



*News and Pictures  
of People You Know*

# BRA

BRADY, TEXAS

## CHRONOLOGICAL LEGAL QUESTIONS INVOLVING HICKORY UNDERGROUND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT NO. 1

•1986—The City of San Angelo filed suit against the Hickory Underground Water Conservation District No. 1, claiming the district didn't have authority to regulate it.

•April 1991—Senior Judge Curt Steib of San Angelo, representing the 119th District, ordered that the water district could not consider San Angelo's alternative sources of water but upheld that San Angelo had to be permitted by the water district.

•Jan. 1995—San Angelo submitted a permit request on 9 wells for a total of 7,250 acre/feet of water.

•March 1995—The City of San Angelo filed a motion to enforce the prior judgement.

•April 1995—The water district filed a plea in abatement stating that it had taken no action to violate the judgement.

•Nov. 1995—In a hearing in San Angelo in 119th District Court, Judge Steib ordered mediation between the two parties. He further announced that if mediation was not successful that the water district must take action on San Angelo's request for permits.

•Jan. 1996—A mediation was held in San Angelo with the water district and City of San Angelo. It was unsuccessful.

•Jan. 1996—San Angelo announced that it had changed its request for permits to 22 wells for a total of 15,011 acre/feet of water.

•Feb. 1996—The board of directors of the water district conducted a public hearing on San Angelo's request for 22 water well permits.

•March 14, 1996—The water district issued Order 96-2 to general manager Stan Reinhard to issue permits to San Angelo for 2,750 acre/feet provided the district received a proof of authorization by the San Angelo City Council authorizing the applications for 22 wells.

•March 14, 1996—The City of Brady filed a suit for dismissal of the water district's Order 96-2.

•March 21, 1996—The City of Brady stated that San Angelo did not authorize its city manager to request 22 well permits, and that San Angelo didn't need the water. It also sued the water district for granting the permits to San Angelo.

•March 28, 1996—The City of Brady amended its suit against the water district to include San Angelo.

•April 18, 1996—The City of San Angelo filed a plea in abatement requesting that all hearings be conducted in Judge Steib's 119th District Court.

•May 31, 1996—The water district filed a motion to strike (throw out) the City of San Angelo's 1995 suit, but Judge Steib denied it.

•June 18, 1996—The water district filed a writ of mandamus with the 3rd Court of Appeals in Austin seeking the removal of jurisdiction from the 119th District Court.

•June 18, 1996—At a hearing in 198th District Court, Senior Judge Charles Sherrill of Kerrville, presiding, heard a plea in abatement from the City of San Angelo to postpone any action in the 198th District Court until after the trial was concluded in the 119th District Court. Judge Sherrill denied the plea.