

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 79TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

May 21, 2005

TO: Honorable Robert Puente, Chair, House Committee on Natural Resources

FROM: John S. O'Brien, Deputy Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: SB3 by Armbrister (Relating to the development and management of the water resources of the state, including the creation of a groundwater conservation district; imposing fees and providing penalties.), **Committee Report 2nd House, Substituted**

Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds for SB3, Committee Report 2nd House, Substituted: a negative impact of (\$3,715,784) through the biennium ending August 31, 2007.

The bill would make no appropriation but could provide the legal basis for an appropriation of funds to implement the provisions of the bill.

General Revenue-Related Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Net Positive/(Negative) Impact to General Revenue Related Funds
2006	(\$1,712,385)
2007	(\$2,003,399)
2008	(\$2,183,309)
2009	(\$2,242,999)
2010	(\$2,195,999)

All Funds, Five-Year Impact:

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from <i>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</i> 1	Change in Number of State Employees from FY 2005
2006	(\$1,712,385)	11.0
2007	(\$2,003,399)	14.0
2008	(\$2,183,309)	17.0
2009	(\$2,242,999)	17.0
2010	(\$2,195,999)	17.0

Fiscal Analysis

Article 1--Environmental Flows

The bill would provide that existing water rights could be converted temporarily or permanently to use for environmental flow protection. The bill would replace the Study Commission on Water for Environmental Flows to the Texas Environmental Flows Commission (TEFC). The TCEQ would continue to provide staff support to the modified TEFC. The TEFC would develop flow regime recommendations based on a priority schedule by river basin. The bill would create the Texas Environmental Flows Science Advisory Committee (TEFSAC) and the Basin and Bay Area Stakeholders Committee (BBASC). The TCEQ, the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) would be responsible for coordinating with the

TEFC, TEFSAC, and the BBASC, providing reports regarding the groups' recommendations, and providing technical assistance.

The bill would allow the TWDB to use money in the research and planning fund of the Water Assistance Fund No. 480 to compensate members of the TEFSAC and the Bay and Basin Expert Science Teams (BBEST) for meeting expenses. It would also allow the TWDB to pay contract costs for technical assistance to TFEC advisory committees and the BBESTs and costs incurred by political subdivisions designated as representatives of the BBASC.

Article 2--Conjunctive Management Water Policy

The bill would require the TWDB to develop and implement a statewide water conservation awareness program to educate about water conservation. The bill also would require the TWDB to review water conservation plans and annual reports submitted by water utilities. It would also authorize expedited amendment processes for regional water plans, and it directs the TWDB to perform compliance reviews of certain water conservation plans and annual reports.

Article 3--Financing of Water Projects

The bill would create a water conservation and development fee to be collected by retail public utilities, remitted to the Comptroller, and deposited to the credit of the Water Infrastructure Fund (WIF) No. 302. However, the rate of the fee would not be set by the legislature, and the fee would not be assessed, until certain conditions provided in the bill are met, including how to establish and implement the fee as determined by the Legislative Oversight Committee on Water Financing created by the bill. The bill also would provide for various uses of money in the WIF.

Article 4--Special District Creation

The bill would create the Victoria County Groundwater Conservation District.

Article 5--Edwards Aquifer Authority

The bill would modify withdrawal limits from the Edwards Aquifer and establish pumping reduction levels and stages for critical period management.

Article 6--Val Verde County Groundwater Conservation District

The bill would create the Val Verde Groundwater Conservation District. It would also require the Water Development Board to conduct a study of groundwater in a county to determine water levels and other characteristics.

Methodology

Article 1--Environmental Flows

To provide technical support to the committees established in Article 1 of the bill, complete hydrological modeling, geographic information systems applications related to instream flows, and to evaluate economic factors, 6.0 additional FTEs and related costs are expected to be needed by the TCEQ. In addition, the TCEQ would have contract service costs of \$250,000 per year to upgrade and maintain water availability models.

The TWDB also expects to need additional staff and related costs to provide data and expertise to the committees established in Article 1, as well as funding for costs incurred by the TEFSAC, BBEST, as well as administrative costs for designated political subdivisions and studies relating to bays and estuaries. The agency expects that the number of FTEs needed would increase from 2.0 in fiscal year 2006 to 8.0 FTEs in fiscal year 2008. The TWDB expects costs not related to FTEs to total between \$675,000 to \$1,025,000 per fiscal year for duties prescribed in Article 1.

No significant fiscal implications to the TPWD are anticipated to result from the bill's provisions

relating to the agency's coordination with newly created councils and committees.

Article 2--Conjunctive Management Water Policy

No significant fiscal implications are expected to the TCEQ as a result of provisions in Article 2 of the bill.

The TWDB would need 1 additional FTE and related costs to review the water conservation plans and annual reports of approximately 800 retail water supply systems, as required in Article 2.

Article 3--Financing of Water Projects

No significant fiscal implication is expected as a result of the bill's creation of a water conservation and development fee, nor as a result of changes to the uses of funds in the WIF, until such time as the fee would be established by the legislature and assessed by the TCEQ. At that time, the fiscal impact would depend on the fee rate established and the number of persons paying the fee.

No significant fiscal implication is expected as a result of the bill's creation of the Legislative Oversight Committee on Water Financing.

Article 4--Special District Creation

No significant fiscal implications to the state are expected from the bill's creation of the Victoria County Groundwater Conservation District.

Article 5--Edwards Aquifer Authority

No significant fiscal implications to the state are expected as a result of changes to law regarding the Edwards Aquifer Authority.

Summary--Total Administrative/Operating/FTEs by Agency

Total administrative costs to the TCEQ in implementing the bill would be \$876,214 in fiscal year 2006 and \$566,248 per fiscal year in subsequent years. The agency would require 8.0 additional FTEs.

Total operating costs to the TWDB would be as follows:

Fiscal year 2006: \$836,171; FTEs--3.0

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,447,151; FTEs--6.0

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,617,061; FTEs--9.0

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,660,751; FTEs--9.0

Fiscal year 2010: \$1,629,751; FTEs--9.0

Local Government Impact

Councils and committee created, expanded or modified by the bill could incur administrative costs. However, these costs are not expected to be significant, since state agencies are required to provide technical and staff support to these entities.

Because Article 4 of the bill regarding the creation of the Victoria County Groundwater Conservation District would not have statewide impact on units of local government of the same type or class, no comment from this office is required by the rules of the House/Senate as to its probable fiscal implication on units of local government.

Since Article 5 of the bill could raise overall annual withdrawal rates from the Edwards Aquifer, local

governments depending on water from that source could benefit from greater water availability. However, because of the bill's provisions relating to critical period management plans, local governments also could be forced to find more expensive sources of water. Any costs would depend on the levels of rainfall and the aquifer.

Source Agencies: 580 Water Development Board, 582 Commission on Environmental Quality, 802 Parks and Wildlife Department, 304 Comptroller of Public Accounts

LBB Staff: JOB, DLBa, SD, WK, ZS, TL