

Self-Evaluation Report Instructions



***Sunset Advisory Commission
June 2015***

INSTRUCTIONS

Each agency under Sunset review is required by law to complete a Self-Evaluation Report (SER) on its operations. The SER is designed to provide the Sunset Commission members and staff with a general background description of each agency being reviewed. The SER also gives each agency an opportunity to provide the Commission with a preview of issues and suggested improvements regarding the agency and its functions.

The SER contains 12 sections. Agencies should record their responses to each question directly on this electronic form. Answers should be typed in the white space beneath each question. Use as little or as much room as needed to answer each question. Since the SER is intended to be a learning instrument, and you are the instructor, Sunset is quite flexible in how various charts and sections apply to your operations. If the information requested does not apply to your agency, either provide similar information to reflect agency practices or enter "N/A" in the space provided. In charts, add or delete rows, change column widths, and renumber exhibits as necessary, or rename chart headings to better reflect agency practices. If a chart is not applicable, indicate so and delete the blank chart.

This document also contains examples for certain sections of the SER. Links are provided to jump directly from one part of the document to another, and can be accessed by clicking on the text indicating an exhibit example or exhibit.

Reviewing the background and issues sections of recent Sunset staff reports may also be helpful in preparing certain sections of the SER. Recent Sunset staff reports are available on the Sunset website at www.sunset.texas.gov.

Once the report is complete, update the appropriate page numbers on the table of contents. The text regarding Instructions, Attachments, and Examples can be deleted from the SER that the agency submits to the Sunset Commission.

By September 1, 2015, please submit an accessible pdf file of the Self-Evaluation Report and attachments to Cee Hartley at cecelia.hartley@sunset.state.tx.us. Please redact any personally identifiable medical information from any documents you provide to Sunset. If available, please provide the Sunset Commission with one hard copy of the SER and attachments to verify the pdf.

We encourage you to contact Sean Shurtleff at sean.shurtleff@sunset.state.tx.us of the Sunset staff at (512) 463-1300 with any questions, or email them to the Sunset Commission. Every effort will be made to minimize the additional workload this report places on your agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Agency Contact Information	1
II.	Key Functions and Performance	1
III.	History and Major Events.....	11
IV.	Policymaking Structure	13
V.	Funding	16
VI.	Organization.....	18
VII.	Guide to Agency Programs	19
	<i>Please list each program or function you describe in this section with the appropriate hyperlink and page reference</i>	
VIII.	Statutory Authority and Recent Legislation.....	45
IX.	Major Issues	55
	<i>Please list each major issue you describe in this section with the appropriate hyperlink and page reference</i>	
X.	Other Contacts	56
XI.	Additional Information	57
	Reporting Requirements.....	57
	Complaint Data	57
	Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) Data.....	59
	Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Data.....	60
XII.	Agency Comments	62

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Self-Evaluation Report**

I. Agency Contact Information

A. Please fill in the following chart.

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 1: Agency Contacts**

	Name	Address	Telephone & Fax Numbers	Email Address
Agency Head	Nancy Rose, Administrator	911 N. Bishop Street, Suite C-104 Wake Village, Texas 75501	903-223-7887 903-223-7988	nrsrba@cableone.net
Agency's Sunset Liaison	Nancy Rose, Administrator	Same As Above	Same As Above	Same As Above

Table 1 Exhibit 1 Agency Contacts

II. Key Functions and Performance

Provide the following information about the overall operations of your agency. More detailed information about individual programs will be requested in a later section.

A. Provide an overview of your agency's mission, objectives, and key functions.

ENABLING ACT: Section 4: AUTHORITY PURPOSES: The purpose of this Act is to authorize the authority to provide for the conservation and development of the state's natural resources within the basin of Sulphur River, including:

- (1). the control, storage, preservation, and distribution of the state's water for domestic and municipal uses, industrial uses, irrigation, mining and recovery of minerals, stock raising, underground water recharge, electric power generation, navigation, recreation and pleasure, and other beneficial uses and purposes;
- (2). the reclamation and irrigation of land needing irrigation;
- (3). the reclamation and drainage of overflowed land and other land needing drainages;
- (4). the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the water;
- (5). the conservation and development of the forests, water and hydroelectric power;
- (6). the navigation of inland water; and
- (7). the provision of systems, facilities, and procedures for the collection, transportation, handling, treatment, and disposal of waste of all types.

MISSION: SRBA is authorized by the state to provide for the conservation and development of its natural resources within the Basin of Sulphur River. Land included in the authority will be benefited by the improvements to be acquired and constructed by the authority.

Prudent planning for conservation and development plus understanding existing conditions are paramount. Since 2011, the current Board of Directors is focused on gathering data throughout the entire basin. Environmental, social, economic, hydrologic, geological, and more data continue to be gathered and studied in order to make the best decisions possible for conservation and development.

No collective and comprehensive study exists covering the entire basin. Pieces have been done in the past but more is being done to meet the objectives of SRBA.

Objectives: During the process of prudent planning and understanding existing conditions, pinpoint problems and work with those impacted to mitigate or solve those problems.

Determine what improvements need to occur based on purpose and need within the basin and the state. Develop improvements needed with the greatest benefit to the basin.

KEY FUNCTIONS:

- Protect the basin:

Prudent planning and understanding existing conditions are needed to protect and make the best decisions for the basin. In 2010, SRBA directors began focusing on gathering the data needed to develop a 50 year plan. The process takes years and millions of dollars.

- Share Information:

Conduct open meetings to share information. Make data readily available to the public and others from SRBA office and website. Notify and update those affected by a problem discovered by SRBA or other sources. Submit information to the TWDB regional planning group to incorporate needed information to the State Water Plan.

- Problem solving:

Once a problem is discovered, develop a plan to eliminate or alleviate the problem. Work with cities, counties, state and federal agencies, groups, or others as needed to find and implement solutions.

- Develop new water supply:

SRBA Water Availability Modeling, using the drought of record, revealed over 1,000,000 acre-feet of unappropriated water flows down the Sulphur River annually. There are future water needs within the basin along with adjacent areas outside of the basin. Water planning involving Water Supply strategies is an important part of the current studies being conducted by SRBA.

- Clean Rivers Program:

Since 1997 SRBA has been the major force in planning water quality monitoring activities in the Sulphur River Basin. It does that through its state contract to manage the Clean Rivers Program. The SRBA is the program manager and subcontracts the monitoring contract to Texarkana College. The program has been quite successful in producing useful water quality data and generating interest by citizens.

B. Do your key functions continue to serve a clear and ongoing objective? Explain why each of these functions is still needed. What harm would come from no longer performing these functions?

SRBA's key functions continue to serve clear and ongoing objectives. Active and in-depth studies continue to reveal valuable information.

Problems have been realized and are being addresses.

The "Clean Rivers Program" continues to be valuable and SRBA's participation is favored by TCEQ.

The need for evaluation of water quality issues through continuing the Clean Rivers Program in the basin is as great as ever. The erosion issue, and its impact on streams and lakes in the basin, has increased with the loss of riparian buffer zones due to agriculture and loss of timber. No other governmental entities in the basin have the experience and twenty-year track record necessary to manage the Clean Rivers Program.

Explain why each of these functions is still needed:

To protect the basin and make prudent decisions, current and additional studies are needed. A 50 year plan needs to be maintained, updated, changed, etc. Purpose and need in the future may require any of the actions listed below that SRBA is authorized to provide.

- The control, storage, preservation, and distribution of the state's water for domestic and municipal uses, irrigation, industrial uses, mining and recovery of minerals, stock raising, underground water recharge, electric power generation, navigation, recreation and pleasure, and other beneficial uses and purposes;
 - The reclamation and irrigation of land needing irrigation;
 - The reclamation and drainage of overflowed land and other land needing drainage;
 - The maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water;
 - The conservation and development of the forests, water and hydroelectric power;
 - The navigation of inland water, and

- The provision of systems, facilities, and procedures for the collection, transportation, handling, treatment, and disposal of waste of all types

The Clean Rivers Program is crucial to the health of all within the basin and outside of the basin. Industrial, drinking, recreational, and wildlife water can become hazards. Organic material, bacteria, chemicals, and more need to be monitored and documented. Sources of pollutants need to be located and monitored. Best Management Practices may need to be funded and implemented by SRBA.

What harm would come from no longer performing these functions?

To protect and develop natural resources in the basin, a vast knowledge of the basin must be maintained. Jurisdictional actions from others can negatively impact the basin if there are data gaps. A river basin is a system of water, plants, life and livelihoods that may be impacted by the smallest changes.

SRBA is the only agency with boundaries of the entire basin (excluding Fannin County). SRBA was formed to protect and benefit the basin and those in it. Without SRBA, jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional changes could occur with little or no benefit. Before SRBA, Cooper Lake (now Jim Chapman) was built and the benefit to the basin was minimal. Environmental impacts could have been mitigated differently to protect certain habitats and position economic development more favorable. Everything was done within the law but no agency had the legislative authority to plan, prepare, protect, and develop the entire basin.

C. What evidence can your agency provide to show your overall effectiveness and efficiency in meeting your objectives?

Since 2011 the SRBA has carefully and methodically pursued prudent planning for the basin. Previously, specific areas were targeted for study. The current Board of Directors determined a systemic understanding of the entire basin was mandatory to protect and develop the basin. Decisions will be based on this data and must be current and correct.

SRBA's 2005 "Feasibility Cost Share Agreement" (FCSA) with the United States Corps of Engineers (COE) was executed to study water related resources problems in the watershed of the Sulphur River. In 2010, SRBA worked with the COE to begin expanding their scope of work toward alternative water supply strategies and reallocation (pool raise) of existing reservoirs.

The COE's budget was very limited at the time and funding was carefully prioritized. The COE recognized the importance of SRBA's path forward and found ways to fund their required 50% match. The COE secured federal dollars from PAS grant funding (Public Assistance to States) between 2011 and 2013.

Planning, executing, and completing tasks during 2011 and 2013 were recognized by the COE administration. In August of 2013, the study was re-scoped to be 3x3x3 compliant, taking into consideration a water supply approach for the SMART Planning feasibility study. In 2014, 2015

and 2016 the U. S. President's budget included money for the Sulphur River Basin Feasibility Study totaling \$1,500,000.

The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) has recognized, and supports, the SRBA's planning process. The data helped TWDB resolve a conflict between two Regional Planning Groups. (*An interim Order, August 7, 2014*).

Each year a path forward is determined. Then a scope of work is developed for the next fiscal year. These tasks are then coordinated with the COE and integrated into the overall plan. Cost, timelines, milestones, and deadlines are applied. The work is executed the following fiscal year and those responsible are held accountable.

Clean Rivers Program:

The SRBA has been audited numerous times by the state auditor for its management of the Clean Rivers Program contract both for fiscal responsibility and for its monitoring activities. The results of the audits are of public record.

SRBA did a TCEQ Management Audit in FY2010.

D. Does your agency's enabling law continue to correctly reflect your mission, objectives, and approach to performing your functions? Have you recommended changes to the Legislature in the past to improve your agency's operations? If so, explain. Were the changes adopted?

Yes! The current agency's enabling law provides the authority needed to plan, prepare, protect and develop the basin now and in the future.

No changes have been recommended from SRBA.

In May of 2009 the legislature added an "at large" appointment to the Board of Directors.

Clean Rivers Program:

The SRBA has been able to manage the Clean Rivers Program effectively for the basin by carefully utilizing the funding available from the state appropriation for this activity. The Clean Rivers Program could be expanded if more state funding was available.

SRBA has a contract with TCEQ for a certain dollar amount for a two-year Contract at a time. SRBA has to spend the funds and then send in Vouchers to be reimbursed.

E. Do any of your agency's functions overlap or duplicate those of another state or federal agency? Explain if, and why, each of your key functions is most appropriately placed within your agency. How do you ensure against duplication with other related agencies?

SRBA's functions include the entire basin of the Sulphur River. No other agency, with similar authority, has the same boundaries or is modeling, analyzing, assessing, and documenting data from and for the entire Sulphur River Basin.

Other agencies within the basin help protect the basin. Those agencies have a focus on smaller areas within the basin. SRBA's scope and focus are on the entire basin. SRBA and other agencies share information and concerns so SRBA can ensure a current basin wide understanding is developed.

SRBA's relationship with the USACE, TWDB, TCEQ and others helps in solving problems within the basin. Because SRBA's focus is on the entire basin, several problems have been realized. SRBA has eliminated or alleviated problems in the past and will continue to do so as problems surface.

No other agency is studying water supply strategies within the basin. Other agencies are providing purpose and need for additional water supply. Those agencies recognize the authority given to SRBA and support SRBA facilitating the scope of work needed.

SRBA does its best not to duplicate functions with other related agencies by being aware of their purpose, functions, contracts, activities, etc. Direct communication, agreements, and contracts with related agencies are the easiest way to prevent duplication. Also, reviewing information in Regional Water Plans, agency meeting agendas, agency websites, and legislative information help as a resource to prevent duplication of activities.

Clean Rivers Program:

No other government agency in the Sulphur River Basin manages the Clean Rivers Program. Within the Clean Rivers Program, duplication of effort is minimized by joining with other partners in the basin in a coordinated monitoring effort to eliminate duplication and maximize the use of available funding.

F. In general, how do other states carry out similar functions?

SRBA is unfamiliar with other state agencies pertaining to river authority.

The Clean Rivers Program in some form is mandated in all states to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act. Other states are similar to Texas, but many have more expenses because the activities are carried out by extra personnel needed to maintain the programs.

G. What key obstacles impair your agency's ability to achieve its objectives?

The planning and study process SRBA is performing is a time consuming and expensive endeavor that could take another 5 years. Public input, along with the data, will determine what projects will be selected for water supply. Once a project is selected and the permitting process begins, regulatory agencies begin their long process for approval or denial. Water rights from TCEQ could take up to 12 years. A 404 permit from the USACE could take an additional 7 years. During the permitting period regulatory guidelines may change at the state and federal levels.

Examples:

- Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Proposed Rule to Define “Waters of the United States” Under the Clean Water Act EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0880
- [Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015](#), H.R. 1732
- Waters of the U.S. (WOTUS) bill, the Federal Water Quality Protection Act , S. 1140, on April 30, 2015
- Executive Order (Amendments) January, 2015 to Executive Order 11988 of May 24, 1977 (Floodplain Management),

Regulatory changes can prolong or temporarily stop the scope of studies, project selection, and permitting process. Purpose and need for SRBA’s water demand begin in 2030. The permitting process is a dynamic obstacle.

CLEAN RIVERS PROGRAM:

The SRBA meets its Clean Rivers Program objectives fully utilizing the funding from the state. Its objectives could be expanded if more funding was available.

H. Discuss any changes that could impact your agency’s key functions in the near future (e.g., changes in federal law or outstanding court cases).

Listed in Question G are two federal issues that can expand jurisdictional areas regulated by the United States Corps of Engineers, FEMA, and other federal agencies. The State of Texas has fought many of these type of changes in the past. Once they become law, state agencies will conform in one way or another. Additional workload, costs, and time may result.

Clean Rivers Program:

Although it is not anticipated at this time, any loss of Clean Rivers Program funding from the state would create problems in maintaining SRBA’s current level of effort. On a more positive note, the SRBA is currently developing a partnership with North Texas Municipal Water District to monitor Jim Chapman Lake near Cooper, Texas. The partnership has the potential to make a substantial contribution to the amount of monitoring in the basin.

I. What are your agency’s biggest opportunities for improvement in the future?

SRBA’s studies have revealed several issues within the basin that need to be addressed. Many opportunities exists to improve the health and welfare of the basin. These opportunities fall directly within the enabling legislation directive to provide for the conservation and development of the natural resources within the basin.

- Erosion: A Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) analysis indicated areas producing soil erosion and where that erosion is settling. Significant impacts have and are occurring. Sediment from erosion is impacting habitats and shortening the life cycle of Jim Chapman Lake and Wright Patman Lake. Sedimentation is crippling the lake usefulness. Best

Management Practices (BMP) need to be evaluated to determine the options to mitigate this erosion. Revegetation, bank revitalization, controlled grazing, retention, and sediment banks, are examples of BMP's to be considered. Landowner participation and funding are major parts of a successful BMP program. Educating the public and funding are required.

- Dam Safety Action Classification (DSAC): A national risk cadre screened Wright Patman Dam on April 30, 2007 as part of the FY07 Screening Portfolio Risk Assessment (SPRA) effort to classify dams according to relative risk in order to prioritize funding, investigations, and measures for risk-informed dam safety management. Potential failure modes (PRMs) were identified and engineering assessments were assigned to each PRM, which assigns each dam a Dam Safety Action Class (DSAC). Currently, Wright Patman Dam is rated as a DSCA III, meaning it is at moderate-to-high risk.

SRBA has worked with the COE to move the Periodic Assessment (PA) up from 2017 to 2014. This in an effort to keep Wright Patman Lake on the list of possible new water supply and allow the COE to operate the lake above contracted operation so Texarkana can pull water year round. SRBA included Texarkana in the process and initial studies needed. Joint efforts lead by SRBA diverted operational changes by convincing the COE to move the (PA) to 2014 which revealed the dam's structure is a minimal risk.

Consequences downstream still exist as a high risk. Structural risks are low but still exist. The preferred DSCA rating is an IV. To move the rating from III to IV will take several years and millions of dollars. SRBA will continue to work with the COE to stay on task. SRBA stands ready to help financially and to conduct additional studies if needed.

- Lack of Water Supply: SRBA's initial studies revealed current and future water shortages within the basin.

Clarksville, Texas, along with Red River County, is experiencing negative growth partly due to the lack of water and quality of available water. SRBA's 2011 studies collected valuable information that helped Clarksville. The Regional Planning Group for the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) did not have the correct information regarding Clarksville's water supply. SRBA helped Clarksville integrate the correct information for the 2016 regional water plan. SRBA also worked with Texarkana Water Utilities to upsize a several mile long water supply line during a road widening. The increase in pipe size is needed if Clarksville ever connects to that supply.

No additional water has reached Clarksville at this time. SRBA continues to work with Clarksville and others to help meet Clarksville's needs.

- Unappropriated Water: SRBA's Water Availability Modeling revealed an estimated 1.1 million acre feet of unappropriated water in the Sulphur River Basin potentially available for development. The regional water planning by the state indicates a purpose and need by 2070 for approximately 600,000 ac-ft. /yr that could be developed in the Sulphur River Basin out of the unappropriated 1.1 million ac-ft. available. The basin wide studies facilitated by SRBA and the Corps of Engineers (COE) are to determine a new water supply project (projects) that will meet the need. The project (or projects) must meet regulatory

requirements and have the least environmental impact, and a balanced benefit from the diversion.

Most of the need is outside of the Sulphur River basin and requires an interbasin transfer. The outside cities and agencies providing purpose and need could pursue the unappropriated water without SRBA. Knowing that SRBA was authorized to provide for the conservation and development of the basin’s natural resources, the cities and agencies have partnered with SRBA to facilitate prudent planning and selection. They include the City of Irving, City of Dallas, Upper Trinity Regional Water District, North Texas Municipal Water District and Tarrant Regional Water District.

The studies are bringing SRBA closer to selected project (or projects). Final data for selection will be completed in the near future.

- **Benefit to the basin:** To move water from one basin to another for use is called “Interbasin Transfer”. Interbasin transfers have long been subject to special requirements under Texas law to ensure that interests of the basin of origin are protected. In *San Antonio v Texas Water Commission*, the Texas Supreme Court held that the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) was prohibited from granting a permit for an interbasin transfer where doing so would “prejudice any person or entity”. To determine whether a particular interbasin transfer would result in prejudice, the court held that the TCEQ should undertake “a balancing process” under which a permit for an interbasin transfer would be denied “if the benefits from the diversion were outweighed by detriments to the originating basin”.

SRBA’s knowledge of existing conditions, problems and concerns throughout the basin sets the stage to facilitate significant benefits to the Sulphur River basin. Once a project is elected, SRBA will work closely with cities, counties, and agencies to reach a balanced benefit to the basin.

Clean Rivers Program:

The SRBA intends to seek more Clean Rivers Program partnerships with stakeholders in the basin to increase the amount of data that is being collected and generate interest in improving water quality within the Sulphur Basin. The logical outcome from these activities is to produce a number of watershed protection plans that limit point and non-point sources of pollution in the basin lakes and streams.

J. In the following chart, provide information regarding your agency’s key performance measures included in your appropriations bill pattern, including outcome, input, efficiency, and explanatory measures. See Exhibit 2 Example.

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 2: Key Performance Measures — Fiscal Year 2014**

Key Performance Measures	FY 2014 Target	FY 2014 Actual Performance	FY 2014 % of Annual Target
Complete studies needed for Decision Milestone	100%	100%	100%

Self-Evaluation Report

Key Performance Measures	FY 2014 Target	FY 2014 Actual Performance	FY 2014 % of Annual Target
Develop Decision Support Tool for Board of Directors	50%	50%	50%
Decision Milestone to narrow select feasible water strategies	100%	100%	100%
Reconstruct the SRBA website	100%	100%	100%
Review and update Policies	100%	100%	100%
Evaluate PA with the objective to protect current lake operations in favor of Texarkana	100%	100%	100%
Participate with COE to complete Periodic Assessment (PA) For WPL Dam	100%	80%	80%
Monitor Water Quality	100%	100%	100%

Table 2 Exhibit 2 Key Performance Measures

III. History and Major Events

Provide a timeline of your agency's history and key events, including:

- the date your agency was established; **August 29, 1985**
- the original purpose and responsibilities of your agency
- major changes in responsibilities or statutory authority;
- changes to your policymaking body's name or composition;
- significant changes in state/federal legislation, mandates, or funding;
- significant state/federal litigation that specifically affects your agency's operations; and
- key changes in your agency's organization (e.g., a major reorganization of the agency's divisions or program areas).

S. B. No. 5, 69th Legislature, which became effective August 29, 1985, created the Sulphur River Basin Authority pursuant to Article XVI, Section 59, of the Texas Constitution.

The authority is composed of the territory in each county in Texas, other than Fannin County, that is located, in whole or in part, within the watershed of the Sulphur River and its tributaries with confluences with the Sulphur River upstream from the eastern boundary of Texas, as those watersheds and tributaries are defined by maps now on file with the Texas Department of Water Resources.

The purpose of this Act is to authorize to provide for the conservation and the development of the state's natural resources within the basin of Sulphur River, including:

- 1). the control, storage, preservation, and distribution of the state's water for domestic and municipal uses, industrial uses, irrigation, mining and recovery of minerals, stock raising, underground water recharge, electric power generation, navigation, recreation and pleasure, and other beneficial uses and purposes;
- 2). the reclamation and irrigation of land needing irrigation;
- 3). the reclamation and drainage of overflowed land and other land needing drainage;
- 4). the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the water;
- 5). the conservation and development of the forests, water, and hydroelectric power;
- 6). the navigation of inland water; and

7). the provision of systems, facilities, and procedures for the collection, transportation, handling, treatment, and disposal of waste of all types.

2003

S.B. 287, 78th Legislature, changed the composition of certain state agency governing bodies with an even number of members to an odd number. SRBA added an at large position to total 7 governing members.

2013

H.B. 1675, 83rd Legislature, placed SRBA subject to review under Chapter 325 for 2017.

2015

S.B. 523, 84th Legislature, grouped SRBA with all River Authorities subject to review under Chapter 325. SRBA was positioned for 2017 review.

IV. Policymaking Structure

A. Complete the following chart providing information on your policymaking body members.

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 3: Policymaking Body**

Member Name	Term / Appointment Dates / Appointed by <i>(e.g., Governor, Lt. Governor, Speaker)</i>	Qualification <i>(e.g., public member, industry representative)</i>	City
Michael Russell, President	February 2004	Realtor	Clarksville
Borden Bell, Jr., Vice President	February 2009	Retired Businessman/Trucking	Texarkana
David Neeley	February 2009	Consultant	Mt Pleasant
Patricia Wommack	May 2005	Retired Government	Lone Star
Brad Drake	February 2007	Employee	Paris
Wally Kraft	May 2009	Owner of Construction Co.	Paris
Kirby Hollingsworth	May 2009	Dr. of Veterinary Financial Advisor	Mt Vernon
(Text)	(Text)	(Text)	(Text)
ALL SRBA BOARD MEMBERS ARE APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS and CONFIRMED BY THE TEXAS SENATE	6 years Term	Open Meeting Act & Texas Public Information Act	

Table 3 Exhibit 3 Policymaking Body

The authority is governed by a board of directors composed of seven members. Six members are appointed to represent specific counties with the authority’s boundaries and one member is at large. The members of the board are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Each member of the board is qualified by taking the constitutional oath (Article XVI, 51) and by executing a bond in an amount determined by the board conditioned on a faithful performance of his or her duties.

B. Describe the primary role and responsibilities of your policymaking body:

Govern the authority;

Represent their county to the best of their ability in matters related to providing for conservation and the development of the state’s natural resources within the basin of Sulphur River, including:

The control, storage, preservation, and distribution of the state’s water for domestic and municipal uses, irrigation, industrial uses, mining and recovery of minerals, stock raising, underground water recharge, electric power generation, navigation, recreation and pleasure, and other beneficial uses and purposes;

The reclamation and irrigation of land needing irrigation;

The reclamation and drainage of overflowed land and other land needing drainage;

The maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water;

The conservation and development of the forests, water and hydroelectric power;

The navigation of inland water; and

The provision of systems, facilities, and procedure for the collection, transportation, handling, treatment, and disposal of waste of all types;

Elect a president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, and other officers if the Board considers necessary;

Hold open meeting for the transaction of business with a board majority (quorum);

Adopt or amend necessary rules for the conduct of the authorities business;

Appoint committees from the membership of the board as necessary or desirable to assist in conducting the business of the authority according to rule of law; and

Set and enforce all rules & regulations and approve the budget & all Finances.

C. How is the chair selected?

By the Election of the Board of Directors (Quorum) in March of every odd number year.

D. List any special circumstances or unique features about your policymaking body or its responsibilities.

N/A

E. In general, how often does your policymaking body meet? How many times did it meet in FY 2014? In FY 2015?

SRBA's By-Laws state to meet the 3rd Tuesday of each month. Sometimes SRBA has Workshops for the Board of Directors; the Workshops are also open to the Public.

In FY2014.... We met on the 3rd Tuesday of each month... Total of 12 months/Meetings

In FY2015...We met on the 3rd Tuesday of each month...We have met 8 months for FY15

F. What type of training do members of your agency's policymaking body receive?

When they are appointed by the Governor of Texas, each has to attended the

Training of the Open Meeting Act & Public Information Act.

The Board of Directors also attends other Regional Water Meetings.

G. Does your agency have policies that describe the respective roles of the policymaking body and agency staff in running the agency? If so, describe these policies.

SRBA and its policymaking body and agency staff follow the “Enabling Act’ and the Texas Water Codes 325 and 49 along with other Texas Government Codes 325, etc.

H. What information is regularly presented to your policymaking body to keep them informed of your agency’s performance?

1. Conduct regular monthly Meetings...(Cash Position, Expenditures, Investment Funds, By-Laws, Contracts, Daily Duties and Basin Wide Feasibility Study and Public Comments. SRBA has people from Engineer Firms, Corps of Engineers, Water Groups to meet and discuss Contracts and Policies.

I. How does your policymaking body obtain input from the public regarding issues under the jurisdiction of the agency? How is this input incorporated into the operations of your agency?

SRBA holds regular meetings on the third Tuesday of each month. SRBA has an agenda item entitled “Public Input” at every Board Meeting. Repetitive items on the agenda allow performance information to be presented regarding budget, studies, and water planning activities in the region. Several days before the meeting, packets are sent to the board members with information for their review and preparation. SRBA has (2) Web Sites that allow anyone to make comments, along with the listing of SRBA phone number and E-Mail address. Web Sites: www.srbatx.org (&) www.sulphurr.org

Special meetings or workshops are held if the board or staff believe them to be helpful.

Grant charts or percentage of completion updates are presented on most studies.

J. If your policymaking body uses subcommittees or advisory committees to carry out its duties, fill in the following chart. See Exhibit 4 Example.

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 4: Subcommittees and Advisory Committees**

Name of Subcommittee or Advisory Committee	Size / Composition / How are members appointed?	Purpose / Duties	Legal Basis for Committee
Personnel Committee	3 Board Members	All Personnel Duties	Interviews
Contract Committee	3 Board Members	Review all Contracts	Pre-View all Contracts

Table 4 Exhibit 4 Subcommittees and Advisory Committees

V. Funding

A. Provide a brief description of your agency’s funding.

We have a Contract with TCEQ for the Clean Rivers Program..... \$198,594.00 for 2 years

SRBA does the water quality monitoring for the Clean Rivers Program and then sends in Quarterly Purchase Vouchers with all receipt, to TCEQ; SRBA gets reimbursed for the amounts spent.

SRBA and Feasibility Basin Wide Study: The operation of SRBA and the Feasibility Basin Wide Study are currently being funded by The City of Dallas, The City of Irving, North Texas Municipal Water District, Tarrant Regional Water District and Upper Trinity Water District.

The funding parties agreed to work with the authority to develop regional solutions toward developing the state’s water supplies.

A joint committee for program development (JCPD) consists of representatives from each funding party and the authority. The JCPD will meet at least once a year to discuss goals, objectives, performance, and progress in order to recommend a budget. The authority will review and discuss the recommended budget. Changes may be made by the authority before final approval.

Once the budget is approved by SRBA, each funding party is sent a request for funds. Each funding party pays a percentage of the total as written in the agreement.

B. List all riders that significantly impact your agency’s budget.

NONE (We do not receive any Funds/Money from the Federal Government.

C. Show your agency’s expenditures by strategy. *See Exhibit 5 Example.*

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 5: Expenditures by Strategy — 2014 (Actual)**

Goal / Strategy	Amount Spent	Percent of Total	Contract Expenditures Included in Total Amount
Sulphur River Basin Authority	\$725,072.05		\$725,072.05
GRAND TOTAL:	(Number)	(Percent)	(Number)

Table 5 Exhibit 5 Expenditures by Strategy

- D. Show your agency’s sources of revenue. Include all local, state, and federal appropriations, all professional and operating fees, and all other sources of revenue collected by the agency, including taxes and fines. *See Exhibit 6 Example.*

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 6: Sources of Revenue — Fiscal Year 2014 (Actual)

Source	Amount
N/A	TOTAL

Table 6 Exhibit 6 Sources of Revenue

- E. If you receive funds from multiple federal programs, show the types of federal funding sources. *See Exhibit 7 Example.*

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 7: Federal Funds — Fiscal Year 2014 (Actual)

Type of Fund	State / Federal Match Ratio	State Share	Federal Share	Total Funding
NONE...N/A	(Number)	(Number)	(Number)	(Number)
TOTAL		(Number)	(Number)	(Number)

Table 7 Exhibit 7 Federal Funds

- F. If applicable, provide detailed information on fees collected by your agency. *See Exhibit 8 Example.*

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 8: Fee Revenue — Fiscal Year 2014

Fee Description/ Program/ Statutory Citation	Current Fee/ Statutory Maximum	Number of Persons or Entities Paying Fee	Fee Revenue	Where Fee Revenue is Deposited (e.g., General Revenue Fund)
NONE N/A	(Text)	(Number)	(Number)	(Text)
NONE N/A	(Text)	(Number)	(Number)	(Text)

Table 8 Exhibit 8 Fee Revenue

VI. Organization

- A. Provide an organizational chart that includes major programs and divisions, and shows the number of FTEs in each program or division. Detail should include, if possible, Department Heads with subordinates, and actual FTEs with budgeted FTEs in parenthesis.

(Place here)

- B. If applicable, fill in the chart below listing field or regional offices. See Exhibit 9 Example.

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 9: FTEs by Location — Fiscal Year 2014

Headquarters, Region, or Field Office	Location	Co-Location? Yes / No	Number of Budgeted FTEs FY 2014	Number of Actual FTEs as of June 1, 2014
Sulphur River Basin Authority	911 N. Bishop Street Suite C-104 Wake Village, Texas	Yes	1	1
			TOTAL:	TOTAL:

Table 9 Exhibit 9 FTEs by Location

- C. What are your agency's FTE caps for fiscal years 2014–2017?

FY2014==\$54,080.00 & FY2015==\$58,240.00 & FY2016==\$58,240.00

- D. How many temporary or contract employees did your agency have as of August 31, 2014?

NONE

- E. List each of your agency's key programs or functions, along with expenditures and FTEs by program. See Exhibit 10 Example.

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 10: List of Program FTEs and Expenditures — Fiscal Year 2014

Program	Number of Budgeted FTEs FY 2014	Actual FTEs as of August 31, 2014	Actual Expenditures
All Duties: Administration, Payroll, Insurance, monthly meeting, minutes, daily office routine, invoices, contracts, etc.	1	1	\$65,086.00
TOTAL	1	1	\$

Table 10 Exhibit 10 List of Program FTEs and Expenditures

VII. Guide to Agency Programs

Complete this section for **each** agency program (or each agency function, activity, or service if more appropriate). Copy and paste the questions as many times as needed to discuss each program, activity, or function. Contact Sunset staff with any questions about applying this section to your agency.

A. Provide the following information at the beginning of each program description.

Name of Program or Function: *SRBA/Basin Wide Study Feasibility Study-Protect the Basin*

Location/Division: ****** SRBA's Office*

Contact Name: ****** Nancy Rose*

Actual Expenditures, FY 2014: ****** \$725,072.05*

Number of Actual FTEs as of June 1, 2015: ******Only (1) Full Time Employee*

Statutory Citation for Program:****** -0-*

Name of Program or Function: *SRBA/Clean Rivers Program/Water Monitoring Quality*

Location/Division.....*SRBA's Office*

Contract Name:.....*Nancy Rose*

Actual Expenditures, FY2014.....*\$99,297.00*

Number of actual FTEs as of June 1, 2015..... *Only (1) Full Time Employee*

B. What is the objective of this program or function? Describe the major activities performed under this program.

As an artery connects the parts of a body to one another, so a river threads together the creeks and streams, valleys and hills, lakes and underground springs that share a common assembly of water. A river basin comes closer than any other defined area of land, with the exception of an isolated island, to meeting the definition of an ecosystem in which all things, living and non-living, are connected and interdependent.

These often very large-scale ecosystems combine both terrestrial (e.g. forest and grassland) and aquatic (e.g. river, lake and marsh) components, thereby providing a wide diversity of habitats for plants and animals.

Communities greatly depend on a river basin to provide the natural resources to exist. Farming of all types and economic development would not occur without a healthy river basin. If any area in the basin is changed by either man or nature such changes can easily impact some or all of the river basin. These impacts can be positive or negative.

The Sulphur River Basin encompasses some 3,558 square mile in Northeast Texas. Included in the basin are all or parts of 10 Texas counties (Lamar, Red River, Bowie, Hunt, Delta, Hopkins, Franklin, Titus, Morris and Cass). From the eastern state line of Texas, the Sulphur River flows into Arkansas and joins with the Red River, a tributary of the Mississippi River. The South and North Sulphur Rivers originate in southern Fannin County and flow eastward approximately 50 miles to their confluence near the eastern boundary of Delta and Lamar counties. (The Middle Sulphur joins the South Sulphur River approximately 23 miles upstream of its confluence with the North Sulphur). White Oak Creek, the largest tributary of the Sulphur River, drains approximately 500 square miles and joins the main stream of the Sulphur River further downstream in Cass County.

The Sulphur River Basin Authority's objective is to develop a vast base of information involving the entire Sulphur River basin. Hydrological, geological, environmental, social, and economic studies continue to be developed. This fundamental process is an academic necessity in order to protect and manage a river basin efficiently and successfully. Understanding what is needed to sustain the ecosystem is the foundation needed to protect and improve the quality of life dependent on the river basin.

Most recent studies developing under SRBA and in coordination with the COE:

Dam Safety Fact Sheet:

This is a Corps of Engineers Fort Worth Dam Safety Fact Sheet on Structural Geology in the vicinity of Wright Patman Dam. In this fact sheet it is clearly noted that "...each site has a unique subsurface geology and each site must be independently evaluated. Characterization of site specific structural geology and seismic hazards requires a thorough geologic and engineering investigation to evaluate the site-specific conditions".

Final Watershed Overview Report:

This is the January 2014 "Watershed Overview...Final Report" for the Sulphur River Basin, as prepared for the Corps of Engineers. It addresses institutional setting, water demand and availability, Wright Patman Lake yield scenarios, yield analysis of other sites, and summary/conclusions.

Comparative Environmental Assessment Report:

This is the December 2, 2014 "Environmental Evaluation Interim Report" for the "Sulphur River Basin Comparative Assessment", as prepared for the Fort Worth District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). It addresses land resource/cover type assessment, assessment of Federal

and State listed threatened and endangered species, comparative analysis of cultural resources, and water quality.

Socioeconomic Report:

This is the “Sulphur River Basin Socioeconomic Characterization” for the “Sulphur River Basin Comparative Assessment”, as prepared for the Fort Worth District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). It addresses population, demographics, labor, earnings, public finance and school districts and develops a “Regional Input/output Model” for socioeconomic impacts.

Cost Rollup Report:

This is the “Cost Rollup Report-Final” for the “Sulphur River Basin Feasibility Study”, as prepared for the Sulphur River Basin Authority (SRBA). It addresses embankment and spillway cost estimates, Wright Patman reallocation costs, real estate costs, reservoir conflicts and relocation estimates, other reservoir costs, transmission costs estimates, operation and maintenance costs, carbon footprint analysis, and a “cost rollup” summary.

International Paper Impact Analysis:

This is a technical memorandum which summarizes the impact of strategies to develop additional water supply in the Sulphur River Basin by reallocating storage in Wright Patman Lake on the operations of the International Paper Company’s Texarkana Mill (IP). The download is in two parts, with one containing the body of the technical memorandum and the other containing the appendices.

Hydrologic Yields Report:

This is the “Hydrologic Yields Report”, as prepared for the Sulphur River Basin Authority (SRBA). This report describes an evaluation of the hydrologic yields of proposed water supply projects in the Sulphur River Basin, performed as part of the larger Sulphur River Basin Feasibility Study.

Data being developed:

Revised Yield Study:

This builds on work performed in prior studies to evaluate the available water supply from a combination of Lake Wright Patman reallocation and the proposed Marvin Nichols Reservoir using a Riverware software platform. The scope assumes that the USACE will update the Riverware model with assumptions regarding precipitation on the reservoir surface of Lake Wright Patman. It is also assumed that they will extend the hydrology through 2014 as feasible.

Phase II—International Paper Analysis:

This builds on previous work evaluating the effect of modified operations at Lake Wright Patman on operation of International Paper’s management and release of plant effluent downstream of Wright Patman Dam. This analysis will utilize the updated Riverware model and operational

assumptions developed in the Revised Yield Study to provide a more focused assessment of possible impacts as well as address possible measures to mitigate/reduce the effect of upstream water supply development on International Paper operations.

Timberland and Agricultural Impact Assessment:

This involves identification of potential impacts to timber production and other important agricultural activities within the footprint of the potential new reservoir/Wright Patman reallocation combinations. Impact assessment will include estimation of the amount and value of timber/agricultural lands impacted.

Optimization Evaluation:

This serves as the integration of the revised yield information, cost information developed in previous studies, and environmental/socio-economics information developed, as well as previous studies, to identify the best combination of Wright Patman Lake, reallocation and new storage at the Marvin Nichols site. The trade-off assessment will address yield, cost, environmental and socioeconomic factors. The Decision Support Tool developed as part of previous work will be updated and adapted for potential use in broader stakeholder coordination.

CLEAN RIVERS PROGRAM: Data Management (Project Administration):

The Texas Clean Rivers Program (CRP) was created by the Texas Legislature in 1991 through the Texas Clean Rivers Act. The CRP is designed to do the planning, coordination, and reporting of water quality monitoring and use public outreach to involve the citizens in those efforts. The program is administered by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) and is funded by state collected fees. The goal of the CRP is to maintain and improve the quality of water within each river basin in Texas through an ongoing partnership involving the TCEQ, river authorities, other state agencies, regional entities, local governments, industry, and citizens. Through the program's watershed management approach, the CRP identifies and evaluates water quality issues, establishes priorities for corrective action, works to implement those actions, and adapts to changing priorities.

The Sulphur River Basin Authority (SRBA) coordinates the CRP for the Sulphur River Basin. To guide its efforts under the CRP, the SRBA has established a Steering Committee to set priorities for the Sulphur River Basin. The Steering Committee members represent the diverse interests of the stakeholders in the Sulphur River Basin. Every individual and every organization in the river basin are stakeholders, and the CRP is designed to address stakeholder concerns. The CRP investigates water quality concerns and coordinates people's efforts in order to address water quality issues. Individuals and representatives of organizations are encouraged to attend the SRBA Steering Committee meetings and to become members of the committee. The TCEQ and CRP partners throughout the state develop and prioritize programs that protect the quality of healthy water bodies and improve the quality of impaired water bodies.

SRBA is funded through a two-year contract at a time with TCEQ to manage the Clean Rivers Program. This includes the receiving of state funding to support the CRP and maintaining all financial records for the state. The SRBA Project Manager is responsible for the specific requirements detailed below and overseeing all of the other contract Tasks.

Informative and timely Progress Reports

Participation in conference calls;

Participation at CRP meetings;

Prepare and submit timely and accurate reimbursement forms with adequate documentation;

Efficient cost control to ensure expenses are allowable and applicable;

Responsibility for procurement and oversight of subcontractors;

Participation in fiscal monitoring reviews;

Timely and accurate deliverables that meet the intent of the FY2016-2017 CRP Guidance;

Adherence to TCEQ contract provisions;

Detailed and reasonable Work Plan development;

Financial reporting and budget monitoring; and

Training to ensure personnel are properly prepared to conduct work.

The SRBA has an extensive number of deliverables that must be met to assure that the requirements of managing the CRP contract are achieved.

C. What evidence can you provide that shows the effectiveness and efficiency of this program or function? Provide a summary of key statistics and outcome performance measures that best convey the effectiveness and efficiency of this function or program.

Data collection has revealed specific problems and their origins within the basin (e.g. erosion and sedimentation). It is known that Lake Jim Chapman and Lake Wright Patman are impacted heavily with sediment. The Texas Water Development Board conducted volumetric surveys on each lake to determine the sediment impact. SRBA conducted a Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) analysis to determine the origin of the sediment discharge. The study area was the entire Sulphur River basin. The data revealed areas releasing sediment that had not been known prior to the SWAT analysis. Best management practices (e.g. filter strips, terrace, cropland pasture, critical pasture planting, channel grade control, and riparian buffer strip) will be considered for a conservation plan in the future to control erosion that is creating a sediment impact downstream. More data is being developed to determine other changes that could help control sediment discharge into the basin.

During SRBA's water availability modeling (WAM), a firm yield was determined for Lake Wright Patman as operated according to the operations manual of the COE. Texarkana Water Utilities was aware they did not have enough firm yield in Lake Wright Patman to meet their permit of 180,000 acre feet per year but was unaware of how little the firm yield is. SRBA's data determined a firm yield of 40,000 acre feet per year. Additional data showed that in 50 years a decrease in acre feet of over 10% will occur due to sedimentation. The WAM study area included the entire Sulphur River basin.

The COE operates the levels at Lake Wright Patman. The COE has been operating the levels above normal guidelines during certain periods to allow Texarkana to pump water to their treatment plant. SRBA was aware that the COE had placed a DSAC rating of III on the Wright Patman dam. The DSAC III rating will not allow levels to be manually raised above normal operation. A DSAC IV rating or above is required before the lake level could be raised. In 2012 the USACE threatened to operate Lake Wright Patman lower to comply with the operation manual. Operation according to the COE's operation manual was to begin in January 2013 and could prevent Texarkana from pumping water several months out of the year. Until the periodic assessment (PA) of the dam takes place in 2017, Lake Wright Patman would be operated, at times, below usable levels for Texarkana.

SRBA is familiar with COE's dam safety inspection process and immediately began working with the COE to move the PA up. The DSAC III rating was a result of past periodic inspections data indicating symptoms of structural problems. SRBA and the COE agreed that this was based on minimal data. After months of persuasions, SRBA convinced the COE to continue operating the lake at above normal levels (when needed) until the PA was completed and risks were verified. This was contingent on moving the PA up. This USACE did not have enough money budgeted to complete the initial data needed (seepage survey) to begin a PA. SRBA and Texarkana, Texas shared the expense to complete the seepage survey. The PA was then moved from 2017 to 2014.

The PA was completed and the data indicated risks with the structure of the dam but not to the extent of high risks. It was determined that the structural integrity of the dam is low risk. These results gave the COE confidence that the lake can continue to operate slightly above the operation manual's requirement.

The PA did not recommend a change of rating. Consequences downstream will keep it at a DSAC III rating for now. The process leading to a change in rating will take several more years. SRBA continues to monitor dam safety activity and will help, when needed, to reach a DSAC IV rating of Lake Wright Patman dam.

The SRBA contracts with Texarkana College (TC) to complete many reporting requirements and the water monitoring of the CRP. The CRP is organized around a fiscal year that starts on the 1st of September and ends on August 31st. The planning for a given year starts in the spring of the previous year and includes the following elements:

Coordinated Monitors Meeting...SRBA and TC hold an annual coordinated monitoring meeting as described in the CRP Guidance. Qualified monitoring organizations are invited to attend the working meeting in which monitoring needs and purposes are discussed. Information from

participants and stakeholders are used to select stations and parameters that enhance overall water quality monitoring coverage, eliminate duplication of effort, and address basin priorities. The changes to the monitoring schedule are entered into the statewide database on the Internet (<http://cms.lcra.org>) and communicated to meeting attendees. Changes to monitoring schedules that occur during the course of the year are entered into the statewide database on the Internet and communicated to meeting attendees.

Development of Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)...The process details how monitoring funded by the CRP that involves the acquisition of environmental data shall be planned in consultation with the TCEQ and be documented in a fully approved TCEQ/QAPP before data collection can be implemented. The QAPP describes the development and implementation of the plan, laboratory quality assurance, data review, verification, validation, oversight of projects and special studies project planning. TC personnel are responsible for developing and implementing the QAPP. The SRBA is the program manager and TC reports it progress to SRBA.

Water Quality Monitor---Monitoring is focused on collecting information to characterize water quality in a variety of locations and conditions. The Sulphur River Basin is over 120 miles long, and the SRBA has monitored many water bodies across the basin. The monitoring includes routine sites (long term) and systematic sites (short term). The monitoring is done quarterly and involves the parameters necessary to characterize both streams and lakes, including water chemistry, biological and 24-hour parameters. For FY2016, TC is scheduled for quarterly monitoring of twenty-two monitoring sites. Eight of the sites are located on lakes and fourteen are streams sites. The sites are located in Bowie County, Cass County, Red River County, Morris County and Hopkins County.

Data Management--- After water quality monitoring data is collected, it must be quality assured to make certain that it meets the requirements specified in the QAPP. The process checks to see that all instrument calibrations are acceptable and that the records are complete. All chain of custody forms must be complete with signatures, and laboratory results must meet the appropriate quality assurance checks. When the data is deemed to meet the QAPP specifications, it is put into the events and results files that are specified by the TCEQ in the Data Management Reference Guide. The files are checked using a software validator tool developed by TCEQ to verify that they meet specific requirements. The validator tool allows more detailed checks. After further review and refinement, event and result files are sent to the TCEQ program manager. The TCEQ program manager reviews the files and may ask for clarification and changes. When all changes are accepted, the TCEQ enters the data into the Surface Water Quality Information System (SWQIS), and it is available to use to determine if the water bodies meet EPA assessment criteria.

Data Analysis and Reporting--- TC conducts data analysis and develops reports that provide information to describe water quality and identify priority water quality issues for further investigation or action. The data analysis results are detailed in two reports. The Basin Summary Report is done every five years and is a detailed report of all the water quality data for the Sulphur River Basin. The most recent Basin Summary Report was during FY2013 and can be seen on the SRBA Clean Rivers webpage (www.sulphurr.org). This year TC will develop a Basin Highlights

Report that is less comprehensive than the Basin Summary Report and is done for the four years in between the Basin Summary Reports. Both reports correlate watershed characteristics with water quality conditions, highlight areas where water quality appears to be improving or declining, support and/or validate the findings of the TCEQ Water Quality Integrated Report, support planning of monitoring efforts, identify areas where nonpoint source management efforts may be applied, and provide information for stakeholders to discuss at Steering Committee meetings. The lengths of the reports vary from 30 to 120 pages and contain numerous maps, tables, graphs, and pictures produced by TC.

Public Outreach—The major focus of the SRBA public outreach activities is to develop an interested and diverse Steering Committee to give direction to the CRP. SRBA and TC plans the Steering Committee Meeting at the college in July of each year. The SRBA Project Manager sends out over 200 printed questionnaire forms by mail for suggested topics 45 days before the Steering Committee Meeting is actual held. Then the SRBA Project Manager mails out over 200 Agendas to the Stakeholders with the topics. The meeting agenda is placed on the SRBA CRP webpage (www.sulphurr.org) in a timely fashion and is thus available to all potential steering committee members who plan to attend. This year's meeting included a presentation by Texas Parks and Wildlife personnel about oil spills in the basin, modeling developments to aid in making basin decisions, and Wright Patman Lake analysis as presented in the Basin Highlights Report. The Steering Committee attracts an interested and diverse group of citizens. Public outreach is supported by a webpage (www.sulphurr.org) that TC maintains. The webpage has timely updates on activities in the basin and links to web pages of TCEQ and river authorities. Basin Highlights Reports, Basin Summary Reports, QAPPs , meeting minutes, and other documents of importance are archived on the webpage and can be accessed as pdf files. TC faculty supports the Texas Stream Team which is a voluntary monitoring effort funded in part by TCEQ grant.

The success of SRBA and TC in managing the CRP for the Sulphur River Basin is clearly evident in the large amount of data that has been collected and entered into the SQMQIS. This data is important for water body assessment. Both SRBA and TC have been audited for financial management and management of the water quality monitoring program regularly since the CRP was adopted by SRBA.

D. Describe any important history regarding this program not included in the general agency history section, including how the services or functions have changed from the original intent.

Since the creation of SRBA, the Sulphur River basin has not been harmed by change or construction. Previous activity before SRBA's existence (e.g. Cooper Lake and White Oak Creek Mitigation Area) did not result in a balanced benefit to the basin. SRBA continues to develop the data base needed to understand the systemic value and what changes impact the basin in order to protect the basin.

The intent of protecting the basin has not changed since the creation of SRBA. The concept on what is needed to protect the basin has changed.

Prior to 2011, only targeted areas within the basin were studied for construction of a specific water strategy. In 2011, the authority agreed to study the entire basin as a system to have a

baseline of data in order to make prudent decisions for conservation and the development of the state's natural resources.

E. Describe who or what this program or function affects. List any qualifications or eligibility requirements for persons or entities affected. Provide a statistical breakdown of persons or entities affected.

Anything that is living, growing, or flowing within the Sulphur River basin could be affected, along with socioeconomic factors.

F. Describe how your program or function is administered. Include flowcharts, timelines, or other illustrations as necessary to describe agency policies and procedures. Indicate how field/regional services are used, if applicable.

The Administrator follows the direction of the SRBA Board of Directors in all functions.

The SRBA Board of Directors and Administrator direct the Consultant.

The Consultant shall devote all time necessary to the performance of duties as directed by SRBA, its employees, agents, attorneys and contractors.

The Consultant coordinates and manages activity of the Basin Wide Feasibility Study.

The technical level of the Joint Committee on Program Development which meets to review recent data. The COE's recommendation for a path forward is considered and incorporated with the committee's direction to create a united path forward for the next fiscal year.

SRBA consulting engineers and COE work together to assemble a scope of work and cost of services to fit the path forward.

The scope of work and cost are reviewed by the Joint Committee on Program Development.

The SRBA Consultant presents a recommendation to the SRBA board for consideration in the budget. If approved, the board will consider work orders or contract for services for approval at a following meeting. The work orders or contract for services are required to include the scope of services, tasks, timelines, and cost of services.

The SRBA Contract Committee (3 Board of Directors) reviews the contracts and work orders.

The contracts and work orders are discussed for approval at a following Board meeting and work begins.

Monthly reports are presented at the SRBA board meetings by the SRBA Consultant. The COE and other engineers report and make presentation as needed during monthly board meetings.

Modifications, amendments, or other changes may be made by the Board of Directors if needed.

Monthly invoices from the contractors/engineers are reviewed and approved by the SRBA Consultant for Payment.

Once a scope of work is final, it is placed on the (www.srbatx.org) webpage for the public to view or download.

- G. Identify all funding sources and amounts for the program or function, including federal grants and pass-through monies. Describe any funding formulas or funding conventions. For state funding sources, please specify (e.g., general revenue, appropriations rider, budget strategy, fees/dues).**

SRBA does not receive any state or federal funding for this function.

SRBA and the COE executed an agreement "Agreement Between the Department of the Army and The Sulphur River Basin Authority for the Feasibility Study of the Sulphur River Watershed" on 02/24/2005. This cost share is 50/50. None of the USACE's money is sent to SRBA. All federal money goes directly to the Army. The 50% match from SRBA comes from in kind services or cash sent directly to the USACE.

SRBA is currently being funded through a 2013 agreement with Tarrant Regional Water District, North Texas Municipal Water District, Upper Trinity Regional Water District, the City of Irving and the City of Dallas.

- H. Identify any programs, internal or external to your agency, that provide identical or similar services or functions to the target population. Describe the similarities and differences.**

There are no programs or agency functions that provide identical or similar services.

- I. Discuss how the program or function is coordinating its activities to avoid duplication or conflict with the other programs listed in Question H and with the agency's customers. If applicable, briefly discuss any memorandums of understanding (MOUs), interagency agreements, or interagency contracts.**

No other programs are studying the Sulphur River basin as a system. All data is available to others (e.g. individuals, agencies, cities, counties, regional planning groups) for their benefit.

- J. If the program or function works with local, regional, or federal units of government, include a brief description of these entities and their relationship to the agency.**

SRBA and COE executed an agreement “Agreement Between the Department of the Army and The Sulphur River Basin Authority for the Feasibility Study of the Sulphur River Watershed on 02/24/2015. SRBA and the COE coordinate scopes of work. The COE and SRBA divide up tasks to complete. The COE and SRBA staff and consultants meet twice a month to discuss and exchange information in order to meet the objective of completing the scopes of work.

K. If contracted expenditures are made through this program please provide:

- a short summary of the general purpose of those contracts overall;
- the amount of those expenditures in fiscal year 2014;
- the number of contracts accounting for those expenditures;
- top five contracts by dollar amount, including contractor and purpose;
- the methods used to ensure accountability for funding and performance; and
- a short description of any current contracting problems.

1. Professional Service Agreement with Sulphur Basin Group, PLLC, as (SBG), engineering firm. Perform scope of work approved by the SRBA Board of Directors related to the Sulphur River Basin Feasibility Study.

The total expenditure to SBG in 2014 was \$441,273.13.

Progress reports are presented monthly to the SRBA Administrator, Consultant, and Board of Directors.

2. SRBA and the USACE executed an agreement “Agreement Between the Department of the Army and the Sulphur River Basin Authority for the Feasibility Study of the Sulphur River Watershed on 02/24/2005.

The total expenditure to the Department of the Army was \$150,000.00.

Progress reports are presented monthly to the SRBA Administrator, Consultant and Board of Directors.

3. Professional Service Agreement with Jon-Lark, Inc., (Consultant). Provide services to assist in achieving the goals of SRBA (e.g. the securing and management of contracts related to the Sulphur River Basin Wide Study and obtaining with federal and state agencies, the advancement of regional water supply projects and programs benefitting the Sulphur River Basin, supporting State of Texas and regional water supply planning and development programs, the development of capacity and capability to manage Sulphur River Basin water and waste water infrastructures, and the development and implementation of public relations programs and representation in state and national water related meeting.

The total expenditures to Jon-Lark, Inc. in 2014 was \$133,798.92.

Progress reports are presented monthly to the SRBA Administrator and Board of Directors.

L. Provide information on any grants awarded by the program.

N/A

M. What statutory changes could be made to assist this program in performing its functions? Explain.

No Changes.

N. Provide any additional information needed to gain a preliminary understanding of the program or function.

The budget for functions to develop new water supply and protect the basin is the same budget.

O. Regulatory programs relate to the licensing, registration, certification, or permitting of a person, business, or other entity. For each regulatory program, if applicable, describe:

- why the regulation is needed;
- the scope of, and procedures for, inspections or audits of regulated entities;
- follow-up activities conducted when non-compliance is identified;
- sanctions available to the agency to ensure compliance; and
- procedures for handling consumer/public complaints against regulated entities.

N/A

P. For each regulatory program, if applicable, provide the following complaint information. The chart headings may be changed if needed to better reflect your agency's practices.

N/A

A. Provide the following information at the beginning of each program description.

<u>Name of Program or Function</u>	<u>Share Information</u>
<u>Location/Division</u>	<u>SRBA's Office</u>
<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Nancy Rose, Administrator</u>
<u>Actual Expenditures</u>	<u>Not budgeted specific</u>
<u>Number of actual FTE as of June 1, 2015</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Statutory Citation for Program</u>	

B. What is the objective of this program? Describe the major activities under this program.

Conduct open meetings to share information. Make data readily available to the public and others from SRBA office and website. Notify and update those affected by a problem discovered by SRBA or other sources. Submit information to the TWDB regional planning group to incorporate needed information to the State Water Plan.

SRBA's data base of basin wide studies is available for anyone who needs it. Anyone can download completed reports, fact sheet, analysis, and studies from the SRBA website (srbatx.org). The COE and other consultants give reports and presentations to the SRBA Board during public meetings. SRBA does its best to fulfill requests from individuals and organizations to schedule presentations for SRBA.

If, during the study process, an issue of concern or a problem is discovered, brought to the attention of the authority, and verified, SRBA notifies the affected party. It is also SRBA's intent to help in such matters.

The SRBA data base is valuable information needed for the Texas State Water Plan. Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) collects data during a 5-year planning cycle. This information is collected through a Regional Water Planning Group to TWDB. SRBA continues to work with the Regional Water Planning Group's contract engineer to make sure he receives and understands the data from SRBA.

C. What evidence can you provide that shows the effectiveness and efficiency of this program or function? Provide a summary or key statistics and outcome performance measures that best convey the effectiveness and efficiency of this function or program.

SRBA Board of Directors meetings (open meetings) are scheduled monthly. The agendas are posted days before the meeting according to state law. As required, action items and public comments are placed on the agendas to allow the public to see what business will be conducted. For several years, every agenda has repetitive items to inform the board as well as the public. They are "Updates on the Clean Rivers Program", "Updates on the Feasibility Study" and "Updates on Region D".

The updates on Region D is a report from a board or staff member who attended the monthly Regional Water Planning Group.

The updates on the Clean Rivers Program is directed by the SRBA Administrator with occasional reports from the contractor (Texarkana College). The quality of water, within the flows of the Sulphur River Basin, is always of great concern with the SRBA Board Members, staff and public.

The update on the Feasibility Study is directed by the Consultant. Progress, timelines, delays, data, possible changes needed, and upcoming technical meetings, are examples of the content of the report. Project managers and engineers from the COE and other contractors are present and add to the report as needed. Presentations are used at times to clearly inform

the Broad, staff, and public (e.g. power point, videos, and additional written information). Completed data is placed on the (srbatx.org) website for anyone to view or download.

If, during the study process, an issue of concern or a problem is discovered, brought to the attention of the authority, and verified, SRBA notifies the affected party. It is also SRBA's intent to help in such matters.

EXAMPLES:

- SRBA's Water Availability Modeling (WAM) 2011/2012 revealed a very low dependable yield in Texarkana's water supply (Lake Wright Patman Lake) owned and operated by COE. SRBA notified Texarkana, TX/Texarkana Water Utilities.
- SRBA's Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) 2012/2013 analysis along with Texas Water Development Board's Volumetric Survey revealed an accelerated sediment load in Lake Wright Patman and the origin of the sediment discharge. SRBA notified Texarkana, TX/Texarkana Water Utilities.
- USACE reported at SRBA's meeting in 2012 that, in the near future, Lake Wright Patman may be operated below the level needed for Texarkana due to the Dam Safety Action Classification (DSAS III). Texarkana Water Utilities attended the meeting. The possibility of COE changing the operation of Lake Wright Patman was verified by SRBA at a later technical level meeting with COE; SRBA notified Texarkana, TX/Texarkana Water Utilities.
- Current and future water demand for surface water supplies was assessed by SRBA 2011/2012. Information was collected from surface water stakeholders within the Sulphur River basin. The State Water Plan, developed by the Texas Water Development (TWDB) through 16 Regional Water Planning Groups (RWPG), was one of the baseline resources during the assessment. Correct and current data in the State Water Plan is extremely important for TWDB and agencies to provide for conservation and the development of the state's natural resources. SRBA's water demand assessment revealed new data not included in the 2011 Region D Water Planning Group Plan. SRBA contracted Region D's contract engineer to share the new information for the next round of planning. SRBA also contacted the cities and agencies related to the new information to be included in the next round of the Region D planning process.
- Other data from SRBA's studies has been used to enhance the Region D Plan for 2016.

D. Describe any important history regarding this program not included in the general agency history section, including how the services or functions have changed from the original intent.

N/A

E. Describe who or what this program or function affect. List any qualifications or eligibility requirements for persons or entities affected. Provide a statistical breakdown of persons or entities affected.

Sharing information is fundamental and necessary to work with others in order to provide for the conservation and development of the state's natural resources within the Sulphur River Basin.

F. Describe how your program or function is administered. Include flow charts, timeliness, or other illustrations as necessary to describe agency policies and procedures. Indicate how field/regional services are used, if applicable.

- The SRBA Administrator facilitates public notification of open meetings, information requests, and Texas Clean Rivers Program activity and reports.
- The SRBA Administrator and Board of Directors require monthly, reports from the Consultant.
- The Consultant reports to the Board, staff and public monthly, and coordinates reports from others as needed to clearly communicate progress, performance, data, and other important information.
- A SRBA Board Member, Administrator, or Consultant will give talks/presentation from time to time outside of SRBA public meetings.
- The SRBA Administrator facilitates placing completed data on the srbatx.org website.

G. Identify all funding sources and amounts for the program or function, including federal grants and pass-through monies. Describe any funding formulas or funding conventions. For state funding sources, please specify (e.g. general revenue appropriations rider, budget strategy, fees/dues).

Not budget specific

H. Identify any programs, internal or external to your agency that, provides identical or similar services or functions to the target population. Describe the similarities and differences.

N/A

I. Discuss how the program or function is coordinating its activities to avoid duplication or conflict with the other programs listed in Questions H and with the agency's customers. If applicable, briefly discuss any memorandums of understanding (MOUs), interagency agreements, or interagency contracts.

N/A

J. If the program or function works with local, regional, or federal units of government, included a brief description of these entities and their relationship to the agency.

N/A

K. If contracted expenditures are made through this program please provide:

- **A short summary of the general purpose of those contracts overall;**
- **The amount of those expenditures in fiscal year 2014;**
- **The number of contracts accounting for these expenditures;**
- **Top five contracts by dollar amount, including contractor and purpose;**
- **A short description of any current contracting problems.**

N/A

L. Provide information on any grants awarded by the program.

N/A

M. What statutory changes could be made to assist this program in performing its functions? Explain.

N/A

N. Provide any additional information needed to gain a preliminary understanding of the program or function.

The previous information should be enough to gain a preliminary understanding of the function.

O. N/A

P. N/A

A. Provide the following Information at the beginning of each program description:

Name of Program or Function	Problem Solving
Location/Division	SRBA Office
Contact Name	Nancy Rose
Actual Expenditures	Not budget specific
Number of Actual FTE's as of June 1, 2015	1
Statutory Citation of Program	

B. What is the objective of this program? Describe the major activities under this program.

In order to provide for the conservation and development of the state's natural resources within the Sulphur River basin, SRBA does its best to solve a matter or situation regarded as unwelcome or harmful and needing to be dealt with and overcome. SRBA's activity in developing a database has noted several problems in different areas (e.g. socioeconomic, environmental, and planning).

SRBA's objective is to become fully aware of a problem as a fact, understand it clearly and work to solve it for the benefit of the basin. Some solutions happen fairly quickly and some may take decades.

C. What evidence can you provide that shows the effectiveness and efficiency of this program or function? Provide a summary or key statistics and outcome performance measures that best convey the effectiveness and efficiency of this function or program.

Some of the most recent problems discovered by SRBA or other sources are summarized below with a solution or a path to a solution.

- Sediment discharge is a major problem in the basin. SRBA conducted a Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) analysis to determine the origin of the sediment discharge. The study area was the entire Sulphur River basin. The data revealed sediment discharge that had not been known prior to the SWAT analysis. Best management practices (e.g. filter, strips, terrace, cropland pasture, critical pasture planting, channel grade control, and riparian buffer strip) will be considered for a conservation plan in the future to control erosion creating a sediment impact downstream. These type programs require private land owners to participate and can be very expensive. SRBA will develop an educational program and seek funding for property owners who want to participate. More data is being developed to determine other changes that could help control sediment discharge into the basin.
- During SRBA's water availability modeling (WAM), a firm yield was determined for Lake Wright Patman using COE's operation manual guidelines. Texarkana Water Utilities was aware they did not have enough firm yield in Lake Wright Patman to meet their permit of 180,000 acre feet per year but was unaware of how little the firm yield is. SRBA's data determined a firm yield of 40,000 acre feet per year. Additional data showed that in 50 years a decrease in acre feet of over 10% will occur due to sedimentation. The WAM study area included the entire Sulphur River basin.

The COE operates the levels at Lake Wright Patman. The COE has been operating the levels above normal guidelines during certain periods to allow Texarkana to pump water to their treatment plant. SRBA was aware that the COE had placed a DSAC rating of III on the Wright Patman Dam. The DSAC III rating will not allow levels to be manually raised above normal operation. A DSAC IV rating or above is required before the lake level could

be raised. In 2012 the USACE threatened to operate Lake Wright Patman lower to comply with the operation manual.

Operation according to the COE's manual was to begin in January 2013 and could prevent Texarkana from pumping water several months out of the year. Until the periodic assessment (PA) of the dam takes place in 2017, Lake Wright Patman would be operated, at times, below usable levels for Texarkana.

SRBA is familiar with COE's dam safety inspection process and immediately began working with COE to move the PA up. The DSAC III rating was a result of past periodic inspections data indicating risks of structural problems. SRBA and the USACE agreed that this was based on minimal data. After months of persuasion, SRBA convinced the COE to continue operating the lake above the control manual guideline levels (when needed) until the PA was completed and risks were verified. This was contingent on moving the PA up. The COE did not have enough money budgeted to complete the initial data needed (seepage survey) to begin a PA. SRBA contacted Texarkana, Texas to participate in the expense to complete the seepage survey. This gave Texarkana, Texas a needed seat at the table. SRBA and the COE found existing money at the COE to fund Texarkana's part of the seepage survey. The seepage survey was completed and the PA was then moved from 2017 to 2014.

The PA data indicated risks with the structure of the dam but not to the extent of high risks. It was determined that the structural integrity of the dam is low risk. These results gave the USACE confidence that the lake can continue to operate slightly above the operation manual's requirement.

The PA did not recommend a change of rating. Consequences downstream will keep it at a DSAC III rating for now. The process leading to a change in rating will take several more years. SRBA continues to monitor dam safety activity and will help, when needed, to reach a DSAC IV rating of Lake Wright Patman dam.

- The City of Clarksville draws its supply from Lake Langford and a system of three municipal wells. One well is currently out of service. The groundwater source exceeds state drinking water standards for chlorides, while the surface water exceeds state standards for turbidity. The two sources are mixed at 60% surface water/40% groundwater ratio in order to provide water meeting drinking water standards. Under drought conditions, such as in 2006 and 2011, the reliability of the Lake Langford source is significantly stressed, and aggregate supply is barely adequate for the current population. One way to supply additional surface water to Red River County would be to build a water supply pipeline from Annona and upsize existing pipelines from DeKalb to Clarksville (approximately 30 miles). Due to the high cost of the project, this option is not being pursued. Population-driven demand for water from Red River County is included in our analysis of in-basin demand; however, there is not currently a developed or contemplated Sulphur Basin source to supply this demand. The Red River Water Supply Corporation receives most of its water from a series of municipal wells and a connection to the TWU system near Annona.

In 2013 SRBA notified Clarksville that the Regional Water Plan from 2011 submitted incorrect information into the 2012 State Water Plan stating that Clarksville was already connected to the pipeline at Annona. This diminished the necessary purpose and need required to participate in grants or loans from The Texas Water Development Board. Additional water rights from TCEQ could also be denied. SRBA advised Clarksville to contact the Region D contract engineer to begin the correction process. The error will be corrected during this cycle and the correct information will be placed in the 2017 State Water Plan.

- The plan for the expansion of US Highway 82 between DeKalb and New Boston had been developing for more than ten years when Bowie County was finally approved in December 2009 for a Pass-Through Finance Project which would cover 26 million dollars of the project. On February 14, 2011 the Commissioners Court of Bowie County passed a Resolution in support of the project. In May of 2011, the voters agreed with the Court through a bond election and an agreement was executed between Bowie County and TX DOT. Construction began in 2014.

SRBA contacted Clarksville in 2013 to ask if they would like for SRBA to contact Texarkana Water Utilities (TWU) to consider upsizing the water supply line during the widening of Highway 82. Clarksville agreed. SRBA was successful and the pipeline upsize created more storage supply for TWU and the member cities and would save Clarksville a great deal of construction cost if/when they ever connect to Annona.

SRBA continues to work with Clarksville to ensure that they have the water supply they need to maintain their economy and provide for economic development.

- TexAmericas is a 12,000 acre industrial park located in the eastern area of the Sulphur River Basin in Bowie County. TexAmericas Center is actively recruiting new industry to the area. TexAmericas' business plan estimates a baseline water use of 2 MGD currently, which will double in the next 15 years and then double again in another 15 years (to a total of 8 MGD, or 8,960 ac-ft./yr., by 2040). This demand was included in SRBA's Bowie County manufacturing projections. TexAmericas also indicated that there is potential for additional large water users to locate at their facility. An additional 10 MGD (11,200 ac-ft. /yr.) has been added to the baseline demand in SRBA's analysis to account for this possibility, for a total of 18 MGD by 2040.

TexAmericas may pursue grants and loans from TWDB in the future. It is important that their information be placed in the State Water Plan in order for TWDB to process and execute a grant or loan. SRBA explained to the CEO of TexAmericas that category placement was vital in the State Water Plan in order to receive funding from TWDB. TexAmericas was currently in the "County Other" category, lumped in with multiple water users. TexAmericas provides wholesale water for the largest employer in Bowie County (Red River Army Depot). SRBA and TexAmericas worked with the Regional Water Planning Group's contract engineer to position TexAmericas in the "Wholesale Water Provider" (WWP) category for the 2017 State Water Plan with all the information providing purpose and need.

- The purpose of the 2014 International Paper impact analysis technical memorandum was to summarize the impacts of strategies to develop additional water supply in the Sulphur River

Basin by reallocating storage (pool raise) in Wright Patman Lake on the operations of the International Paper Company's Texarkana Mill (IP). IP is located near Texarkana, Texas in the lower portion of the Sulphur River Basin near the Texas/Arkansas state line. The Mill employs around 800 people and is dependent on the Sulphur River Basin's natural resources (e.g. water and timber). The Texarkana Plant draws its water supply from Wright Patman Lake and discharges its plant effluent into the Sulphur River immediately downstream of the Wright Patman Dam. Because of this proximity and other dependencies, modifications to Wright Patman operating parameters have the potential to impact plant operations. The purpose of this analysis was to develop an understanding of the relationship between the releases from Wright Patman and IP operations and what the potential impact changes in Wright Patman releases could have on IP operations.

Under **current** IP operations and restrictions in the TCEQ permit, a pool raise at Lake Wright Patman could be problematic for IP in several areas:

- Additional water held back for a pool raise in Lake Wright Patman could, at times, reduce flows downstream needed for IP's effluent releases;
- Current TCEQ permit only allows limited effluent releases 7-8 months of the year;
- Because essentially no discharges are allowed by the TCEQ permit during the summer months, IP's operating protocol is to empty the holding ponds by 30 April of each year in order to maximize the storage available during those no-discharge months. Effluent volume remaining in the holding ponds on 30 April represents an increased risk that plant operations could be affected during the coming year if weather and Wright Patman releases are not advantageous.

The next level of analysis (Phase II) is looking at the impact of Wright Patman in association with other upstream reservoirs. After a detailed study of the impacts, the studies will include an assessment of the strategies to mitigate the potential impact on the IP plant operations. The following assumptions will be analyzed and refined in this phase of studies:

- Timing of diversions for water supply
- Environmental Flow simulations
- Alternative mechanisms to reduce/mitigate impacts:
 1. Increased releases using existing water rights under low flow conditions; and
 2. Modified discharge structure to increase the range of flows under which discharge could occur.
- Impacts of potential upstream reservoirs on WP operations/discharges and IP system.

D. Describe any important history regarding this program not included in the general agency history section, including how the services or functions have changed from the original intent.

Focusing on the entire basin and collecting data basin wide since 2011 has helped provide the information needed to make this function successful.

- E. Describe who or what this program or function affects. List any qualifications or eligibility requirements for persons or entities affected. Provide a statistical breakdown of persons or entities affected.**

The effects are basin wide.

- F. Describe how your program or function is administered. Include flow charts, timelines, or other illustrations as necessary to describe agency policies and procedures. Indicate how field/regional services are used, if applicable.**

- SRBA Board Members, staff, consultants, agencies, or individuals can bring attention to a matter or situation regarded as unwelcome or harmful and needing to be dealt with and overcome.
- Consideration is given to the matter or situation by the Board, staff, and consultants to determine if there is a workable solution to the problem.
- Each problem has its own path forward to a solution involving different people, groups, organizations, tools, timelines, etc.

- G. Identify all funding sources and amounts for the program or function, including federal grants and pass-through monies. Describe any funding formulas or funding conventions. For state funding sources, please specify (e.g. general revenue, appropriations rider, budget strategy, fees/dues).**

Not budget specific.

- H. Identify any programs, internal or external to your agency, that provide identical or similar services or functions to the target population. Describe the similarities and differences.**

SRBA works with everyone affected not to duplicate activity.

- I. Discuss how the program or function is coordinating its activities to avoid duplication or conflict with the other programs listed in Question H and with the agency's customers. If applicable, briefly discuss any memorandums of understanding (MOUs), interagency agreements, or interagency contracts.**

SRBA works with everyone affected not to duplicate activity.

- J. If the program or function works with local, regional, or federal units of government, include a brief description of these entities and their relationship to the agency.**

SRBA works with any local, regional, and federal units of government needed to help create solutions.

- K. If contracted expenditures are made through this program please provide:**

- A short summary of the general purpose of those contracts overall;

- The amount of those expenditures in fiscal year 2014;
- The number of contracts accounting for these expenditures;
- Top five contracts by dollar amount, including contractor and purpose;
- The methods used to ensure accountability for funding and performance; and
- A short description of any current contracting problems.

N/A

L. Provide information on any grants awarded by the program.

N/A

M. What statutory changes could be made to assist this program in performing its functions? Explain.

N/A

N. Provide any additional information needed to gain a preliminary understanding of the program or function.

The previous information should be enough to gain a preliminary understanding of the function.

O. N/A

P. N/A

A. Provide the Following Information at the beginning of each program description.

Name of Program or Function	Develop New Water Supply
Location/Division	SRBA office
Contact Name	Nancy Rose
Actual Expenditures	\$725,072.05
Number of Actual FTE's as of June 1, 2015	1
Statutory Citation for Program	

B. What is the objective of this program? Describe the major activities under this program.

SRBA Water Availability Modeling, using the drought of record, revealed over 1,000,000 acre-feet of unappropriated water flows down the Sulphur River annually. There are future water needs within the basin along with adjacent areas outside of the basin. Water planning involving Water Supply Strategies is an important part of the current studies being conducted by SRBA. The objective is to develop new water supplies that meet the purpose and need for the future.

C. What evidence can you provide that shows the effectiveness and efficiency of this program or function? Provide a summary or key statistics and outcome performance measures that best convey the effectiveness and efficiency of this function or program.

The population in Texas is expected to increase significantly between the years of 2010 and 2060, growing from 25.4 million to 46.3 million people. Water demand in Texas is projected to increase by 22 percent, from about 18 million acre-feet per year in 2010 to a demand of about 22 million acre-feet per year in 2060. *(excerpts from State Water Plan)*

Existing water supplies—categorized as surface water, groundwater, and reuse water—are projected to decrease about 10 percent, from about 17.0 million acre-feet in 2010 to about 15.3 million acre-feet in 2060. *(excerpts from State Water Plan)*

Texas does not have enough existing water supplies today to meet the demand for water during times of drought. In the event of severe drought conditions, the state would face an immediate need for additional water supplies of 3.6 million acre-feet per year with 86 percent of that need in irrigation and about 9 percent associated directly with municipal water uses. Total needs are projected to increase by 130 percent between 2010 and 2060 to 8.3 million acre-feet per year. *(excerpts from State Water Plan)*

If drought of record conditions recur and water management strategies identified in regional water plans are not implemented, the state could suffer significant economic losses. If the drought affected the entire state like it did in the 1950s, economic models show that Texas businesses and workers could have lost almost \$12 billion in income in 2010. By 2060 lost income increases to roughly \$116 billion. Foregone state and local business taxes associated with lost commerce could amount to \$1.1 billion in 2010 and \$9.8 billion in 2060. Lost jobs total approximately 115,000 in 2010 and 1.1 million in 2060. *(excerpts from State Water Plan)*

The drought of record was documented in the 1950's. Water Availability Modeling (WAM) for water rights in Texas uses the naturalized flows recorded during the drought of record to model for available water. Using the naturalized flows from the Sulphur Basin Water Availability Model, the Texas portion of the Sulphur River Basin produced an average of 1.5 million ac-ft. /yr. from 1951 to 1956, the historical drought of record for this basin. Appropriated water (existing water rights) from the Sulphur total almost 400,000 ac-ft. /yr. So, unappropriated water (owned by the state of Texas) potentially available for development in the basin is roughly 1.1 million ac-ft. /yr.

The Sulphur River Basin neighbors to the west have established purpose and need for additional water supply of approximately 600,000 ac-ft. /yr. by 2070. These agencies and cities are seeking 54% (600,000 ac-ft. /yr.) of the unappropriated water in the Sulphur River. **This will require an interbasin transfer.** The out of basin cities and agencies providing purpose and need could pursue the unappropriated water without SRBA. Knowing that SRBA is authorized to provide for the conservation and development of the basins natural resources, the cities and agencies have partnered with SRBA to facilitate prudent planning, selection, and development. The SRBA, North Texas Municipal Water District, Upper Trinity Regional Water District, Tarrant Regional Water District, City of Dallas, and City of Irving entered into an “Advanced Funding Agreement for Water Resources Planning in the Sulphur River” to allow SRBA to facilitate water planning and the studies needed to determine the water supply strategy that is best for the basin and its

inhabitants. SRBA is prudent with the planning process. The objective is to protect the basin, provide a water supply that will meet purpose and need with the least environmental impact, and ensure a benefit to the basin equal to the diversion of its natural resource.

To select a water strategy with the least environmental, social, and economic impacts, the Sulphur River Basin Authority is developing a vast data base of information involving the entire Sulphur River basin. Hydrological, geological, environmental, social, and economic studies continue to be developed. This process is essential to protect and develop a river basin and to comply with regulatory requirements needed to permit projects.

Planning, executing, and completing tasks during 2011 and 2013 were recognized by the COE administration. In August of 2013, the study was re-scoped to be 3x3x3 compliant, taking into consideration a water supply approach for the SMART Planning feasibility study. In 2014, 2015 and 2016 the US President's budget included money for the Sulphur River Basin feasibility study totaling \$1,500,000.

The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) has recognized and supports the SRBA's planning process. The data helped TWDB resolve a conflict between two Regional Planning Groups. (*An Interim Order, August 7, 2014*)

D. Describe any important history regarding this program not included in the general agency history section, including how the services or functions have changed from the original intent.

In 2010 the current Board of Directors for SRBA questioned the history of water planning conducted by the Authority. The lack of progress was a concern. The Authority's ability to provide for the conservation and development of the state's natural resources was not satisfactory.

A consultant was engaged to review the history. The outcome resulted in the realization that the previous planning left many questions unanswered and significant data gaps.

After the review, the Board of Directors viewed the Authority's previous water planning process as inverted or reversed. The previous water planning used the State Water Plan as a resource to select a water supply project to meet purpose and need. The data was limited but estimated the firm yield of each water supply strategy listed in the Sulphur River Basin. A water supply strategy (Marvin Nichols Reservoir) was selected because its standalone firm yield met purpose and need and the other alternatives did not. Once the selection was made, data had to be developed to support the selection. Additional studies were done during this period but were not a systemic view of the basin as a whole. Cause and effect was not clear. Alternatives within the basin as combinations and reallocation (pool raise) at existing reservoirs were not analyzed.

In 2011, the SRBA Board of Directors took the prudent path forward to water planning.

E. Describe who or what this program or function affects. List any qualifications or eligibility requirements for persons or entities affected. Provide a statistical breakdown of persons or entities affected.

Anything that is living, growing, or flowing within the Sulphur River basin could be affected along with socioeconomic factors.

F. Describe how your program or function is administered. Include flow charts, timelines, or other illustrations as necessary to describe agency policies and procedures. Indicate how field/regional services are used, if applicable.

- The SRBA Board of Directors and Administrator direct the Consultant.
- The Consultant coordinates and manages the Basin Wide Feasibility Study activity.
- The technical level of the Joint Committee on Program Development which meets to review recent data. USACE's recommendation for a path forward is considered and incorporated with the committee's direction to create a united path forward for the next fiscal year.
- SRBA consulting engineers and USACE work together to assemble a scope of work and cost of services to fit the path forward.
- The scope of work and cost are reviewed by the Joint Committee on Program Development.
- The consultant for program development presents a recommendation to the SRBA board for consideration in the budget. If approved, the board will consider work orders or contract for services for approval at a following meeting. The work orders or contract for services are required to include the scope services, tasks, timelines, and cost of services.
- The Contract Committee (3 Board of Directors) reviews the contracts and work orders.
- The contracts and work orders are discussed for approval at a following Board meeting and work begins.
- Monthly reports are presented at the SRBA board meetings by the consultant for program development. USACE and other engineers report and make presentations as needed during monthly board meetings.
- Modifications, amendments, or other changes may be made by the Board of Directors if needed.
- Monthly invoices from the contractors are reviewed and approved by the Consultant for the Administrator to execute payment.
- Once a scope of work is final, it is placed on the srbatx.org website for the public to view or download.

The study process takes several years and millions of dollars. It will take decades to complete the process of planning, selection, permitting, and construction.

G. Identify all funding sources and amounts for the program or function, including federal grants and pass-through monies. Describe any funding formulas or funding conventions. For state funding sources, please specify (e.g. general revenue, appropriations rider, budget strategy, fees/dues).

SRBA does not receive any state or federal funding for this function.

SRBA and the USACE executed an agreement "Agreement Between the Department of the Army and The Sulphur River Basin Authority for the Feasibility Study of the Sulphur River Watershed" 02/24/2005. This cost share is 50/50. None of the USACE's money is sent to SRBA. All federal money

goes directly to the Army. The 50% match from SRBA comes from in kind services or cash sent directly to the USACE.

SRBA is currently being funded through a 2013 agreement with Tarrant Regional Water District, North Texas Municipal Water District, Upper Trinity Regional Water District, The City of Irving, and The City of Dallas.

H. Identify any programs, internal or external to your agency, that provide identical or similar services or functions to the target population. Describe the similarities and differences.

There are no programs or agency functions that provide identical or similar services.

I. Discuss how the program or function is coordinating its activities to avoid duplication or conflict with the other programs listed in Question H and with the agency's customers. If applicable, briefly discuss any memorandums of understanding (MOUs), interagency agreements, or interagency contracts.

No other programs are studying the Sulphur River basin as a whole for water supply. All data is available to others (e.g. individuals, agencies, cities, counties, regional planning groups) for their benefit.

J. If the program or function works with local, regional, or federal units of government, include a brief description of these entities and their relationship to the agency.

SRBA and the COE executed an agreement "Agreement Between the Department of the Army and The Sulphur River Basin Authority for the Feasibility Study of the Sulphur River Watershed" 02/24/2005. SRBA and the COE coordinate scopes of work. The COE and SRBA divide up tasks to complete. The COE and SRBA staff and consultants meet twice a month to discuss and exchange information in order to meet the objective of completing the scopes of work.

K. If contracted expenditures are made through this program please provide:

- **A short summary of the general purpose of those contracts overall;**
- **The amount of those expenditures in fiscal year 2014;**
- **The number of contracts accounting for these expenditures;**
- **Top five contracts by dollar amount, including contractor and purpose;**
- **The methods used to ensure accountability for funding and performance; and**
- **A short description of any current contracting problems.**

1. Professional Service Agreement with Sulphur Basin Group, PLLC, as (SBG), engineering firm. Perform scopes of work approved by the SRBA board of directors related to the Sulphur River Basin Feasibility Study.

The total expenditure to SBG in 2014 was \$441,273.13.

Progress reports are presented monthly to the SRBA Administrator, Consultant, and Board of Directors.

2. SRBA and the USACE executed an agreement "Agreement Between the Department of the Army and The Sulphur River Basin Authority for the Feasibility Study of the Sulphur River Watershed" 02/24/2005.

The total expenditure to the Department of the Army was \$150,000.

Progress reports are presented monthly to the SRBA Administrator, Consultant, and Board of Directors.

3. Professional Service Agreement with Jon-Lark, Inc. Provide services to assist in achieving the goals of SRBA (e.g. the securing and management of contracts related to the Sulphur River Basin Wide Study and obtaining funding from federal and state agencies, the advancement of regional water supply projects and programs benefitting the Sulphur River Basin, supporting State of Texas and regional water supply planning and development programs, the development of the capacity and capability to manage Sulphur River Basin water and waste water infrastructures, and the development and implementation of public relations programs and representation in state and national water related meetings), Consultant.

The total expenditure to Jon-Lark, Inc. in 2014 was \$133,798.92.

Progress reports are presented monthly to the SRBA administrator and Board of Directors.

4. **Provide information on any grants awarded by the program.**

N/A

5. **What statutory changes could be made to assist this program in performing its functions? Explain.**

No changes.

6. **Provide any additional information needed to gain a preliminary understanding of the program or function.**

The budget for functions to Develop New Water Supply and Protect the Basin is the same money.

7. N/A

8. N/A

VIII. Statutory Authority and Recent Legislation

- A. Fill in the following charts, listing citations for all states and federal statutes that grant authority to or otherwise significant impact on your agency. Do not include general state statutes that apply to all agencies, such as the Public Information Act, the Open Meetings Act, or the Administrative Procedure Act. Provide information on Attorney General opinions from 2011-2015, or earlier significant Attorney General opinions, that effect your agency’s operations.**

Sulphur River Basin Authority

Statutes

Citation/Title	Impact on Agency
S.B. No. 5, Chapter 3 Pursuant to Article XVI, Section 59, of the Texas Constitution	The 69th Texas Legislature in June 1985 delegated responsibilities to the SRBA to provide for the conservation and development of the state’s natural resources within the basin of the Sulphur River. The Sulphur River Basin is in the northeast corner of Texas. The basin includes all or parts of, Fannin, Hunt, Lamar, Hopkins, Red River, Franklin, Titus Morris, Bowie, Cass and Delta counties.

Attorney General Opinions

None

- B. Provide a summary of recent legislation regarding your agency by filling in the charts below or attaching information already available in an agency-developed format. Briefly summarize the key provisions. For Bills that did not pass, briefly explain the key provisions and issues that resulted in failure of the bill to pass.**

84th Legislature		
Legislation Passed		

HB 23

Davis, Sarah(R)
Huffman, Joan(R)

Relating to disclosure of certain relationships with local government officers and vendors.

Track Name(s): Passed Priority Bills

Bill History: 09-01-15 G Earliest effective date

HB 655 Larson, Lyle(R)
Perry, Charles (F)(R) Relating to the storage and recovery of water in aquifers.

Companions: SB 1724 Creighton, Brandon (F) (Identical)

3-23-15 S Introduced and referred to committee on Senate Agriculture, Water, and Rural Affairs

SB 1903 Perry, Charles (F) (Identical)

4-22-15 S Placed on the Senate Calendar for

Track Name(s): Howard's TRACK, Passed Priority Bills, Water Rights

Bill History: 06-16-15 G Earliest effective date

HB 685 Sheets, Kenneth(R)
Hancock, Kelly(R) Relating to the production of public information available on the website of a political subdivision of this state.

Track Name(s): Public Information Act, Passed Priority Bills

Bill History: 09-01-15 G Earliest effective date

HB 1295 Capriglione, Giovanni(R)
Hancock, Kelly(R) Relating to the disclosure of interested parties by persons contracting with governmental entities and state agencies.

Companions: SB 852 Kolkhorst, Lois (F) (Identical)

3- 4-15 S Introduced and referred to committee on Senate Business and Commerce

Track Name(s): Administrative Rules, Contracts, Passed Priority Bills, Priority/Watch

Bill History: 09-01-15 G Earliest effective date

HB 1378 Flynn, Dan(R)
Bettencourt, Paul (F)(R) Relating to annual financial reporting of debt information.

Track Name(s): Passed Priority Bills, Priority/Watch

Bill History: 01-01-16 G Earliest effective date

HB 1665 Bonnen, Dennis(R)
Kolkhorst, Lois (F)(R) Relating to notice of water level fluctuations to purchasers of real property adjoining an impoundment of water.

Companions: SB 483 Kolkhorst, Lois (F) (Identical)

2-10-15 S Introduced and referred to committee on Senate Agriculture, Water, and Rural Affairs

Track Name(s): Land Rights, Passed Priority Bills

Bill History: 09-01-15 G Earliest effective date

HB 1919 Phillips, Larry(R)
Estes, Craig(R) Relating to the applicability of certain provisions concerning invasive species.

Track Name(s): Endangered Species, Passed Priority Bills

Bill History: 06-19-15 Earliest effective date

HB 2528 Harless, Patricia(R)
Kolkhorst, Lois (F)(R) Relating to the authority of a water district to accept donations to fund certain economic development programs.

Track Name(s): Passed Priority Bills, Water Planning

Bill History: 06-17-15 G Earliest effective date

HB 3357 Lucio III, Eddie(D)
 Eltife, Kevin(R) Relating to permitted methods for certain political subdivisions to post notice of a meeting.

Track Name(s): Open Meetings Act, Passed Priority Bills

Bill History: 09-01-15 G Earliest effective date

SB 523 Birdwell, Brian(R)
 Keffer, Jim(R) Relating to the sunset review of river authorities.

Companions: HB 1290 Keffer, Jim (Identical)

5-19-15 S Referred to Senate
 Committee on Senate Committee on
 Administration

Track Name(s): Administrative Rules, Passed Priority Bills,
 Priority/Watch

Bill History: 06-19-15 G Earliest effective date

SB 912 Eltife, Kevin(R)
 Crownover, Myra(R) Relating to a volume-based exemption from reporting requirements for certain accidental discharges or spills from wastewater facilities.

Companions: HB 2051 Crownover, Myra (Identical)

5-20-15 S Referred to Senate
 Committee on Senate Agriculture,
 Water, and Rural Affairs

Track Name(s): Passed Priority Bills, Operations, Water
 Planning

Bill History: 09-01-15 G Earliest effective date

SB 1812 Kolkhorst, Lois (F)(R)
 Geren, Charlie(R) Relating to transparency in the reporting of eminent domain authority and the creation of an eminent domain database.

Companions: HB 3988 Geren, Charlie (Identical)

4-13-15 H Committee action pending
House Land and Resource
Management

Track Name(s): Passed Priority Bills, Land Acquisition/Em. Domain

Bill History: 06-19-15 Earliest effective date

84th Texas Legislature Legislation not Passed

HB 201

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB201>

Relating to the procedure for action by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality on an application for a water right.

HB 632

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB632>

Relating to the planning and funding of water projects to be constructed in a region other than the region proposing the project.

HB 1027

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB1027>

Relating to state agency contracting.

HB 1153

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB1153>

Relating to the repeal of the junior priority of a water right authorizing a transfer of water from one river basin in this state to another river basin in this state.

HB 1548

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB1548>

Relating to comprehensive reviews of certain special districts.

HB 1764

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB1764>

Relating to public information in the possession, custody, or control of a current or former officer or employee of a governmental body; creating a criminal offense.

HB 2308

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB2308>

Relating to the consideration by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality of the economic impact of an appropriation of state water in determining whether to grant an application for the appropriation.

HB 2805

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB2805>

Relating to the priority applicable to certain interbasin transfers of water.

HB 2887

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB2887>

Relating to the definition of a "Navigable stream".

HB 2892

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB2892>

Relating to the procedure by which a state agency may issue an opinion that a watercourse is navigable.

HB 3298

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB3298>

Relating to a study conducted by the Texas Water Development Board regarding the development of a market and conveyance network for water in this state.

HB 3324

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB3324>

Relating to the requirements for obtaining an interbasin water transfer permit.

HB 3413

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB3413>

Relating to a general permit to convey water using the bed and banks of a natural stream channel; authorizing a fee.

HB 3803

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB3803>

Relating to defining the occurrence of an interregional conflict between regional water plans.

HB 3821

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=HB3821>

Relating to the procedure for action by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality on an application for a water right.

SB 474

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=SB474>

Relating to the recovery of costs and fees in connection with certain eminent domain proceedings.

SB 636

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=SB636>

Relating to the creation of a task force to evaluate recreational use of rivers.

SB 863

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=SB863>

Relating to the audit of river authorities by the state auditor's office.

SB 1411

<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=84R&Bill=SB1411>

Relating to a water right authorizing a transfer of water from one river basin in this state to another river basin in this state.

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)**(Regulatory Program Name)****Exhibit 11: Information on Complaints Against Regulated Persons or Entities
Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014**

	Fiscal Year 2013	Fiscal Year 2014
Total number of regulated persons	(number)	(number)
Total number of regulated entities	(number)	(number)
Total number of entities inspected	(number)	(number)
Total number of complaints received from the public	NONE	NONE
Total number of complaints initiated by agency	NONE	NONE
Number of complaints pending from prior years	(number)	(number)
Number of complaints found to be non-jurisdictional	(number)	(number)
Number of jurisdictional complaints found to be without merit	(number)	(number)
Number of complaints resolved	(number)	(number)
Average number of days for complaint resolution	(number)	(number)
Complaints resulting in disciplinary action:	(number)	(number)
administrative penalty	(number)	(number)
reprimand	(number)	(number)
suspension	(number)	(number)
revocation	(number)	(number)
other	(number)	(number)

Table 11 Exhibit 11 Information on Complaints Against Persons or Entities

VIII. Statutory Authority and Recent Legislation

- A. Fill in the following charts, listing citations for all state and federal statutes that grant authority to or otherwise significantly impact your agency. Do not include general state statutes that apply to all agencies, such as the Public Information Act, the Open Meetings Act, or the Administrative Procedure Act. Provide information on Attorney General opinions from FY 2011–2015, or earlier significant Attorney General opinions, that affect your agency’s operations.

N/A

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 12: Statutes / Attorney General Opinions**

Statutes

Citation / Title	Authority / Impact on Agency <i>(e.g., “provides authority to license and regulate nursing home administrators”)</i>
(Text)	(Text)

Table 12 Exhibit 12 Statutes

Attorney General Opinions

Attorney General Opinion No.	Impact on Agency
(Text)	(Text)

Table 13 Exhibit 12 Attorney General Opinions

- B. Provide a summary of recent legislation regarding your agency by filling in the charts below or attaching information already available in an agency-developed format. Briefly summarize the key provisions. For bills that did not pass, briefly explain the key provisions and issues that resulted in failure of the bill to pass (e.g., opposition to a new fee, or high cost of implementation). Place an asterisk next to bills that could have a major impact on the agency. *See Exhibit 13 Example.*

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 13: 84th Legislative Session**

Legislation Enacted

Bill Number	Author	Summary of Key Provisions
(Number)	(Text)	(Text)

Table 14 Exhibit 13 Legislation Enacted 84th Leg

Legislation Not Passed

Bill Number	Author	Summary of Key Provisions / Reason Bill Did Not Pass
(Number)	(Text)	(Text)

Table 15 Exhibit 13 Legislation Not Passed 84th Leg

IX. Major Issues (SEE ON PAGE 11).

The purpose of this section is to briefly describe any potential issues raised by your agency, the Legislature, or stakeholders that Sunset could help address through changes in statute to improve your agency's operations and service delivery. Inclusion of an issue does not indicate support, or opposition, for the issue. Instead, this section is intended to give the Sunset Commission a basic understanding of the issues so staff can collect more information during our detailed research on your agency. Some questions to ask in preparing this section may include: (1) How can your agency do a better job in meeting the needs of customers or in achieving agency goals? (2) What barriers exist that limit your agency's ability to get the job done?

Emphasis should be given to issues appropriate for resolution through changes in state law. Issues related to funding or actions by other governmental entities (federal, local, quasi-governmental, etc.) may be included, but the Sunset Commission has no authority in the appropriations process or with other units of government. If these types of issues are included, the focus should be on solutions which can be enacted in state law. This section contains the following three components.

A. Brief Description of Issue

B. Discussion

Background. Include enough information to give context for the issue. Information helpful in building context includes:

- What specific problems or concerns are involved in this issue?
- Who does this issue affect?
- What is the agency's role related to the issue?
- Any previous legislative action related to the issue?

C. Possible Solutions and Impact

Provide potential recommendations to solve the problem. Feel free to add a more detailed discussion of each proposed solution, including:

- How will the proposed solution fix the problem or issue?
- How will the proposed change impact any entities or interest groups?
- How will your agency's performance be impacted by the proposed change?
- What are the benefits of the recommended change?
- What are the possible drawbacks of the recommended change?
- What is the fiscal impact of the proposed change?

Complete this section for **each** issue. Copy and paste components A through C as many times as needed to discuss each issue. **See Major Issue Example.**

X. Other Contacts

- A. Fill in the following charts with updated information on people with an interest in your agency, and be sure to include the most recent email address.

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 14: Contacts**

Interest Groups

(groups affected by agency actions or that represent others served by or affected by agency actions)

Group or Association Name/ Contact Person	Address	Telephone	Email Address
(Text)	(Text)	(Number)	(Address)
(Text)	(Text)	(Number)	(Address)

Table 16 Exhibit 14 Interest Groups

Interagency, State, or National Associations

(that serve as an information clearinghouse or regularly interact with your agency)

Group or Association Name/ Contact Person	Address	Telephone	Email Address
(Text)	(Text)	(Number)	(Address)
(Text)	(Text)	(Number)	(Address)

Table 17 Exhibit 14 Interagency, State, and National Association

Liaisons at Other State Agencies

(with which your agency maintains an ongoing relationship, e.g., the agency's assigned analyst at the Legislative Budget Board, or attorney at the Attorney General's office)

Agency Name / Relationship / Contact Person	Address	Telephone	Email Address
Texas Secretary of State	Austin, Texas	512-463-5561	www.sos.state.tx.us
Attorney General Office	Austin, Texas	512-463-7922	www.governor.state.tx.us
TEXAS Legislative Budget Board	Austin, Texas	512-463-2965	Kevin.Kromenacker@lbb.state.tx.us

Table 18 Exhibit 14 Liaisons at Other State Agencies

XI. Additional Information

- A. Texas Government Code, Sec. 325.0075 requires agencies under review to submit a report about their reporting requirements to Sunset with the same due date as the SER. Include a list of each agency-specific report that the agency is required by statute to prepare and an evaluation of the need for each report based on whether factors or conditions have changed since the statutory requirement was put in place. Please do not include general reporting requirements applicable to all agencies, reports that have an expiration date, routine notifications or notices, posting requirements, federally mandated reports, or reports required by G.A.A. rider. If the list is longer than one page, please include it as an attachment. *See Exhibit 15 Example.*

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 15: Evaluation of Agency Reporting Requirements

Report Title	Legal Authority	Due Date and Frequency	Recipient	Description	Is the Report Still Needed? Why?
(text)	(text)	(text)	(text)	(text)	(text)
(text)	(text)	(text)	(text)	(text)	(text)

Table 19 Exhibit 15 Agency Reporting Requirements

Note: If more than one page of space is needed, please provide this chart as an attachment, and feel free to convert it to landscape orientation or transfer it to an Excel file.

- B. Has the agency implemented statutory requirements to ensure the use of "first person respectful language"? Please explain and include any statutory provisions that prohibits these changes.

(Answer here)

- C. Fill in the following chart detailing information on complaints regarding your agency. Do not include complaints received against people or entities you regulate. The chart headings may be changed if needed to better reflect your agency's practices.

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 16: Complaints Against the Agency — Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014

	Fiscal Year 2013	Fiscal Year 2014
Number of complaints received	NONE	NONE
Number of complaints resolved	(number)	(number)
Number of complaints dropped / found to be without merit	(number)	(number)
Number of complaints pending from prior years	(number)	(number)
Average time period for resolution of a complaint	(number)	(number)

Table 20 Exhibit 16 Complaints Against the Agency

D. Fill in the following charts detailing your agency’s Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) purchases. See Exhibit 17 Example.

**(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 17: Purchases from HUBs**

Fiscal Year 2013

Category	Total \$ Spent	Total HUB \$ Spent	Percent	Agency Specific Goal*	Statewide Goal
Heavy Construction	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	11.2%
Building Construction	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	21.1%
Special Trade	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	32.7%
Professional Services	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	23.6%
Other Services	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	24.6%
Commodities	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	21.0%
TOTAL	(number)	(number)	(number)		

Table 21 Exhibit 17 HUB Purchases for FY 2013

* If your goals are agency specific-goals and not statewide goals, please provide the goal percentages and describe the method used to determine those goals. (TAC Title 34, Part 1, Chapter 20, Rule 20.13)

Fiscal Year 2014

Category	Total \$ Spent	Total HUB \$ Spent	Percent	Agency Specific Goal	Statewide Goal
Heavy Construction	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	11.2%
Building Construction	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	21.1%
Special Trade	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	32.7%
Professional Services	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	23.6%
Other Services	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	24.6%
Commodities	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	21.0%
TOTAL	(number)	(number)	(number)		

Table 22 Exhibit 17 HUB Purchases for FY 2014

Fiscal Year 2015

Category	Total \$ Spent	Total HUB \$ Spent	Percent	Agency Specific Goal	Statewide Goal
Heavy Construction	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	11.2%
Building Construction	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	21.1%
Special Trade	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	32.7%
Professional Services	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	23.6%
Other Services	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	24.6%
Commodities	(number)	(number)	(number)	(number)	21.0%
TOTAL	(number)	(number)	(number)		

Table 23 Exhibit 17 HUB Purchases for FY 2015

E. Does your agency have a HUB policy? How does your agency address performance shortfalls related to the policy? (Texas Government Code, Sec. 2161.003; TAC Title 34, Part 1, rule 20.15b)

SRBA does not have a HUB policy since its contracts are not funded by legislative appropriated money.

F. For agencies with contracts valued at \$100,000 or more: Does your agency follow a HUB subcontracting plan to solicit bids, proposals, offers, or other applicable expressions of interest for subcontracting opportunities available for contracts of \$100,000 or more? (Texas Government Code, Sec. 2161.252; TAC Title 34, Part 1, rule 20.14)

The only contracts issued by SRBA valued at \$100,000 or more are for engineering services and subcontracting opportunities are not probable under such contracts. Consequently, SRBA does not follow a HUB subcontracting plan.

G. For agencies with biennial appropriations exceeding \$10 million, answer the following HUB questions.

1. Do you have a HUB coordinator? If yes, provide name and contact information. (Texas Government Code, Sec. 2161.062; TAC Title 34, Part 1, rule 20.26)

N/A

2. Has your agency designed a program of HUB forums in which businesses are invited to deliver presentations that demonstrate their capability to do business with your agency? (Texas Government Code, Sec. 2161.066; TAC Title 34, Part 1, rule 20.27)

N/A

3. Has your agency developed a mentor-protégé program to foster long-term relationships between prime contractors and HUBs and to increase the ability of HUBs

to contract with the state or to receive subcontracts under a state contract? (Texas Government Code, Sec. 2161.065; TAC Title 34, Part 1, rule 20.28)

N/A

H. Fill in the charts below detailing your agency’s Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) statistics. See Exhibit 18 Example.

(SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY)
Exhibit 18: Equal Employment Opportunity Statistics

1. Officials / Administration: SRBA has only (1) Employee

Year	Total Number of Positions	Percent African-American	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Hispanic	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Female	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent
2013	1	(0)	8.99%	(0)	19.51%	(100)	39.34%
2014	1	(0)	8.99%	(0)	19.51%	(100)	39.34%
2015	1	(0)	8.99%	(0)	19.51%	(100)	39.34%

Table 24 Exhibit 18 EEO Statistics for Officials/Administration

2. Professional

Year	Total Number of Positions	Percent African-American	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Hispanic	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Female	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent
2013	(number)	(percent)	11.33%	(percent)	17.4%	(percent)	59.14%
2014	(number)	(percent)	11.33%	(percent)	17.4%	(percent)	59.14%
2015	(number)	(percent)	11.33%	(percent)	17.4%	(percent)	59.14%

Table 25 Exhibit 18 EEO Statistics for Professionals

3. Technical

Year	Total Number of Positions	Percent African-American	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Hispanic	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Female	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent
2013	(number)	(percent)	14.16%	(percent)	21.36%	(percent)	41.47%
2014	(number)	(percent)	14.16%	(percent)	21.36%	(percent)	41.47%
2015	(number)	(percent)	14.16%	(percent)	21.36%	(percent)	41.47%

Table 26 Exhibit 18 EEO Statistics for Technical

4. Administrative Support

Year	Total Number of Positions	Percent African-American	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Hispanic	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Female	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent
2013	(number)	(percent)	13.57%	(percent)	30.53%	(percent)	65.62%

Year	Total Number of Positions	Percent African-American	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Hispanic	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Female	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent
2014	(number)	(percent)	13.57%	(percent)	30.53%	(percent)	65.62%
2015	(number)	(percent)	13.57%	(percent)	30.53%	(percent)	65.62%

Table 27 Exhibit 18 EEO Statistics for Administrative Support

5. Service / Maintenance

Year	Total Number of Positions	Percent African-American	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Hispanic	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Female	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent
2013	(number)	(percent)	14.68%	(percent)	48.18%	(percent)	40.79%
2014	(number)	(percent)	14.68%	(percent)	48.18%	(percent)	40.79%
2015	(number)	(percent)	14.68%	(percent)	48.18%	(percent)	40.79%

Table 28 Exhibit 18 EEO Statistics for Service and Maintenance

6. Skilled Craft

Year	Total Number of Positions	Percent African-American	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Hispanic	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent	Percent Female	Statewide Civilian Workforce Percent
2013	(number)	(percent)	6.35%	(percent)	47.44%	(percent)	4.19%
2014	(number)	(percent)	6.35%	(percent)	47.44%	(percent)	4.19%
2015	(number)	(percent)	6.35%	(percent)	47.44%	(percent)	4.19%

Table 29 Exhibit 18 EEO Statistics for Skilled Craft

I. Does your agency have an equal employment opportunity policy? How does your agency address performance shortfalls related to the policy?

SRBA follow the laws of the State of Texas.

XII. Agency Comments

Provide any additional information needed to gain a preliminary understanding of your agency.