Groundwater Management Area (GMA) 7
Desired Future Conditions
2021 Joint Planning

Adopted Desired Future Conditions for Relevant Aquifers			
County	**Aquifer**	**Desired Future Condition (DFC)**	**Date DFC Adopted**
Pecos	Capitan Reef Complex	Total net drawdown not to exceed 56 feet in 2070 as compared with 2006 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Reagan	Dockum	Total net drawdown not to exceed 14 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Pecos	Dockum	Total net drawdown not to exceed 52 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Kinney	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)	Total net drawdown in Kinney County in 2070, as compared with 2010 aquifer levels, shall be consistent with maintenance of an annual average flow of 23.9 cfs and an annual median flow of 23.9 cfs at Las Moras Springs	8/19/2021
Val Verde	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)	Total net drawdown in Val Verde County in 2070, as compared with 2010 aquifer levels, shall be consistent with maintenance of an average annual flow of 73-75 mgd at San Felipe Springs	8/19/2021
Coke	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 0 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Crockett	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 10 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Ector	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 4 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Edwards	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 2 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Gillespie	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 5 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Glasscock	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 42 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Irion	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 10 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021

Groundwater Management Area (GMA) 7
Desired Future Conditions
2021 Joint Planning

Adopted Desired Future Conditions for Relevant Aquifers			
County	**Aquifer**	**Desired Future Condition (DFC)**	**Date DFC Adopted**
Kimble	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 1 foot in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Menard	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 1 foot in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Midland	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 12 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Pecos	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 14 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Reagan	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 42 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Real	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 4 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Schleicher	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 8 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Sterling	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 7 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Sutton	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 6 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Taylor	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 0 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Terrell	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 2 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021

Groundwater Management Area (GMA) 7
Desired Future Conditions
2021 Joint Planning

Adopted Desired Future Conditions for Relevant Aquifers			
County	**Aquifer**	**Desired Future Condition (DFC)**	**Date DFC Adopted**
Upton	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 20 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Uvalde	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), Pecos Valley, and Trinity	Total net drawdown not to exceed 2 feet in 2070 as compared to 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Gillespie	Ellenburger-San Saba	Total net drawdown not to exceed 8 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Kimble	Ellenburger-San Saba	Total net drawdown not to exceed 18 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Mason	Ellenburger-San Saba	Total net drawdown not to exceed 14 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
McCulloch	Ellenburger-San Saba	Total net drawdown not to exceed 29 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Menard	Ellenburger-San Saba	Total net drawdown not to exceed 46 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
San Saba	Ellenburger-San Saba	Total net drawdown not to exceed 5 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Concho	Hickory	Total net drawdown not to exceed 53 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Gillespie	Hickory	Total net drawdown not to exceed 9 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Kimble	Hickory	Total net drawdown not to exceed 18 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Mason	Hickory	Total net drawdown not to exceed 17 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
McCulloch	Hickory	Total net drawdown not to exceed 29 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Menard	Hickory	Total net drawdown not to exceed 46 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
San Saba	Hickory	Total net drawdown not to exceed 6 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Glasscock	Ogallala	Total net drawdown not to exceed 6 feet in 2070 as compared with 2010 aquifer levels	8/19/2021
Pecos	Rustler	Total net drawdown not to exceed 94 feet in 2070 as compared with 2009 aquifer levels	8/19/2021

Groundwater Management Area (GMA) 7
Desired Future Conditions
2021 Joint Planning

Non-Relevant Aquifers *		
Aquifer	**Location**	**Justification**
Blaine	GMA 7 (Nolan County)	Limited areal extent; lack of groundwater use
Cross Timbers	GMA 7 (Coleman and Taylor counties)	Limited areal extent; limited groundwater use
Dockum	Coke, Crockett, Ector, Glasscock, Irion, Midland, Mitchell, Midland, Mitchell, Nolan, Scurry, Sterling, Tom Green, and Upton counties	Limited areal extent; limited groundwater use; limited impacts across county lines; no groundwater conservation district
Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)	Hickory UWCD No. 1, Lipan-Kickapoo WCD, Lone Wolf GCD, and Wes-Tex GCD (Concho, Mason, McCulloch, Mitchell, Nolan, and Tom Green counties)	Limited areal extent; limited groundwater use
Ellenburger-San Saba	Outside of Hickory UWCD, Hill County UWCD, Kimble County GCD, and Menard GCD (Coleman, Concho, and Mason counties)	Limited areal extent; limited groundwater use; no groundwater conservation district
Hickory	Outside of Hickory UWCD, Hill County UWCD, Kimble County GCD, Menard GCD, and Llano County (Coleman and Llano counties)	Limited areal extent; limited groundwater use; no groundwater conservation district
Igneous	GMA 7 (Pecos County)	Limited areal extent; lack of groundwater use
Lipan	GMA 7 (Coke, Concho, Glasscock, Irion, Runnels, Schleicher, Sterling, and Tom Green counties)	Annual management by Lipan-Kickapoo Water Conservation District, and pumping in the district does not affect areas outside of district; outside of the district, limited areal extent and lack of groundwater use

* Districts in a groundwater management area may, as part of the process for adopting and submitting desired future conditions, propose classification of a portion or portions of a relevant aquifer as non-relevant if the districts determine that aquifer characteristics, groundwater demands, and current groundwater uses do not warrant adoption of a desired future condition (Texas Administrative Code § 356.31(b)). Declaring an aquifer as non-relevant for the purposes of joint planning does not necessarily mean that the aquifer will not be managed by a local groundwater conservation district.

Groundwater Management Area (GMA) 7
Desired Future Conditions
2021 Joint Planning

Non-Relevant Aquifers *		
Aquifer	**Location**	**Justification**
Marble Falls	GMA 7 (Kimble, Llano, Mason, McCulloch, and San Saba counties)	Limited areal extent; limited groundwater use; no groundwater conservation district
Ogallala	Ector and Midland counties	Limited areal extent; limited groundwater use; no groundwater conservation district
Seymour	GMA 7 (Taylor County)	Limited areal extent; limited groundwater use

* Districts in a groundwater management area may, as part of the process for adopting and submitting desired future conditions, propose classification of a portion or portions of a relevant aquifer as non-relevant if the districts determine that aquifer characteristics, groundwater demands, and current groundwater uses do not warrant adoption of a desired future condition (Texas Administrative Code § 356.31(b)). Declaring an aquifer as non-relevant for the purposes of joint planning does not necessarily mean that the aquifer will not be managed by a local groundwater conservation district.