



DROUGHT PREPAREDNESS COUNCIL

RICK PERRY
Governor

5805 N. Lamar Blvd.
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0220
Phone: (512) 424-2138
Fax: (512) 424-2444

W. NIM KIDD
Council Chairperson

June 20, 2012

TO: The Honorable Rick Perry, Governor, State of Texas
The Honorable David Dewhurst, Lieutenant Governor, State of Texas
Ms. Esperanza Andrade, Secretary of State, State of Texas
The Honorable Steve Ogden, President Pro-Tempore of the Senate, State of Texas
The Honorable Joe Straus, Speaker of the House, State of Texas
The Honorable Steve Ogden, Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, State of Texas
The Honorable Troy Fraser, Chairman, Senate Natural Resources Committee, State of Texas
The Honorable Tommy Williams, Chairman, Senate Committee on Transportation & Homeland Security, State of Texas
The Honorable Jim Pitts, Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, State of Texas
The Honorable Allan Ritter, Chairman, House Natural Resources Committee, State of Texas
The Honorable Rick Hardcastle, Chairman, House Agriculture & Livestock Committee, State of Texas
The Honorable Pete Gallego, Chairman, House Criminal Jurisprudence Committee, State of Texas
Mr. Jeff Boyd, Chief of Staff, Office of the Governor
Mr. Steven McCraw, Director, Texas Department of Public Safety

FROM: Assistant Director Nim Kidd, Texas Division of Emergency Management

SUBJECT: Statewide Drought Situation Report

Nim Kidd, Chairman
Texas Division of Emergency Mgmt

Brenner Brown, Member
Texas Water Development Board

Richard Egg, Member
State Soil & Water Conservation Board

Lance Williams, Member
Texas Department of Agriculture

Dr. Travis Miller, Member
Texas AgriLife Extension Service

David Bradsby, Member
Texas Parks & Wildlife Department

Gilbert Jordan, Member
Texas Department of Transportation

David A. Van Dresar, Member
Texas Alliance of Groundwater Districts

Suzanne Burnham, Member
Texas Department of State Health Services

Chris Loft, Member
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality

Tad Curtis, Member
Office of the Governor
Economic Development & Tourism

Dr. John W. Nielsen-Gammon, Member
Office of the State Climatologist

Michael Dunivan, Member
Texas Forest Service

Marisa Callan, Member
Texas Department of Housing and
Community Affairs

1. NEXT COUNCIL MEETING

July 12, 2012- Austin, TX

2. GENERAL CONDITIONS

APRIL

April 2012 was drier than normal across most of the state with only a few regions receiving substantial precipitation. One region that saw significant improvement in drought conditions was the Coastal Bend area, where 5-10" of precipitation reduced exceptional drought (D4) at the start of April to severe (D2) drought by the end of the month. Otherwise, drought conditions changed very little throughout April as the dry weather followed a winter that brought beneficial rainfall to most of the state.). As of the May 1, 2012 United States Drought Monitor (USDM), 8.70% of the state was in D4 drought, compared to 14.05% on April 3rd, and this included areas in the southern High Plains, Low Rolling Plains, and the Trans Pecos. Nearly the entire western half of Texas was still experiencing at least severe (D2) drought conditions by the end of March, covering 49.70% of the state.

The most significant monthly rainfall deficits in the state were in Central Texas, which received less than 10% of normal April precipitation. Austin-Bergstrom saw only 0.09", Austin-Mabry only 0.22", and San Antonio only 0.04" of precipitation, which was the third driest April in San Antonio since 1871. This region is at risk of seeing drought conditions worsen if May, the climatologically wettest month of the year, does not bring substantial precipitation. Additionally, April 2012 ranked fourth among the warmest Texas ApriIs since 1895, which in combination with the dry weather, elevated evaporation levels across the state to conditions more typical of May or June. The J-17 Index Well monitored by the San Antonio Water Systems fell 17 feet during the last 3 weeks of April, which prompted Stage 2 watering restrictions by the end of the month.

According the Climate Prediction Center, little to no improvement of drought conditions is expected through end of July 2012, with the exception of a few counties near Childress where some improvement of drought conditions is possible. The El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) is currently in a neutral phase, which is expected to last through the summer of 2012. There is an equal probability of above normal, near normal, and below normal May through July (MJJ) precipitation across the entire state, a forecast typical of summertime weather when ENSO-neutral conditions are present. ENSO-neutral However, warmer than normal weather is forecasted to continue across Texas and most of the southern United States with the probability of above normal MJJ temperatures increasing from northeast to southwest across Texas.

May

May 2012 experienced a gradual improvement in drought conditions across the state, especially in west Texas. According to the U.S. Drought Monitor (USDM), exceptional drought conditions (D4) improved markedly, with the 8.70% of the state covered by D4 at the beginning of the month reduced to 0.73% by month's end. The small areas of exceptional drought were located in the southern Panhandle. In addition, extreme drought conditions (D3) and severe drought conditions (D2) were reduced from 24.72% to 10.16% and 49.70% to 26.58%, respectively. West and southwest Texas witnessed a drastic improvement in drought conditions as frontal passages brought above normal rainfall totals to the regions. The western Panhandle and central Texas also experienced a decrease in drought conditions during the month of May.

The storm systems that brought rain to west Texas were brought more widespread, sporadic precipitation to the eastern half of the state. Although May precipitation generally ranged from 2-4", most areas had monthly totals that were below normal since May is the climatologically wettest month of the year throughout most of the region. As a result, North Central and East Texas ended May with drier conditions, but not considered to be in a drought. Temperatures were above normal all across the state, except for the border-counties surrounding Del Rio, which accelerated evaporation of precipitation that fell. The warmth, in combination with the 2011 drought that depleted water resources across the western half of the state, has left most reservoirs in this region below 50% capacity despite year-to-date precipitation being well above normal.

According to the Climate Prediction Center, little to no improvement of existing drought conditions in the eastern half of the state is expected through end of August 2012. The summer monsoon season is expected to provide improvement in drought conditions across the Trans Pecos and southern Panhandle. The El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) is currently in a neutral phase, which is expected to last through the summer of 2012, with a 50% probability of an El-Niño developing by the end of 2012. The CPC forecast is for equal probabilities of above normal, near normal, and below normal June through August (JJA) precipitation across the entire state. The CPC has a 40-50% probability of above normal JJA temperatures across most of Texas with a greater than 50% chance of above normal JJA temperatures in the western Trans Pecos.

3. OVERALL STATEWIDE DROUGHT CONDITIONS

April

- Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI):
Based on this index, seven (7) Texas climate regions were drier than a month ago: High Plains, Low Rolling, North Central, Edwards Plateau, South Central, Upper Coast, and Southern all went up one or two levels on the drought scale. High Plains is back in Extreme Drought and Low Rolling Plains is in Severe Drought. Except North Central, all climate regions once again are in drought or experiencing a dry spell.
- Crop Moisture Index (CMI)
Soils went drier. All regions are now in either Slightly Dry, Abnormally dry, or Excessively Dry.
- Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI)
This index paints a different picture of Palmer index: North Central was in Moderate Wet and all others were near normal condition.
- Stream Flow Index (SFI)
Streams were drier in all except High Plains, where flows went higher in the past month. Three regions were low flows: Exceptional Low in Trans-Pecos region, Moderately Low in Low Rolling Plains, and Abnormally Low in Southern regions.
- Keetch-Byram Drought Index (KBDI)
Fire Risk was above normal in seven regions, three more than a month ago.

May

- Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI)
Based on this index, two (2) Texas climate regions, North Central and East Texas region, went drier than a month ago, but Trans-Pecos, Edwards Plateau, and Southern regions were less dry than a month ago. High Plains remained in Extreme Drought, and Low Rolling Plains and East Texas were in Severe Drought. Except the Edwards Plateau, all climate regions once again are in drought or experiencing a dry spell.
- Stream Flow Index (SFI)
If a line were drawn from El Paso in west to roughly above Beaumont in east, all regions above were in Severely Low flow condition and all below this line were in normal condition except Upper Coast region which was in abnormally low flow condition. Flow in the Lower Valley region was not monitored.
- Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI)
This index paints a different picture of Palmer index: North Central was in Moderate Wet and all others were near normal condition.
- Crop Moisture Index (CMI)
Soils were excessively dry in the Low Rolling Plains and abnormally dry in High Plains, North Central and Lower Valley regions. All regions were at cross border of dry-to-wet spell.
- Keetch-Byram Drought Index (KBDI)
Fire Risk was Above Average in two and High in another five regions.

4. WATER UTILITY STATUS

April

There are 1,035 water systems that are asking their customers to restrict water use, compared with 1,000 a month ago. Of these systems, 598 are asking customers to follow a mandatory watering schedule and 437 are asking customers to follow a voluntary watering schedule. There are currently 27 PWSs that have prohibited all outside watering by their customers. A total of 1,249 water systems have reported to the TCEQ regarding their status using the online form on the TCEQ public website. Recent rains in parts of the state have allowed some water systems to relax their water use restrictions. The seasonal forecasts are for the drought to persist or intensify in many areas of the state during the spring and summer months.

May

There are 1,010 water systems that are asking their customers to restrict water use, compared with 1,035 a month ago. Of these systems, 594 are asking customers to follow a mandatory watering schedule and 416 are asking customers to follow a voluntary watering schedule. There are currently 26 PWSs that have prohibited all outside watering by their customers. A total of 1,250 water systems have reported to the TCEQ regarding their status using the online form on the TCEQ public website. Recent rains in parts of the state have allowed some water systems to relax their water use restrictions. The seasonal forecasts are for the drought to persist or intensify in many areas of the state during the summer months.

5. WATER RIGHTS – STATEWIDE

April

New temporary water use permit applications are being reviewed on a site-specific basis and issued if there is sufficient surplus water at the requested source. The number of applications for new water use permits and amendments to existing permits was normal for the month.

In April, the executive director of the TCEQ provided additional guidance in response to a senior water right holder rescinding their priority call in the Neches River Basins; therefore, allowing for junior water right holders to resume diversions under the terms of each respective water right.

The availability of unappropriated water for new water use permits remains low in all river basins in the State, and the search for long-term, dependable alternate sources of water remains a high priority issue.

May

New temporary water use permit applications are being reviewed on a site-specific basis and issued if there is sufficient surplus water at the requested source. The number of applications for new water use permits and amendments to existing permits was normal for the month.

The availability of unappropriated water for new water use permits continues to decrease in all river basins in the State, and the search for long-term, dependable alternate sources of water remains a high priority issue.

6. WATER RIGHTS – LOWER RIO GRANDE / RIO GRANDE WATERMASTER (RGWM)

April

Current Conditions: On April 21 2012, the U.S. combined ownership at Amistad/Falcon stood at 59.44% of normal conservation capacity, impounding 2,016,236 acre-feet, down from 91.39% (3,203,115 AF) of temporary conservation a year ago at this time. Overall the system is holding 53.87% of normal conservation capacity, impounding 3,190,144 acre-feet with Amistad at 64.55% of conservation capacity, impounding 2,114,332 acre-feet and Falcon at 40.65% of conservation capacity, impounding 1,075,812 acre-feet. Mexico has 46.39% of normal conservation capacity, impounding 1,173,908 acre-feet at Amistad/Falcon.

Allocations: As of printing of the April ownership report, the U.S. has allocated 69,389.2422 acre-feet to Class A & B water rights, which include irrigation, mining and recreation.

Storage & Loss Amistad vs. Falcon: The U.S. is currently storing approximately 1.361 million acre-feet at Amistad (74.0%); and approximately 654 thousand acre-feet (42.2%) of normal conservation capacity at Falcon.

Evaporation and seepage losses at Amistad for the last 12 months, as of 04/21/12, are 74,947 acre-feet. For the same period, the U.S. has lost 71,476 acre-feet at Falcon.

Releases to meet demands: In 2012, (through 4/21/12), Mexico has released 530,062 acre-feet from Amistad and 462,979 acre-feet from Falcon for Mexico needs. The U.S. has released 322,439 acre-feet from Falcon and 274,802 acre-feet from Amistad for U.S. needs. Combined with gains between Amistad and Falcon, U.S. inflows to Falcon have totaled 311,129 acre-feet. The U.S. demand in the lower Rio Grande has been met at a rate of 96% by direct Rio Grande inflows and Amistad releases this year.

Upper Rio Grande (New Mexico): Currently, Elephant Butte in New Mexico is storing 380,222 (18.79%) acre feet and Caballo Dam in New Mexico, downstream of Elephant Butte is storing 21,889 (9.54%) acre-feet. This water storage in part is used to meet water needs in the El Paso area.

Outlook: 71% of all accounts began 2012 with 100% of their usable balance and 29% of all accounts began 2012 less than 100% of their usable balance of water available. The National Weather Service continues to report that the drought conditions are affecting 100% of counties and while temperatures have cooled down there has been very little rain to ease the drought conditions.

May

Current Conditions: On May 26, 2012, the U.S. combined ownership at Amistad/Falcon stood at 57.15% of normal conservation capacity, impounding 1,938,408 acre-feet, down from 85.37% (2,992,331 AF) of temporary conservation a year ago at this time. Overall the system is holding 47.53% of normal conservation capacity, impounding 2,814,785 acre-feet with Amistad at 60.17% of conservation capacity, impounding 1,970,836 acre-feet and Falcon at 31.89% of conservation capacity, impounding 843,949 acre-feet. Mexico has 34.63% of normal conservation capacity, impounding 876,378 acre-feet at Amistad/Falcon.

Allocations: As of printing of the May ownership report, the U.S. has allocated 119,256.2922 acre-feet to Class A & B water rights, which include irrigation, mining and recreation.

Storage & Loss Amistad vs. Falcon: The U.S. is currently storing approximately 1.362 million acre-feet at Amistad (74.0%); and approximately 576 thousand acre-feet (37.2%) of normal conservation capacity at Falcon.

Evaporation and seepage losses at Amistad for the last 12 months, as of 05/26/12, are 98,425 acre-feet. For the same period, the U.S. has lost 93,982 acre-feet at Falcon.

Releases to meet demands: In 2012, (through 5/26/12), Mexico has released 705,238 acre-feet from Amistad and 806,278 acre-feet from Falcon Mexico needs. The U.S. has released 483,756 acre-feet from Falcon and 360,748 acre-feet from Amistad for U.S. needs. Combined with gains between Amistad and Falcon, U.S. inflows to Falcon have totaled 417,200 acre-feet. The U.S. demand in the lower Rio Grande has been met at a rate of 86% by direct Rio Grande inflows and Amistad releases this year.

Upper Rio Grande (New Mexico): Currently, Elephant Butte in New Mexico is currently storing 366,440 (18.11%) acre feet and Caballo Dam in New Mexico, downstream of Elephant Butte is storing 34,050 (15.00%) acre-feet. This water storage in part is used to meet water needs in the El Paso area.

Outlook: 71% of all accounts began 2012 with 100% of their usable balance and 29% of all accounts began 2012 less than 100% of their usable balance of water available. The National Weather Service continues to report that the drought conditions are affecting 100% of counties and there has been very little rain to ease the drought conditions.

7. RIVER BASIN REPORTS

April

Stream flow conditions vary widely across the state. When considering drought conditions, United State Geological Survey (USGS) streamflow data is commonly used as a metric for comparison. This report uses monthly mean river flows in cubic feet per second (cfs) to represent average monthly conditions within each river basin. The historical median flow value for the month (the discharge which is equaled or exceeded 50% of the time) is used to prevent the inclusion of high flow values that would skew the data.

Red River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Red River near Burkburnett	582	344
Red River near De Kalb	13,375	11,450

Drought Condition: As of April 24, 88% of the Red River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 5% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Sulphur River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Sulphur River near Talco	705	142

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 11% of the Sulphur River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Cypress Creek Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Little Cypress Creek near Jefferson	495	502

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 67% of the Cypress Creek Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Sabine River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Sabine River near Beckville	1,839	2,180
Sabine River near Ruliff	13,577	9,205

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 21% of the Sabine River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Neches River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Angelina River near Alto	335	716
Neches River at Evadale	4,774	7,175

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 37% of the Neches River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Trinity River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Trinity River at Dallas	2,881	698
Trinity River near Oakwood	9,353	3,285
Trinity River at Romayor	17,037	5,490

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 26% of the Trinity River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Brazos River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Double Mountain Fork Brazos River near Aspermont	.24	4.70
Brazos River near Glen Rose	349	333
Little River at Cameron	1,647	990
Navasota near Easterly	82	55
Brazos near Hempstead	9,567	4,020
Brazos near Rosharon	12,213	5,220

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 80% of the Brazos River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 18% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Colorado River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Colorado River at Ballinger	0.16	12
San Saba River at San Saba	78	95
Llano River at Llano	128	168
Pedernales River near Johnson City	41	95
Colorado River at Columbus	808	1,610

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 97% of the Colorado River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 9% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits however, the Concho Watermaster continues to monitor the streamflow conditions and diversion requests.

Guadalupe River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Guadalupe River near Spring Branch	97	192
San Marcos River at Luling	285	278
Guadalupe River at Cuero	842	1,275
Guadalupe River at Victoria	954	1,210

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 90% of the Guadalupe River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing some exceptional drought conditions

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits however, some water rights in the upper Guadalupe River Basin can only divert on a limited schedule. The South Texas

Watermaster continues to monitor the streamflow conditions and diversion requests. All temporary permits are being reviewed on a case by case basis.

San Antonio River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
San Antonio River at Falls City	251	271
Cibolo Creek at Falls City	44	32

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 100% of the San Antonio River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits however, the South Texas Watermaster continues to monitor the streamflows conditions and diversion requests. All temporary permits are being reviewed on a case by case basis.

Nueces River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	April mean (cfs)	April historical median (cfs)
Nueces river at Tilden	17	3.6
Frio River near Derby	0	11
Atascosa River at Whitsett	5.5	11

Drought Conditions: As of April 24, 100% of the Nueces River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits however, the South Texas Watermaster continues to monitor the streamflow conditions and diversion requests. All temporary permits are being reviewed on a case by case basis.

May

Stream flow conditions vary widely across the state. When considering drought conditions, United State Geological Survey (USGS) streamflow data are commonly used as a metric for comparison. This report uses monthly mean river flows in cubic feet per second (cfs) to represent average monthly conditions within each river basin. The historical median flow value for the month (the discharge which is equaled or exceeded 50% of the time) is used to prevent the inclusion of high flow values that would skew the data.

Red River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Red River near Burkburnett	149	509
Red River near De Kalb	2,652	11,800

Drought Condition: As of June 5, 84% of the Red River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Sulphur River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Sulphur River near Talco	235	184

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 12% of the Sulphur River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Cypress Creek Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Little Cypress Creek near Jefferson	107	398

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 11% of the Cypress Creek Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Sabine River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Sabine River near Beckville	508	2,270
Sabine River near Ruliff	3,812	6,780

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 5% of the Sabine River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Neches River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Angelina River near Alto	146	498
Neches River at Evadale	1,730	5,680

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 28% of the Neches River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Trinity River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Trinity River at Dallas	832	1,090
Trinity River near Oakwood	1,131	5,420
Trinity River at Romayor	1,512	7,350

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 28% of the Trinity River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Brazos River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Double Mountain Fork Brazos River near Aspermont	21	21
Brazos River near Glen Rose	62	646
Little River at Cameron	256	1,520
Navasota near Easterly	18	58
Brazos near Hempstead	1,537	6,550
Brazos near Rosharon	2,315	6,810

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 73% of the Brazos River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 2% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits.

Colorado River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Colorado River at Ballinger	6	40
San Saba River at San Saba	171	114
Llano River at Llano	380	194
Pedernales River near Johnson City	243	99
Colorado River at Columbus	1,311	2,275

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 64% of the Colorado River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits however, the Concho Watermaster continues to monitor the streamflow conditions and diversion requests.

Guadalupe River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Guadalupe River near Spring Branch	319	240
San Marcos River at Luling	424	294
Guadalupe River at Cuero	1,603	1,490
Guadalupe River at Victoria	1,522	1,380

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 85% of the Guadalupe River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing some exceptional drought conditions

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits however, some water rights in the upper Guadalupe River Basin can only divert on a limited schedule. The South Texas Watermaster continues to monitor the streamflow conditions and diversion requests. All temporary permits are being reviewed on a case by case basis.

San Antonio River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
San Antonio River at Falls City	752	302
Cibolo Creek at Falls City	205	35

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 74% of the San Antonio River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits however, the South Texas Watermaster continues to monitor the streamflows conditions and diversion requests. All temporary permits are being reviewed on a case by case basis.

Nueces River Basin:

Streamflow Conditions:

Site	May mean (cfs)	May historical median (cfs)
Nueces river at Tilden	269	39
Frio River near Derby	3	12
Atascosa River at Whitsett	173	15

Drought Conditions: As of June 5, 88% of the Nueces River Basin is experiencing drought conditions; 0% of the basin is experiencing exceptional drought conditions.

Drought Restrictions: Water rights in this area are eligible to impound or divert according to the terms of their permits however, the South Texas Watermaster continues to monitor the streamflow conditions and diversion requests. All temporary permits are being reviewed on a case by case basis.

Statewide Rainfall Totals

April 1 - 31, 2012

City/Station	Rainfall Totals (in)
Brazos River Basin	
Lubbock	1.03
Abilene	0
Waco	1.66
College Station	3.28
Colorado River Basin	
Midland	0.05
San Angelo	.87
Austin Mabry	.22
Austin Bergstrom	.09
Neches River Basin	
Tyler	1.84
Lufkin	2.04
Sabine River Basin	
Longview	2.97
Trinity River Basin	
Dallas/ Fort Worth	4.24

Statewide Rainfall Totals

May 1 - 31, 2012

City/Station	Rainfall Totals (in)
Brazos River Basin	
Lubbock	1.33
Abilene	2.31
Waco	2.80
College Station	1.82
Colorado River Basin	
Midland	2.88
San Angelo	4.50
Austin Mabry	5.45
Austin Bergstrom	5.29
Neches River Basin	
Tyler	2.48
Lufkin	3.59
Sabine River Basin	
Longview	3.22
Trinity River Basin	
Dallas/ Fort Worth	1.66

8. WILDLIFE CONCERNS

No information available at this time.

9. AGRICULTURE CONCERNS

April / May

Following a very dry April, May brought rains to much of the state. Although rainfall was erratic, beneficial rains came to much of the state, significantly decreasing the area impacted by the residual effects of the 2011 drought and providing surface moisture to large areas of the High Plains as cotton planting season began. Texas farmers in the Blacklands and the Rolling Plains are finishing wheat harvest about 3 weeks ahead of normal due to a very early spring and warm winter. The wheat crop in the eastern Rolling Plains was above normal, while the wheat in the Northern Blacklands had exceptional yields due to abundant rain through the winter. Test weights were off a bit due to the dry April, but a good crop all together. The harvest in the western Rolling Plains was not good. Wheat stands were sparse and tiller numbers low due to the prolonged drought. The harvest is moving into the High Plains ahead of schedule. Wheat yields are generally poor there, but appear to be average or above in the northeast quadrant of the High Plains.

Cotton planters are rolling on recent rainfall in the South Plains. While moisture is not deep in the profile, the recent rains should provide a good start to the season in areas that received it. West Texas ranchers are still facing serious hay shortages and there are reports of renewed culling of livestock as they face disappointing spring rains with empty hay barns and high hay prices.

The following are observations from AgriLife Extension District reporters for the week ending on May 26:

Central: Cotton farmers were planting. Some counties saw rain, but others were becoming very dry. Hay fields remained green but were making little growth. Vegetables and fruits made good progress. Spring-planted crops such as corn, sorghum and haygrazer were showing stress from lack of moisture. In others, corn looked very good. Many of producers made a good first cutting of hay, but some worried that if the weather turns dry there will not be another cutting. Stripe rust and septoria were two of the more prevalent fungal diseases in wheat. Armyworms were another problem in many wheat fields; if they ate the flag leaf, yields dropped. Pasture conditions declined as cool season annuals stopped growing and only warm-season grasses remained. Many producers with improved Bermuda grasses noticed sparse stands due to the 2011 drought. Native-grass pastures also had yet to recover from the drought.

Coastal Bend: Temperatures were above normal with no rain reported. Some cotton was being cultivated; all crops needed rain. Sorghum showed signs of drought stress. Some producers were cutting it for hay. The recent dry spell was causing wilting in many grain crops. Most corn and sorghum growers who had wells were laying pipe to furrow irrigate. Pasture conditions remained steady. There were more reports of trees not recovering from last year's drought and dying.

East: Soils continued to dry out due to lack of rain, increased temperatures and high winds. Grass growth slowed, and most ryegrass was already baled. Cattle were in good condition. Grasshopper numbers increased in pastures.

Far West: Highs ranged from the upper 80s to the 100s, with lows in the low 60s. Most counties had windy conditions, which raised the risk of wildfire. Pecos and Presidio counties had as much as 1.5 inches of rain accompanied by hail. Reeves County and Terrell counties also received some precipitation. Cotton and sunflower planting was in full swing, with most farmers starting to plant on dryland fields. Warm-season annuals began rapidly growing. Alfalfa production was up, and wheat hay was abundant. In Presidio County, toxic weeds were reported in some areas. Beneficial weeds such as shin oak and other summer species were in full growth and providing much needed nutrition to cattle and wildlife. Livestock were in good condition due to more abundant forages.

North: The wheat harvest was nearly complete with about 90 percent to 95 percent harvested. Yields were above average, about 65 bushels per acre on a regular basis, with some reports of 70 and even 80-plus bushel yields. These were the highest wheat yields in recent history. Corn was doing very well, with about 75 percent of the crop tasseled. Both corn and wheat were about three weeks ahead of schedule due to the early spring. The hay harvest was excellent. However, topsoils were drying out due to lack of rain and high temperatures, and grasshopper populations were rising. Soil moisture deficits were becoming a factor for dryland soybean planting and young, already emerged plants. Livestock were in fair to good condition.

Panhandle: The region was hot, dry and windy. Soil moisture varied from very short to adequate with most counties reporting short. Corn was mostly in good condition, with some fields under irrigation. The planting of cotton and small grains was ongoing. Early planted grain sorghum was at the two- or three-leaf stage. Wheat was in very poor to excellent condition, with most counties reporting fair. Irrigated wheat was being harvested. Rangeland and pastures were in very poor to good condition, with most reporting poor. Cattle were improving.

Rolling Plains: The wheat harvest was expected to wrap up quickly if the weather remained hot and dry. Wheat yields ranged from very poor to above average. Cotton planting was slowed because of lack of moisture and poor producer enthusiasm. Early planted cotton was at the two-leaf stage. Some producers reported a high death loss of native as well as improved grass stands due to last year's drought and no spring rain. In King County, haygrazer plantings totaled 900 acres but were in very poor condition. Hay was in short supply, and cattle producers planned to start cutting herds again if rain doesn't come soon. The grasshopper population was increasing. Early peaches were smaller than normal. Parker and Throckmorton counties reported from 0.5 inch to 2 inches of rain. For Parker County, it was the first significant rain received since March 26.

South: Atascosa County, south of San Antonio, received 10 inches of rain. No rain was reported in the rest of the region. Soil-moisture levels were 50 to 100 percent adequate in the northern and southern parts of the region and short to very short throughout the

eastern and western areas. Rangeland and pastures were in good condition but high evaporation rates and temperatures, and persistent winds were quickly drying them out. Cattle were mostly in fair condition, with prices for replacements high. Jim Wells County reported \$1,000 being offered for bred cows. Most ranches remained de-stocked on cattle and were expected to remain so for quite some time. Supplemental feeding of cattle with hay, molasses and range cubes continued. Well water remained the primary source of water for livestock and wildlife in some areas. In Atascosa County, corn was tasseling, cotton was blooming and a lot of hay was being baled. In Frio County, the potato harvest continued, peanut planting was in full swing, and irrigation of corn and sorghum increased. In Zavala County, farmers were actively irrigating cabbage, watermelons, corn, cotton, sorghum and oats. In Cameron County, row crops were progressing well.

South Plains: Cotton planting was in full swing, with some fields already emerged. Some stands ranged in development from seedling to two and three true leaves. More rain was needed because high temperatures in the 90s and 100s, along with high winds, dried out what moisture gains were made in the last few weeks. In some areas where there were heavy rains and/or hail, cotton will have to be replanted. Rangeland and pastures improved from the rains a couple of weeks ago, but more rain was needed to regrow stands damaged by the drought. Livestock were in mostly fair to good condition.

Southeast: Daytime highs were in the upper 80s, with lows in the upper 60s. Topsoil moisture levels were fair. Haying was very active. Grass regrowth in hay fields was moderate to good, but more rain was needed. Producers continued to fight severe weed pressure due to the 2011 drought. In Chambers County, oats were grazed and not harvested. Jefferson County received 0.5 inch of rain.

Southwest: The weather was warm and windy, which was quickly drying out soils. Hay was harvested, and the peach crop was very good, with much roadside-stand activity. Grasshopper populations rose enough to cause treatment of field crops to begin.

West Central: Hot, dry, windy conditions continued. All areas needed rain. Producers were busy with field activities, including preparing for planting. The wheat harvest neared completion. Hay producers continued cutting and baling. Cotton planting began under good moisture conditions in most locations. Forage crops were up and growing. Most grain sorghum was planted and off to a good start. Most rangeland and pastures remained in good condition. Warm-season grasses were green and growing, but more rain was needed soon for them to continue producing. Winter weeds and grasses were dying. Livestock were in fair condition. Producers were cautiously beginning to restock herds. Pecans were in good condition.

The Drought Preparedness Council is comprised of state agencies concerned with the effects of drought and fire on the citizens of the State of Texas. The attached information was compiled and provided by representatives listed below. Points of contact, telephone numbers, and web site addresses are also provided.

Nim Kidd, Texas Division of Emergency Management, (512) 424-2436, fax (512) 424-2444, website: <http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/dem>

Brenner Brown, Texas Water Development Board, (512) 475-1128, fax (512) 475-2053, website: <http://www.twdb.state.tx.us>

Chris Loft, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, (512) 239-4715, fax (512) 239-4770, website: <http://www.tceq.state.tx.us>

Richard Egg, Texas State Soil & Water Conservation Board, (254) 773-2250, fax (254) 773-3311, website: <http://www.tsswcb.state.tx.us>

Lance Williams, Texas Department of Agriculture, (512) 463-3285, fax (800) 835-2981, website: <http://agr.state.tx.us>

Dr. Travis Miller, Texas AgriLife Extension Service, (979) 845-4808, fax (979) 845-0456, website: <http://texasextension.tamu.edu>

David Bradsby, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, (512) 912-7015, fax (512) 707-1358, website: <http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us>

Gilbert Jordan, Texas Department of Transportation, (512) 416-3270, fax (512) 416-2941, website: <http://www.txdot.state.tx.us>

Michael Dunivan, Texas Forest Service, (830) 997-5426, website: <http://txforests.service.tamu.edu>

Suzanne Burnham, Texas Department of State Health Services, (512) 801-9816, fax (512) 458-7111, website: <http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/>

Tad Curtis, Office of the Governor, Economic Development & Tourism, (512) 936-0047, website: <http://www.governor.state.tx.us/divisions/ecodev>

David A. Van Dresar, Texas Alliance of Groundwater Districts, (979) 968-3135, fax (979) 968-3194, website: <http://www.texasgroundwater.org/>

Dr. John W. Nielsen-Gammon, Office of the State Climatologist, (979) 862-2248, fax (979) 862-4466, website: <http://www.met.tamu.edu/osc/>

Marisa Callan, Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, (512) 475-3964, website: <http://www.tdhca.state.tx.us>

Attachment 1 Climatic Regions

