – Director Hennings and Director Hunt provided a brief overview of the USGS presentation by Scott Ikard of the interaction between the Colorado River and the Trinity Aquifer. Director Hunt said that Phase 2 of the Travis County/BSEACD ILA was to evaluate the relationship between rivers and lakes, and the aquifer. USGS used a tool to run a transect from Pace Bend to below the Bee Creek Fault. This was a success and gave us information that we did not have. Director Hennings said that there are a couple of distinct features to be investigated. They did see a change at the Bee Creek Fault and Director Hunt added that it is really promising. Director Dower asked if the study looked at the effect of wells drilled next to



the river. Director Hunt said that it did not look in that detail but rather at gross overall flows in or out. Vicky Kennedy said that this technology could be used to look at alluvial wells that pump from the lake. Director Scadden suggested that a link to this presentation be put on our website.

Director Hunt advised that he has 50 hard copies of the Atlas which he will give to General Manager Sawin at the office.

Director Dower advised that there were 361 views of the website, 71 downloads and 1 contact during the past month.

6. Discuss, and possibly act on matters related to formulating District Rules

General Manager Sawin said the rules committee has met several times including a board workshop to work through the various components of the rules from permitting process to fees. The Rules Committee will cover additional items with the Board in our next workshop. She thanked the Board for their guidance so far. She went on to say that the Rules Committee has started to work through definitions to bring to the board for review. Mr. Holland commented that the definitions set the philosophy and tone of the Rules and the Rules Committee has spent a lot of time working on them and the next step in next Monday's meeting. GM Sawin said that the Rules Committee will send the Board information on the meeting in advance so that Directors can think through any questions they might have.

GM Sawin said that she continues to move through the list of Public Water Supplies in the area to obtain up to date contact information and to discern whether or not the system is on groundwater or has moved to surface water.

7. Discuss setting a date for a Board Work Session to discuss the District Rules

Director Scadden suggested Wednesday July 22nd at 10:00 AM for the next Board work session meeting to discuss the District Rules. Directors Davis and Hennings said that they had conflicts on that date and Director Scadden then suggested Tuesday July 21st. The next Board work session meeting to discuss the District Rules was set for July 21st at 9:00 AM since several Directors had existing commitments in the early afternoon.

8. Discuss and possibly act on matters related to designating official office location

GM Sawin presented Resolution 2020-07-01 drafted by Legal Counsel to designate an official office location. Director Scadden suggested that the second "Whereas" paragraph be deleted since the Board had not previously designated an office address. Legal Counsel Embrey agreed.

On a motion by Director Davis and a second by Director Hennings the Board voted to approve Resolution 2020-07-01 as amended – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays

Resolution 2020-07-01 is attached as Exhibit E



9. Discuss and possibly act on matters related to potential loan and grant opportunities

Director Scadden advised that SWTCGCD was not selected for the INTERA Stewardship Scholarship but INTERA has offered to provide some pro bono technical support. He suggested the possibility of work on a new revenue estimate and a senior person review of the SWTCGCD Rules. GM Sawin said that she will revisit the availability of LCRA funds with David Wheelock at LCRA based on new information re: interaction between Colorado River and Trinity Aquifer.

10. Discuss and establish agenda items for the next Board meeting

- District Rules development
- TAGD Groundwater Summit attendance
- August Board work session

11. Discuss, consider, and possibly act on setting the date, time, and location for the next Board meeting

The next Board meeting was set for August 12th, 2020 at 10:00 AM and will be a virtual meeting.

12. Adjourn

On a motion by Director Hunt and a second by Director Hennings the Board voted to adjourn the meeting – 7 Ayes to 0 Nays. The meeting was adjourned at 11:19 AM.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 12th day of August 2020

Tim Van Ackeren, Secretary



SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

OF THE

SOUTHWESTERN TRAVIS COUNTY GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Via Telephone Conference

In accordance with the order of the Office of the Governor issued March 16, 2020, the SWTCGCD Board of Directors conducted a Special Board Meeting as a remote access only meeting in order to advance the public health goal of limiting face-to-face meetings (also called “social distancing”) to slow the spread of the Coronavirus (COVID-19). The meeting was open to the public and instructions for accessing the conference call were provided in advance with the Notice of Meeting

Wednesday, July 21, 2020 at 9:00 am

1. Call to order, declare meeting open to the public, take roll and declare quorum status

Director and Board President Scadden called the special meeting of the Southwestern Travis County Groundwater Conservation District (SWTCGCD or District) Board of Directors to order at 9:00 AM on Tuesday July 21, 2020. Seven District Directors were present on the conference call constituting a quorum, including Directors Davis, Hennings, Dower, Scadden, Hunt, Van Ackeren and Urie. Also present were General Manager Kodi Sawin, Kirk Holland, Ty Embry with Lloyd Gosselink, Rusty Tarver private citizen and hydrologist, and Hank Smith representing Travis County MUD #1 (West Cypress Creek).

At the request of Director Scadden all present introduced themselves.

2. Public comments

Director Scadden expressed the opinion that it is important that we always start District meetings with an opportunity for citizens that have an interest in what we are doing to comment, and he called for public comments. There were no public comments.

3. Discuss and possibly act on matters related to formulating District Rules, including setting a Public Hearing on the rulemaking at some future Board meeting.

Director Scadden initiated the discussion by saying that he feels like the Rules Committee is making good progress and he is excited to have the Committee share that today and get feedback from the Board and he thanked General Manager Sawin and Kirk Holland for doing the heavy lifting on this effort and the progress being made is due to their hard work.

General Manager Sawin, and Kirk Holland led a discussion of the topics outlined in the Work Session Agenda provided to the Board prior to the Work Session.

The Work Session Agenda is attached as Exhibit A



General Manager Sawin said that the goal for this Work Session is to provide enough confirmation and direction on key questions to begin drafting Rules. She then reviewed Item 1) *Next Steps* on the Work Session Agenda which outlines the steps to a possible approval of the Rules at a late September public hearing.

General Manager Sawin then went on to discuss Agenda Item 2) *Permit Process* saying that the Rules Committee has reviewed with the Board, and received guidance on, information on Exempt Wells and what remains outstanding now is issues regarding Non-Exempt Wells which are mostly Operating Permit issues, and the Committee will also need guidance on some General Permit by Rule issues.

Kirk Holland explained that anything that is not Exempt by Chapter 36 or Exempt by Rules is Non-Exempt and requires some sort of special authorization that Exempt Wells do not. He explained that there are three types of Exempt Wells and he reviewed the types as shown in the graphic in Item 2) *Permit Process* of the *Work Session Agenda* as well as other types that are Exempt by Rule.

Kirk Holland then reviewed the Non-Exempt Well criteria presented in Item 2) *Permit Process* of the *Work Session Agenda* explaining that there are two categories of Non-Exempt wells: those requiring an Operating Permit with metering and production fees and the General Permit by Rule wells which do not require metering or production fees. He clarified that Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) wells only require an operating permit if withdrawal volume is greater than injection volume.

General Manager Sawin reviewed the criteria or allocation methods recommended by the Rules Committee as presented in Item 2) *Permit Process* of the *Work Session Agenda*. She then reviewed the allocation methods that are *not* recommended by the Committee. Kirk Holland further discussed the operating permit criteria and suggested that the *Permit applicant data supporting the requested permit* amount be moved up from *not recommended* to *recommended* since we will certainly be using applicant data in evaluating permit applications. He went on to briefly explain correlative rights as permitted amounts based on acreage of land which is mostly used in agricultural regions and unreasonable impacts which is impact on existing wells. Director Hunt commented that evaluating unreasonable impacts is probably not practical now but may be considered in the future. Director Scadden asked if there were any questions before moving on. Director Davis said that she would like to discuss correlative rights more in the future.

Kirk Holland reviewed the nine questions presented in Item 3) of the *Work Session Agenda*:

Question 1: Prohibitions and Restrictions Recommended – Director Hunt said that he agreed with the sentiment of having new wells pay an operating permit application fee and he opined that the idea of not charging an application fee to existing wells for initial operating permit is consistent with wanting to get everyone into the fold as soon as possible and he said he didn't know of any other way to incentivize that other than financially. Director Hennings said that she agreed. Kirk Holland also agreed and said that the goal is to get a fee schedule set after this work session.

He went on to discuss permit renewal fees saying that the maximum amount allowed by statute is \$400 but, even though the permittee has to apply for renewal and it takes Board action to



approve renewal, it is essentially an administrative and “automatic” renewal so \$400 seems high. BSEACD charges a \$50 renewal fee. Director Scadden suggested that we may want to have district representatives go and look at wells due for renewal just to be sure that conditions have not changed and that the well is still in good structurally stable condition. That would be an additional cost that would be covered by the \$400 renewal fee. Director Hunt suggested that there may be annual data collection expenses, such as meter reading, that may be covered by permit renewal fee. He also suggested the possibility of tiered fees, for example, greater or less than 2 Million gallons per year production. Kirk Holland pointed out that we are already doing that with other fees based on size of well for example, but the Rules Committee has not looked at what sort of tiering might be used here. At the request of Director Hennings, Kirk Holland explained Non-Exempt Domestic Use Permits which renew every 5 years v. Operating Permits which renew annually and advised that a \$400 renewal fee every 5 years is roughly equivalent to 33,000 gallons per month production well paying a \$0.20 per 1,000 gallons production fee for 5 years. He also said that one member of the Rules Committee brought up a good point asking what the basis is for having a Well Drilling Authorization Fee and a separate Well Construction Fee and maybe we should have just a Well Drilling Authorization Fee apply to new wells. Director Hunt said that makes sense to him. Kirk Holland commented that to eliminate one of the fees will be leaving some money on the table but the combination of the two fees is a hefty sum for a landowner to pay. Director Scadden pointed out that the enabling legislation specifically calls out authorization for a Well Construction Fee so if we choose to have one fee, his preference is to refer to it as a Well Construction Fee. Director Hennings said that she agreed and expressed the desire to keep the fee structure streamlined so that well owners can understand it. Regarding the prohibition of new wells in the Upper Trinity Director Scadden pointed out that the goal is not only to protect the resource but to protect the well owner’s investment.

Question 2: Fee Schedule – Kirk Holland reviewed the draft fee schedule which he said has been reviewed by the Rules Committee and a few others. He said fees would be effective on October 1, 2020 or some other date as the Board may adopt, and the amounts shown here are suggestions based on what adjacent GMA 9 Districts are using. He said the Rules Committee and Legal Counsel agree the date that determines if a well is existing or new needs to be the date the Rules are adopted by the Board and any well drilled after that date will require a Well Drilling Authorization (WDA). The suggested WDA application fee is \$500.

The Draft Fee Schedule is attached as Exhibit B

Director Dower pointed out that the \$500 fee is to review the WDA application and a WDA may or may not be issued. Kirk Holland confirmed that is correct and he added, as discussed earlier, we need to decide if we want separate WDA application and Well Construction fees. Director Scadden said that he would like to talk about how an applicant who receives a well construction authorization might not get a production permit, under what circumstances would they not get that permit? Kirk Holland explained that the WDA may also require an aquifer test and the well hydraulic properties may not allow the amount of production applied for to be permitted. It could perhaps be permitted for something less than that if the applicant wants to change their application. Director Scadden opined that such a situation would be the result of the well hydrogeology and not any administrative decision made by the GCD. Director Hunt said that in the future that may not be the case if we are considering things like the MAG for example, there may be some constraints that are not hydrogeologic. Kirk Holland added that there is also the possibility that a new well may unexpectedly have adverse impact on adjacent wells. Director



Scadden said that it is important to lay all of this out to applicants so that it is a transparent process and they understand why. Kirk Holland reiterated that the draft fee schedule has the WDA Application Fee of \$500 and the Well Construction Fee of \$1,000 but that can be changed if the board wants. Director Dower said the because the Well Construction Fee is specifically authorized in the enabling legislation it seems appropriate that we would charge that, but he did not understand the need to have multiple other fees for a well. Kirk Holland explained that Exempt Wells do not have a production permit and we do not have the well data required to issue a production permit until the well is drilled. The production permit application phase is when the District will be evaluating the effect of producing that much water out of that well and much of that will not be known until the well is drilled. General Counsel Embrey said this is where a lot of the Districts staff's time is going to be devoted. Kirk Holland said he agreed that is where most of the work is going to go and any well that is not an Exempt well is going to have a production permit.

General Counsel Embrey clarified that the District will not issue a physical document called a production permit, it will be either an Operating permit or a General Permit by Rule and that the term production permit is an over-arching term used in the District's Rules. Kirk Holland said that right now both the Operating Permit and General Permit application fees are \$650, but they could be different. General Counsel Embrey asked if it might be possible to eliminate the term production permit and just refer to Operating Permits and General Permits. Director Scadden suggested using the term production authorization which will have two types, either an Operating Permit of a General Permit by Rule. Director Dower said that he still did not see the need for the term production permit or production authorization. General Counsel Embrey suggested that simplifying the language by eliminating the term is desirable even if it means utilizing the names of both Operating Permit and General Permit in the few cases where we are describing something that could be either type. Directors Scadden and Hennings disagreed and said they like the use of production authorization to encompass both type of permits. General Counsel Embrey agreed that was a good solution.

Director Scadden said he would like to review the Well Drilling Authorization application and the Well Construction Fee again and see if we can get a Board consensus on that. He said it is his understanding that the Well Drilling Authorization application applies to Non-exempt Wells, but does it apply to all wells? Kirk Holland responded that it applies to all new or prospective wells and it does not matter whether they are exempt or not exempt. Director Scadden said that he is not comfortable having a Well Drilling Authorization Fee and a Well Construction Fee, and a Well Construction Fee is specifically authorized in the enabling act. He said he would like to not charge for the Well Drilling Authorization and collect the Well Construction Fee even if the Well Construction Fee needs to be applicable to Exempt Wells at a fee of \$500 then add that but not have both of these fees. Kirk Holland asked if we are willing to have a Well Construction Fee be collected on the type 2 Exempt Wells? After further discussion it was agreed that there are two separate application periods when the District staff must perform work and that there should be separate fees. It was suggested that the Well Drilling Authorization Fee should be \$500 and for Exempt Wells (except Type 2) and General Permit Wells the Well Construction Fee should be \$500 or for Operating Permit Wells the Well Construction Fee should be \$1,000. Concern was expressed that for the Operating Permit the total cost would be over the \$1,000 limit set in the enabling legislation for a well construction permit. General Counsel Embrey said that he recommends continuing this discussion in executive session at a future meeting.



Director Dower asked if the amount of revenue associated with charging the Type 1 Exempt Wells the \$500 Construction Fee was significant because excluding all Exempt Well from that fee would greatly simplify things. Kirk Holland agreed that it would simplify the fee structure and opined that he always felt the Legislature meant to exclude all Exempt Wells from the Well Construction Fee and not just type 2. He also said that it is too soon to be able to estimate the revenue associated with Type 1 Exempt Well Construction Fees.

After some discussion, the Board agreed to schedule a Special Meeting for another work session on July 29th at 10:00 AM and they will have an executive session during that meeting. Kirk Holland said he will put together a fee table as requested by Director Dower.

Kirk Holland then moved on to discuss the application process for Modification to an Operating Permit which needs to be evaluated almost like it's a new permit application, except you will have some operating experience to look at so there is an application fee of \$400. There is also an application for Renewal of an Operating Permit on an annual basis if there are no changes, or every five years for a General Permit and they will pay a \$400 renewal fee. The \$400 amount is a statutory limit on renewal fees. Director Dower pointed out that the way this is currently written it appears to say that there is an actual permit that is issued for both types of permits, is that correct? Kirk Holland explained that there is an actual Operating Permit that is issued and then there is a letter authorization to operate under a General Permit by Rule. Director Hennings offered the opinion that the problem may again be the use of the term *Production Permit*. Kirk Holland proposed changing *Production Permit* to *Production Authorization* and Director Dower agreed that would resolve the confusion.

Kirk Holland asked what the Board thought of the \$400 Renewal Fee every year for an Operating Permit. Director Dower suggested that \$400 seems extreme since little needs to be done by the applicant or the District staff. Director Scadden said he was in favor of keeping the \$400 fee amount. Kirk Holland pointed out that the permit renewal process is not just a fee acquisition process but it is a process to insure performance under the permit because if there is non-compliance of a permit then it is not going to be renewed. Director Scadden asked if we could have a two-tiered fee like for example \$200 for an automatic renewal and then \$400 for an application that requires a public hearing, or are these all not requiring a public hearing? Kirk Holland advised that only the Operating Permits require a public hearing if changes are requested. Director Scadden said that he was now thinking if the renewal were just administrative requiring little District staff time it could be less but if it requires a public hearing it could be the \$400 amount. Kirk Holland agreed that it could be \$200 or \$100 for renewals not requiring a public hearing and \$400 for those that do. He asked what the Board would want for the lower fee \$200 or \$100 and Director Scadden said \$200. Director Hennings said that she was not sure it is simply an administrative process if the staff had to review compliance and maybe go out and inspect wells. Director Dower said that he suspects that in most cases a well inspection will not be required but if it is then we do have the authorization to charge for that inspection. Director Hennings suggested that this might be something we need to think about and discuss further next week. Director Scadden agreed.

Kirk Holland went on to discuss Groundwater Production Fees saying these are all basically statutory. We have \$0.04 per 1,000 gallons for agricultural use wells which is 20% of the \$0.20 per 1,000 gallons for non-agricultural use wells as allowed by Chapter 36 plus a 50% surcharge for any portion of produced water that is exported out of the District. There was a discussion of



alternative export surcharge methodologies and the possibility that there might be a water distribution system that straddles the District boundary. Production fees are paid each quarter on the 10th of the month.

Service Connection Fees for new connections to a public water supply are proposed to be the statutory allowed \$1,000 per connection and RV slips are \$200 and places like hotels, motels, and restaurants will be assessed \$1,000 per building. There was a discussion of the rationale for charging RV slips \$200.

Administrative fees are standard based on other District's fees. Kirk Holland reviewed several of the administrative fees and penalties. It was agreed that including a table of penalties for major and minor violations would be a good approach.

Kirk Holland went on to discuss Drought Curtailments. He and Director Hunt worked on the Framework for Drought Curtailments table using U.S. Drought Monitor intensity levels for Travis County. He reviewed the drought stages and the recommended curtailments for each type of Well Permit. He said that the Committee has tried to be consistent across the different types of wells using the same percentage curtailment across the board regardless of whether it is a mandatory curtailment or a targeted reduction. He also discussed Drought Contingency Plans which all Operating Permittees and General Permittees will be required to have in place. Kirk Holland then said that one thing he would like the Board to consider is that while we have 10% curtailments for D-1 Moderate Droughts that may create some issues with well owners taking actions to achieve the 10% goal and then ignoring the later higher curtailments of 20%, 30%, Etc. Director Hunt shared that the BSEACD has a voluntary reduction period during the month of May to kind of get everyone thinking about drought season but some Mays are really wet and it just does not make a lot of sense in those situations. We are stepping into Drought Curtailments sort of gradually and maybe the D-1 10% curtailment is sort of an education period. Kirk Holland said that he expected that the Rules will also have a calendar-based water conservation period from say May to September. Director Hennings suggested including a link to the U.S. Drought Monitor website on this table and include a definition of *Targeted Reduction*. Director Dower asked how these rules compare to surface water suppliers in this area. Kirk Holland said they are similar, and Director Hunt added that they are consistent with other groundwater districts, and by using the same drought indices as most other water suppliers we will be similar.

The Draft Framework for Drought Curtailments and Contingency Plans is attached as Exhibit C

Kirk Holland said that the rest of the questions have already been covered to some extent in the discussion during today's meeting. Question 4 is regarding having different requirements for existing wells beyond a certain age. General Counsel Embrey suggested discussing this during the executive session at the next meeting.

General Manager Sawin asked that anyone who has a question or comment before the next meeting go ahead and send them to her and she will track them to be sure they get incorporated in the draft Rules.

Director Scadden asked Mr. Tarver if he had any comments or question and Mr. Tarver responded that he appreciated the opportunity and he commended the Board on their work and said that his particular interest is more toward the technical side of the Rules particularly with regard to



aquifer testing. Director Scadden thanked him and said that we are always interested in getting feedback from the public.

4. Adjourn

On a motion by Director Hunt and a second by Director Hennings, the Board voted to adjourn the meeting – 6 ayes to 0 nays. The meeting was adjourned at 11:54 PM.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 12th day of August 2020

Tim Van Ackeren, Secretary

Exhibit C

Staff Presentation on Contents of Proposed Fee Schedule

Public Hearing – Part 1

Staff Presentation on Contents of
Proposed Fee Schedule

As a Well Owner, What Fees Will I Pay?

Southwestern Travis County Groundwater Conservation District
Board of Directors Regular Meeting and Public Hearing
August 12, 2020

Types of District Fees

Authorized but Fee Not Assessed by District Board

- Registration Fee
- Recurring Annual Per-Well Administrative Fee

Permit Application Fees, for Both Existing and Proposed Wells

- Production Authorization Application Fee, for Typically Larger Wells
- Production Authorization Renewal Fee, for Typically Larger Wells
- Existing Well Modification Application Fee, for Certain Existing Wells

Production Fees for Permitted Wells, for Both Existing and Proposed Wells

- Fee for Actual Production by Certain Larger Wells, Per Thousand Gallons

Fees Related Only to Installing Proposed Wells or Modifying Existing Wells

- Well Drilling Authorization Application Fee, for Proposed Wells
- Well Construction Fee, for Typically Larger Proposed Wells

Other Fees

- Service Connection Fee for Each New Connection to Public Water Supply Permittee
- Capping/Sealing/Plugging Fee, for Abandoned and Unused Wells
- Various Business Administration Fees (e.g., Returned Check Fee)

Do I Already Have A Well on My Property?

Yes

Apply to Register Well
with District for Free

No

You're good to go.
Thanks for visiting.

No, but I want one

Apply for Well Drilling
Authorization/Registration

District Determines
Type of Well

Exempt from
Permitting

Non-exempt – Qualifying
for General Permit by Rule

Non-exempt – Operating
Permit Required

Fees by Well Classification

Exempt Wells

❖ Criteria:

- Domestic Use with pumping capability less than 7 gpm
- Domestic and Livestock Use on more than 10 acres and pumping capability less than about 17.4 gpm
- A few other specialty-use wells (rig supply, fire suppression, dewatering wells, etc.)

❖ Fees:

- Registration – None
- Production from Existing or New Exempt Wells – None
- Well Drilling Authorization Application for **New Well** - \$500

Fees by Well Classification (continued)

Non-exempt Wells Qualifying for General Permits by Rule

❖ Criteria:

- Don't meet any Exempt criteria
- Domestic Use wells with pumping capability more than 7 gpm
- Aquifer test and monitor/observation wells

❖ Fees:

- Registration – None
- General Permit initial application - \$400 (\$200 in First Half FY 2021)
- General Permit renewal - \$200 every five years
- Production from Existing or New General Permit Non-exempt wells – None
- Well Drilling Authorization application for **New well** - \$500
- Well Construction Fee for **New** Non-exempt well under General Permit - \$500

Fees by Well Classification (continued)

Non-exempt Wells Requiring Operating Permits

❖ Criteria:

- Don't meet any Exempt criteria
- Don't qualify under a General Permit by Rule
- Differentiate wells for Non-Agricultural and Agricultural Use

❖ Fees:

- Registration - None
- Operating Permit initial application
 - Agricultural Use - \$400 (\$200 in First Half FY 2021)
 - Non-Agricultural Use - \$750 (\$375 in First Half FY 2021)
- Operating Permit renewal –
 - Agricultural Use - \$300 annually (\$150 if no PH required)
 - Non-Agricultural Use - \$400 annually (\$200 if no PH required)

(Fees continue on next page)

Fees by Well Classification (continued)

- **Non-exempt Wells Requiring Operating Permits (continued)**

- ❖ Fees (*cont'd*):

- Production from Existing or New Non-exempt wells under Operating Permit (paid quarterly):
 - Agricultural Use – 4 cents per thousand gallons of actual use
 - Non-Agricultural Use – 20 cents per thousand gallons of actual use
- Well Drilling Authorization application for **New** well - \$500
- Well Construction Fee for **New** Non-exempt wells under Operating Permit:
 - Agricultural Use - \$500
 - Non-Agricultural Use - \$1000
- One-time Connection Fee for new service connections to public water system wells:
 - New RV slip connection - \$200 each (paid by PWS well permittee)
 - Other new PWS connection - \$1000 each (paid by PWS well permittee)

Minor/Major Modifications of Previously Installed Wells/Permits

Minor Modifications Include:

Transfers of ownership without changing type or amount of use • Reductions in permitted volume • Changing well from Non-exempt to Exempt based on changes in type of use or production volume • Alteration of well physical configuration or well system that does not produce “major well modifications” • Converting one well to a multi-user well • Aggregating two or more individually permitted wells by the same permittee under one permit • Increases of permitted volumes by less than 10% in aggregate over three-year period (if they do not produce “major well modifications”).

Applicable Fees For Minor Modifications:

- *Exempt wells:* WDA application - Yes. WDA application fee - ~~\$0~~. Well Construction Fee - \$0.
- *Wells under General Permits:* WDA application - Yes. WDA application fee -~~\$0~~. Well Construction Fee - ~~\$0~~. No PH on permit change.
- *Wells under Operating Permits:* WDA application – Yes. WDA application fee - As proposed (\$400 Non-Ag; \$300 Ag). Well Construction Fee - ~~\$0~~. No PH on permit change.

Minor/Major Modifications of Previously Installed Wells/Permits

Major Modifications Include:

Increases in production that change well from Exempt to Non-exempt • Increases in permitted volumes by 10% or more in aggregate over three-year period • Alteration of well's physical configuration such that the groundwater production is from a different Aquifer Management Zone • Increases in permitted production such that stipulated well spacing cannot be achieved.

Applicable Fees For Major Modifications:

- *For all such wells: Well essentially becomes a proposed new well*
- *For all such wells: WDA application – Yes. WDA application fee - \$500 as proposed*
- *If well remains or will be Exempt: Well Construction Fee - \$0; no PH required*
- *If well remains or becomes Non-exempt and is/will be under a General Permit: New GP application fee - \$400. Well Construction Fee - \$500; PH required*
- *If well remains or becomes Non-exempt and is/will be under an Operating Permit: New OP application fee – \$400 (unless Ag well - \$300). Well Construction Fee - \$1000 (unless Ag well - \$500); PH required*

Public Hearing – Part 2

1. Comments and Questions by Directors
2. Comments by the Public

Exhibit D

Draft FY 2021 Budget

**Southwestern Travis County Groundwater Conservation District
FY 2021 Draft**

Category Detail Planning Sheet

Revenues			
	Category/Description	FY 2020 Budget	FY 2021 Budget
Current Revenues		EOY Projected	Draft
	Well Drilling Authorization Application Fee	\$0	\$12,505
	Non Exempt Well Construction Fee	\$0	\$5,000
	Non Exempt General Permit Well Construction Fee	\$0	\$12,500
	Permit Renewal Application Fees	\$0	\$0
	Water Utility Service Connection Fee	\$0	\$90,000
	Production Fee	\$0	\$50,154
	Production Authorization Application Fee (existing wells)	\$0	\$84,525
	Production Authorization Application Fee (new wells)	\$0	\$13,750
	Well Capping/Plugging Fee	\$0	\$1,000
	Interest Income	\$0	\$100
	Misc. Income (Administrative Fees)	\$0	\$250
	Funding from Travis County ILA (1)	\$15,000	\$0
	Funding from Travis County ILA (2)	\$77,136	\$8,500
	Funding from Travis County ILA (3)	\$0	\$100,000
	Enforcement Penalty Income	\$0	\$0
	Technical Projects Cost Sharing Reimbursements	\$0	\$0
	Total Projected FY19 Revenues	\$92,136	\$378,284
Expenses			
Personnel Expenses			
	General Manager	\$0	\$80,000
	Groundwater Technician	\$0	\$0
	Office Administrator/Administrative Assistant	\$0	\$28,600
	Part Time Employee or Intern	\$0	\$7,800
	Sick Pay or End of Employment Reserve Fund	\$0	\$5,430
	Overtime or Merit/Promotion Pay increases	\$0	\$0
	District Payroll Tax (FICA Medicare 1.45%)	\$0	\$1,688
	(FICA-Social Security 6.2%)	\$0	\$7,217
	Retirement District Match (7.5%)	\$0	\$0
	Rounding Errors	\$0	\$0
	Direct Deposit Payroll Expenses	\$0	\$0
	Director Travel Allowance	\$0	\$0
	Employee Health Insurance	\$0	\$13,500
	Employee Dependent Health Care Reimbursements	\$0	\$0
	Errors and Omissions Insurance	\$625	\$800
	Professional Development/Licensing/Cont. Edu.	\$1,000	\$1,500
	Public Officials and Staff Bonding	\$600	\$800
	Workers Compensation Insurance	\$0	\$2,025
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$2,225	\$149,360

Vehicle Expenses			
	Automobile Insurance		\$0
	Fuel/Oil/Wash		\$0
	POV Mileage/Expenses Reimbursement	\$2,000	\$4,000
	Vehicle Maintenance	\$0	
	Vehicle Purchase/Replacement Fund	\$0	
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$2,000	\$4,000
Contract/Professional Services			
	Auditor Services	\$5,000	\$7,500
	Bookkeeping	\$0	\$12,000
	Payroll Service	\$0	\$1,800
	Legal Services	\$18,500	\$48,000
	Public Relations and Outreach	\$500	\$2,000
	Professional Services	\$47,000	\$70,000
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$71,000	\$141,300
Office and Administrative Expenses			
	Computer Equipment, Software and Web Services	\$5,000	\$5,000
	Director Bonding Insurance	\$300	\$300
	Director General Liability Insurance	\$650	\$650
	Educational Materials	\$500	\$500
	GCD General Liability Insurance	\$0	\$800
	Interest Expense	\$0	\$0
	Late Fees/Penalty Fees/Bank Charges	\$0	\$0
	Library/Subscriptions	\$0	\$0
	Licenses and Permits	\$0	\$500
	Mail Expenses/Postage/Shipping	\$500	\$1,500
	Membership Dues (TAGD)	\$0	\$1,000
	Election Expense (Travis County and newspaper ads)	\$3,712	\$45,000
	Miscellaneous	\$500	\$500
	Office Building Maintenance or Reserve Fund	\$0	\$0
	Office Equipment & Furniture	\$1,000	\$2,500
	Office Grounds Maintenance	\$0	\$0
	Office Rent (annual)	\$1	\$1
	Office Supplies	\$1,000	\$1,000
	P.O. Box	\$148	\$150
	Printing/Copying	\$500	\$1,200
	Property Insurance	\$0	\$0
	Public Relations/Advertising/Public Notices/Signs	\$500	\$1,000
	Reconciliation Adjustment	\$0	\$0
	Refunds	\$0	\$0
	Telephone /Internet	\$600	\$1,200
	Utilities	\$0	\$0
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$14,911	\$62,801
Technical Operations Expenses			
	Groundwater Research Studies/Projects		
	Water Level Monitoring Equipment	\$0	\$5,000
	Other Studies/Project Opportunities	\$0	\$0
	GMA 9 Studies / Report Preparation	\$0	\$7,500
	Water Quality Testing Lab Costs	\$0	\$2,000
	Groundwater Research Studies/Projects Subtotal	\$0	\$14,500
	Related Projects		
	Data Base Services Fund	\$0	\$0
	Equipment Maintenance	\$0	\$0
	Field Equipment/Supplies	\$0	\$500
	Lab Equipment/Supplies	\$0	\$0
	Meetings/Conferences/Presentations	\$2,000	\$4,025
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$2,000	\$4,525
	FY 2021 Technical Operations Expense Total	\$2,000	\$19,025
Reserve Funds			
	Contingency Fund FY2021 Allocation	\$0	\$1,798
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$0	\$1,798
	Total Expenses	\$92,136	\$378,284
	Fund Balance	\$0	\$0

Exhibit E

Financial Report

SW Travis Cty. Groundwater Conservation Dist.
Reconciliation Detail
 Independent Bank, Period Ending 07/31/2020

Type	Date	Num	Name	Clr	Amount	Balance
Beginning Balance						315.26
Cleared Transactions						
Checks and Payments - 5 items						
Bill Pmt -Check	07/06/2020	133	Lloyd Gosselink	X	-6,412.50	-6,412.50
Bill Pmt -Check	07/06/2020	132	Sawin Group	X	-2,000.00	-8,412.50
Bill Pmt -Check	07/10/2020	134	Sawin Group	X	-2,000.00	-10,412.50
Bill Pmt -Check	07/20/2020	100	Spectrum	X	-82.01	-10,494.51
Bill Pmt -Check	07/22/2020	135	Sawin Group	X	-2,500.00	-12,994.51
Total Checks and Payments					-12,994.51	-12,994.51
Deposits and Credits - 2 items						
Deposit	07/02/2020		Travis - County	X	13,392.56	13,392.56
Deposit	07/31/2020			X	0.27	13,392.83
Total Deposits and Credits					13,392.83	13,392.83
Total Cleared Transactions					398.32	398.32
Cleared Balance					398.32	713.58
Register Balance as of 07/31/2020					398.32	713.58
Ending Balance					398.32	713.58



**Independent
Bank**

3090 Craig Drive
PO Box 3035
McKinney, TX 75070

0005811

6193INDP

30955C00X.007

8001



*0005811 S3
SOUTHWESTERN TRAVIS CO GROUNDWATER CONS
PO BOX 340595
LAKEWAY TX 78734-0010
|||||

ACCOUNT NUMBER	xxx3546
STATEMENT DATE	7/31/20
PAGE	1 of 4

INDEPENDENT FINANCIAL

The Bank has updated its Funds Availability policy.
You will receive a digital copy.

ifinancial.com | [f](#) [t](#) [in](#)

PUBLIC FUND NOW ACCT

Account Number	xxx3546	Statement Dates	7/01/20	thru	8/02/20
Previous Stmt Balance	315.26	Days in Statement Period	33		
Deposits/Credits	13,392.56	Average Collected	5,891.43		
Checks/Debits	12,994.51	Average Ledger	5,891.43		
Service Charge	0.00	Interest Earned	0.27		
Interest Paid	0.27	Annual Percentage Yield Earned	0.05 %		
Current Stmt Balance	713.58	2020 Interest Paid	2.21		

DEPOSITS AND OTHER CREDITS

Date	Description	Amount
7/02	REGULAR DEPOSIT	13,392.56
7/31	Interest Deposit	0.27

OTHER DEBITS

Date	Description	Amount
7/20	SPECTRUM DBT CRD 2222 07/19/20 277635 855-707-7328 TX Card# 8345	82.01-

CHECKS IN NUMBER ORDER

Listed in numerical order

Date	Check	Amount	Date	Check	Amount
7/16	132	2,000.00	7/16	134	2,000.00
7/10	133	6,412.50	7/27	135	2,500.00

(*) indicates gap in sequence

0005811

SOUTHWESTERN TRAVIS CO GROUNDWATER CONS
PO BOX 340595
LAKEWAY TX 78734-0010

ACCOUNT NUMBER	xxx3546
STATEMENT DATE	7/31/20
PAGE	3 of 4

6193INDP

30957C00X.007

26FDP

4001 -----



DAILY BALANCE SUMMARY					
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Date	Balance	Date	Balance	Date	Balance
7/01	315.26	7/16	3,295.32	7/27	713.31
7/02	13,707.82	7/20	3,213.31	7/31	713.58
7/10	7,295.32				