A. Consider Approval of Revised Population and Demand Projections and authorize Consultants to Make Minor Revisions Prior to Submittal to TWDB
Projected Population and Municipal Water Demands

Keeley Kirksey
Freese & Nichols, Inc.
Methodology for Population Changes

- Changes made based on:
  - Meetings/surveys from WWPs
  - WUG survey (22 requested changes)
  - State Data Center Estimates
  - NCTCOG Estimates
  - Water and WW Master Plans
  - Impact Fee Reports
  - Comprehensive Plans
  - County Studies (Collin, Denton, Kaufman)
Request for Regional Increase in Population

• October 2017 meeting with TWDB
• 2015 Census estimates and NCTCOG Water Resource Council data presented
• Up to 2.44% increase allowed in all decades
• Large portions of population incorporated to Denton and Tarrant Counties
• Smaller amounts incorporated into outlying counties
• Fulfilled most requests (at least in part)
## Resulting Population Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TWDB Draft Population Projections</th>
<th>Revised Population Projections</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7,504,200</td>
<td>7,632,764</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>8,648,725</td>
<td>8,854,600</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>9,908,572</td>
<td>10,150,077</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>11,260,257</td>
<td>11,533,432</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>12,742,283</td>
<td>13,051,602</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>14,347,912</td>
<td>14,684,790</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GPCD Review

• TWDB draft projections used GPCD’s from 2016 Plan (mostly year 2011 historical drought GPCD)

• July 2017 - TWDB provided updated GPCD’s

• TWDB allowed for adjustment if specific criteria were met
GPCD Review

- Review methodology:
  - Compared last plan to updated GPCD
  - Identified recent GPCD 20+ higher than 2016 Plan
  - Removed outliers (significantly higher than all other years on a non-drought year)
Requested GPCD Changes

- Requested changes:
  - Updated 2011 was higher than 2016 Plan (11)
  - Recent higher GPCD was consistent with other years’ GPCD (6)
  - Recent higher GPCD was attributed to new development (1)
  - Dallas & Tarrant County Other – DFW Airport inclusion (2)
  - Total of 20 WUGs revised GPCD
## Resulting Municipal Demand Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TWDB Draft Municipal Demand Projections (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Revised Municipal Demand Projections (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,477,999</td>
<td>1,514,029</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,671,574</td>
<td>1,716,873</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>1,891,465</td>
<td>1,937,280</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>2,122,879</td>
<td>2,173,144</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>2,357,465</td>
<td>2,421,192</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>2,599,289</td>
<td>2,673,828</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected Non-Municipal Water Demands

Brian McDonald
Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.
Information Presented Today

• Tasks completed to date
• Review key changes to the TWDB water demand projection methodology
• Summarize proposed changes to the TWDB draft water demand projections
Tasks Completed to Date

• Proposed changes to the TWDB’s draft mining water demand projections at the May 2017 RCWPG meeting

• Developed additional recommendations for changes to the TWDB’s draft water demand projections:
  • Irrigation
  • Livestock
  • Manufacturing
  • Steam Electric Power
Change in TWDB Projection Methodology for Manufacturing

• New methodology (for each county)
  • 2020 Water Demand: Maximum annual water use in the most recent 5 years of data
  • 2030 Water Demand: Change from 2020 proportional to the Texas Workforce Commission 10-year employment projections
  • 2040-2070 Water Demands: Same as 2030 Water Demand
Change in TWDB Projection Methodology for Manufacturing

• Reasons for Changes
  • Highest county water use in the most recent 5 years of data accounts for water use that occurred in the recent past
  • Long-term trend of decreasing water use
  • Complicated and expensive to develop modeled projections, and these would still have a large degree of uncertainty.
  • Water demand projections will be updated during each planning cycle with the most recent data.
Change in TWDB Projection Methodology for Manufacturing

Region C Total Manufacturing Comparison

- Draft 2022 SWP Manufacturing Projections
- 2017 SWP Manufacturing Projections
- TWDB Manufacturing Historical Data (2010-2015)
- Previous TWDB Manufacturing Data
- RWPG Recommended Projections
Change in TWDB Projection Methodology for Steam Electric Power

- New methodology (for each county)
  - 2020 Water Demand:
    - Maximum annual water use in the most recent 5 years of data
    - Incorporate near-term (2020-2030) facility additions and retirements
  - Later years: Hold projected demands constant
Change in TWDB Projection Methodology for Steam Electric Power

• Reasons for Changes
  • Highest county water use in the most recent 5 years of data accounts for water use that occurred in the recent past.
  • Complicated and expensive to develop modeled projections, and these would still have a large degree of uncertainty.
  • Projected increase in wind and solar generating capacity will offset the need to run some water-consuming facilities.
  • New facilities will be more water-efficient than those that are replaced.
  • Difficult to identify where future facilities will be located.
  • Water demand projections will be updated during each planning cycle with the most recent data.
Change in TWDB Projection Methodology for Steam Electric Power

Region C Total Steam Electric Power Comparison

* Modified in accord with TWDB comments in 10/31/17 email
Summary of Proposed Changes to Draft Projections

• Large majority of proposed changes:
  • Are based on incorporating 2015 TWDB data (2010-2014 TWDB data used in draft projections)
  • Represent increases to the draft projections
• TWDB has reviewed proposed changes
Summary of Proposed Changes to Draft Projections

• The Valley Steam Electric Station in Fannin County has been retired. The proposed change to the draft SEP water demand in Fannin County is a reduction from 384 ac-ft/yr to 0 ac-ft/yr.
Summary of Proposed Changes to Draft Projections

- There was a recent news report that the Big Brown Steam Electric Station in Freestone County will be closed. This site is currently active and is for sale. A new owner would likely continue operating the Station, and closure is not certain. Therefore, we propose that future water demands for the Big Brown Steam Electric Station (30,847 ac-ft/yr) should be included in the projected SEP water demand for Freestone County. This represents the largest change from the draft projections.
### Resulting Non-Municipal Demand Projections (sum of 5 categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TWDB Draft Non-Mun Demand Projections (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Revised Non-Mun Demand Projections (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>177,732</td>
<td>219,238</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>182,486</td>
<td>219,319</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>180,837</td>
<td>214,646</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>183,658</td>
<td>217,470</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>186,483</td>
<td>220,290</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>190,914</td>
<td>224,711</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• Comparison - TWDB Draft to Revised
  • Population up by 2.44%
  • Municipal Demand up by ~2.7%
  • Non-Municipal Demand up by ~20%
  • TOTAL Demand up by 4-5%

• Comparison – 2016 Plan to Revised
  • TOTAL Demand within 1.5%
## Resulting TOTAL Demand Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TWDB Draft TOTAL Demand Projections (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Revised TOTAL Demand Projections (ac-ft/yr)</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,655,731</td>
<td>1,733,267</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,854,060</td>
<td>1,936,192</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2,072,302</td>
<td>2,151,926</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>2,306,537</td>
<td>2,390,614</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>2,543,948</td>
<td>2,641,482</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>2,790,203</td>
<td>2,898,539</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Consider Designation of Wholesale Water Providers

Jody Puckett, Region C Chair
Amy Kaarlela, Freese & Nichols, Inc.
**WWP Definition**

- **Any person or entity**…that delivers or sells water wholesale (treated or raw) to WUGs or other WWPs or that the RWPG expects or recommends to deliver or sell water wholesale… The RWPGs shall identify the WWPs within each region...

- Previous definition included a 1,000 ac-ft/yr minimum

- New definition has no volume requirement
Wholesale Water Providers

- 2016 Plan = 41 WWPs
- 2021 Plan = 41 WWPs – 5 WWPs = 36 WWPs
  - Argyle WSC
  - Cross Timbers WSC
  - East Cedar Creek FWSD
  - Lake Cities MUA
  - West Cedar Creek MUD
Recommendation

• Keep the 36 WWPs using the same designation that has been used in previous plans
C. Announcement of Vacancy for James Hotopp’s position Representing Municipalities; Call for Nominations to Fill Vacancy, and Vote to Fill Vacancy

Jody Puckett
Region C Chair
D. Receive Report from Nominating Committee for Slate of Officers for 2018; Consider Election of 2018 RCWPG Officers

Jody Puckett
Region C Chair
2018 Slate of Officers

- Nominating Committee
  - Current Officers
  - 2 at-large members: Gary Spicer, Tom Kula
- Met on Dec 15, 2017
- Recommendation from Committee
- Vote for 2018 Slate of Officers
E. Consider Appointment of a Region C Public Information Coordinator in accordance with the Public Information Act

Jody Puckett
Region C Chair
Public Information Coordinator

• Designated person to make sure Region C complies with all elements of the Public Information Act

• Recommending that TRA select a staff member to designate as Coordinator
F. Consider Methodology for Identifying Potentially Feasible WMSs; Review of Methodology for Evaluating Water Management Strategies; Approve Both Methodologies

Jody Puckett
Region C Chair
Background

• Regional Planning rules state that:
  • Consultants must present methodology for Identifying Potentially Feasible WMSs to Planning Group
  • Planning Group must approve methodology
  • Consultants must present criteria for evaluating WMSs to Planning Group (last meeting, review if needed)
  • Planning Group must approve WMS evaluation criteria
General Method for IDENTIFYING PFWMS

• Similar Methodology as previous rounds
• Conservation is required WMS for all
• WMSs from previous Regional Plans
• Contact with Water Providers
  • Survey of WUGs
  • Meetings with WWP
• Seek Input from Region C Members
• Accept Input from public, verify with Water Provider
Categories of WMSs

• Water Conservation
• Drought Management Measures
• Wastewater Reuse
• Interbasin Transfers (IBT)
• Expanded Use of Existing Supplies
• New Supply Development
General Method for EVALUATING PFWMS (review)

- Presented at May 22, 2017 Meeting (20 slides)
- Similar Methodology as previous rounds
- Must:
  - Meet a “need”; reasonable % of need
  - Have a sponsor; available supply, implementable
  - Consider end use (quality, distance from user)
  - Meet regulation; permittable
  - Based on proven technology
  - Appropriate for regional planning
Asking Planning Group to vote to approve Method of Identifying and Evaluating Potentially Feasible WMSs
G. Consider Approval for TRA to Execute Contract Amendment with TWDB to include Additional Funds and updated TWDB Regional Planning Rules

Jody Puckett
Region C Chair
TWDB/TRA contract

- TWDB will amend all contracts with all Regions in January to include:
  - Additional Funding
  - Revised TWDB regional planning rules

- Vote to authorize TRA to execute contract amendment with TWDB
H. Consider Support of the Cities of Hudson Oaks and Willow Park’s requested Minor Amendment to the 2016 Region C Water Plan and approve/authorize the planning group to submit this amendment request to the TWDB along with a request for a minor amendment determination.

Jody Puckett, Region C Chair
Preston Dillard, Halff Associates
Requested Minor Amendment by Hudson Oaks & Willow Park

- Cities seeking SWIFT funding for project not in 2016 Region C Plan
- Cities present basic information on amendment/project and RCWPG votes on supporting the cities’ request (today)
- If supported by RCWPG, Cities to prepare minor amendment “packet” to TWDB
- TWDB to determine if minor amendment and consider the amendment for approval
- If approved by TWDB, back to RCWPG for approval
Hudson Oaks

- Current population of 1,900
- Projected 2070 population of 4,808
- Current supplies are City of Weatherford and groundwater
- WMS from 2016 Region C Plan:
  - Water Conservation
  - Additional Weatherford water (TRWD)
Willow Park

- Current population of 4,500
- Projected 2070 population of 16,000
- Current supplies are groundwater
- WMS from 2016 Region C Plan:
  - Conservation
  - Purchase treated water from Weatherford (raw water supplied by TRWD)
  - Alternative WMS – purchase treated water from Fort Worth (raw water from TRWD)
Proposed Project

- 18-inch & 16-inch diameter transmission main
- Approximately 5 miles long
- Includes meter stations, storage, and pumping
- Connects to Fort Worth system near I-20 & FM 1187
- Both Hudson Oaks and Willow Park city councils passed resolutions
- Fort Worth Water Department is supportive of project
H. Consider Support of the City of Westlake’s requested Minor Amendment to the 2016 Region C Water Plan and approve/authorize the planning group to submit this amendment request to the TWDB along with a request for a minor amendment determination.

Jody Puckett, Region C Chair
Amy Kaarlela, Freese and Nichols
Requested Minor Amendment for Westlake

- City seeking SWIFT funding for project that IS in 2016 Region C Plan, but not 2017 State Plan (?)
- Consultant explains omission from State Plan (DB17) and RCWPG votes on supporting the city’s request (today)
- If supported by RCWPG, consultants to coordinate with TWDB on necessary submittal
- TWDB to determine if minor amendment and consider the amendment for approval
- If approved by TWDB, back to RCWPG for approval
Westlake Project in previous plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Recommended Water Management Strategy Project (WMSP) Name</th>
<th>Capital Cost ($)</th>
<th>Final Prioritization Score (max = 1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TROPHY CLUB</td>
<td>Trophy Club, Westlake, Fort Worth - Phase I: 36&quot; Water Delivery Line Q-187</td>
<td>2,727,000</td>
<td>592.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WESTLAKE</td>
<td>Trophy Club, Westlake, Fort Worth - Phase I: 36&quot; Water Delivery Line Q-187</td>
<td>1,464,000</td>
<td>922.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5D.351
Projected Population and Demand, Current Supplies, and Water Management Strategies for the City of Westlake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Values in Ac-Ft/yr)</th>
<th>Projected Population and Demand</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>2060</th>
<th>2070</th>
<th>2080</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>3,682</td>
<td>4,211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Water Demand</td>
<td>Municipal Demand</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>3,623</td>
<td>4,242</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Projected Demand</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>3,623</td>
<td>4,242</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Available Water Supplies</td>
<td>Fort Worth (from TRWD)</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Current Supplies</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need (Demand - Current Supply)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Management Strategies</td>
<td>Water Conservation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Water from Fort Worth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase delivery infrastructure from Ft. Worth joint project with Ft. Worth, Westlake, Trophy Club</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Water Management Strategies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve (Shortage)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Q-197
Trophy Club, Westlake, Fort Worth - Phase I: 36" Water Delivery Line

| Probable Owner: Fort Worth, Westlake, and Trophy Club | Amount: 5,895 acre-ft/yr |
| CONSTRUCTION COSTS |                             |
| Pipelines | Size | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Cost  |
| Pipeline and Appurtenances | 36 in. | 13,150 | LF | $497.82 | $6,540,300 |
| ROW Easements | 20% | 1,146,000 | Engineering (12%) | $3,093,000 | $943,000 |
| Subtotal of Pipelines | $9,446,600 |
| CONSTRUCTION TOTAL | $9,446,600 |
| Interest During Construction | (18 months) | $522,000 |
| TOTAL COST | $10,468,600 |
| Fort Worth's Share (50%)  | $5,233,000 |
| Westlake's Share (28%)  | $2,961,000 |
| Trophy Club's Share (22%) | $2,273,000 |
C. Announcement of Vacancy for James Hotopp’s position Representing Municipalities; Call for Nominations to Fill Vacancy, and Vote to Fill Vacancy

Jody Puckett
Region C Chair
Vote to Fill Vacancy

• James Hotopp resignation effective today
• Recommending current alternate, Rick Shaffer
• Other nominations

• Vote to fill vacancy
DISCUSSION ITEMS
A. Schedule

Amy Kaarlela
Freese and Nichols, Inc.
Schedule – 2021 Planning Cycle

• Key Dates
  • January 12, 2018 – Population/Demand Projections due
  • September 2018 – Technical Memo on Needs (existing supply minus demands)
  • March 2, 2020 – Initially Prepared Plan due
  • October 14, 2020 – Final Plan Due

• Next Meetings – Spring/April & August 2018
B. New and Removed WUGs

Amy Kaarlela
Freese and Nichols, Inc.
New and Removed WUGs

• TWDB new definition of WUG, providers of >100 acre-feet/year
• Moved to “service area boundaries” for WUGs rather than city limits
• Eliminated cities who don’t provide their own retail water service
• Added many SUDs/MUDs/WSCs

• 52 Added WUGs
• 47 Removed WUGs
C. Major Water Provider Designation

Keeley Kirksey
Freese and Nichols, Inc.
Major Water Provider (MWP) Definition

- a water user group or a wholesale water provider of particular significance to the region’s water supply as determined by the regional water planning group. This may include public or private entities that provide water for any water use category.

- A subset of WUGs and/or WWP
Major Water Provider (MWP)

- After discussions with TWDB staff:
  - Intended to give a snapshot of the plans for the region
  - For reporting purposes only. Does not affect inclusion in the plan, prioritization, or funding eligibility.
- How does the Planning Group want to define “significant”? 
MWP vs. WWP

- Any person or entity...that delivers or sells water wholesale (treated or raw) to WUGs or other WWPs or that the RWPG expects...to deliver or sell water wholesale to WUGs or other WWPs...

- 2021 Plan has 36 anticipated WWPs

- WWPs will still be specifically planned for in the text
Proposed Alternatives for Designating MWPs

• Alternative 1 (Recommended) – Large WWPs (DWU, NTMWD, TRA, TRWD, UTRWD)
• Alternative 2 – Regional WWPs as designated in the 2016 Region C Water Plan
• Alternative 3 – Function of amount of water sold in a given year
• Alternative 4 – All WWPs designated as MWPs
Alternative 1 (Recommended) – Large WWPs

- DWU, NTMWD, TRA, TRWD, and UTRWD meet ~80% of the total Region C Demand (2016 Plan)
- Many of the other WWPs purchase water from one of these five WWPs
- Including these five WWPs as MWPs provides a good summary of the plans for the region as a whole
Alternative 2 – Regional WWPs

2016 Plan designated 13 WWPs as Regional WWPs

- DWU
- TRWD
- NTMWD
- TRA
- UTRWD
- Fort Worth
- SRA
- Upper Neches MWA
- Sulphur River WD
- Dallas County Park Cities MUD
- GTUA
- Corsicana
- SRBA (future provider)
### Alternative 3 – Amount of Water Sold

*(example using 2016 Plan data)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wholesale Water Provider</th>
<th>Year 2011 Total Sales (Acre-Feet)</th>
<th>Forney</th>
<th>Weatherford</th>
<th>Waxahachie</th>
<th>Denison</th>
<th>Midlothian</th>
<th>Corsicana</th>
<th>Sherman</th>
<th>Rockwall</th>
<th>Dallas County Park Cities MUD</th>
<th>Mansfield</th>
<th>North Richland Hills</th>
<th>Sulphur River Municipal Water District (located in Region D)</th>
<th>Upper Neches River Municipal Water Authority (located in Region I)</th>
<th>Upper Trinity Regional Water District</th>
<th>Grand Prairie</th>
<th>Denton</th>
<th>Garland</th>
<th>Arlington</th>
<th>Trinity River Authority</th>
<th>Fort Worth</th>
<th>North Texas Municipal Water District</th>
<th>Dallas (Dallas Water Utilities)</th>
<th>Tarrant Regional Water District</th>
<th>Sabine River Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur River Basin Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,056</td>
<td>6,819</td>
<td>7,197</td>
<td>8,785</td>
<td>9,080</td>
<td>10,337</td>
<td>11,459</td>
<td>12,321</td>
<td>14,152</td>
<td>15,381</td>
<td>15,406</td>
<td>16,694</td>
<td>21,328</td>
<td>27,604</td>
<td>28,752</td>
<td>32,155</td>
<td>41,080</td>
<td>72,466</td>
<td>73,204</td>
<td>231,796</td>
<td>320,482</td>
<td>392,915</td>
<td>399,587</td>
<td>unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Timbers WSC (formerly Bartonville WSC)</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustang SUD</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle WSC</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cedar Creek FWSD</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cedar Creek MUD</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise County WSD</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Cities MUA</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagoville</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek SUD</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens Municipal Water Authority</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockett SUD</td>
<td>4,226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrell</td>
<td>4,321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Texoma Utility Authority</td>
<td>4,643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennis</td>
<td>4,673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative 4 – All WWPs
Designated MWP

- 36 WWPs
- Over half of the WWPs purchase a portion of their supply from DWU, TRWD, TRA, UTRWD, or NTMWD
- Does including all WWPs as MWPWPs negate the designation of MWP and provide the snapshot the region wants capture?
D. Task 5A & 5B Reuse and Conservation

Brian McDonald
Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.
Task 5A Overview

Reuse Recommendations
Approach to Reuse Recommendations

• Gather information on existing and planned reuse
  • Surveys
  • Meetings with WWPs/WUGs
  • 210 Authorizations

• Identify potential reuse projects that can help meet projected shortages
Task 5B Overview

Water Conservation Recommendations
Information Presented Today

• Scope of work
• Approach to water conservation recommendations
Scope of Work

- Identify, evaluate, and recommend water conservations WMSs
  - Consider water conservation practices and drought management measures for each identified water need.
  - Consider strategies to address issues revealed by water loss audits.
  - Include:
    - Water conservation practices for each group that is required to develop a Water Conservation Plan.
    - Drought management measures for each group that is required to develop a Drought Contingency Plan.
    - A water conservation strategy that will result in the highest practicable level of water conservation and efficiency achievable for each WUG/WWP that is to obtain water from a proposed interbasin transfer under Texas Water Code 11.085.
  - If a water conservation strategy and/or a drought management strategy is not recommended to meet a need, document the reason.
Scope of Work

• Provide model water conservation plans.
• Develop a subchapter document that consolidates the RCWPG’s water conservation recommendations.
Approach to Water Conservation Recommendations

- Gather information on existing and planned conservation practices
  - Surveys
  - Meetings with WWPs/WUGs
  - Water conservation plan and drought contingency plans
- Develop a Water Conservation Package that is
  - Practicable for implementation in Region C
  - Projected to provide long-term water savings
  - Projected to provide reasonable water savings at reasonable cost for a wide range of WUGs
Approach to Water Conservation Recommendations

• Recommend Water Conservation Package for municipal WUGs that meet the following criteria:
  • Projected total water demand exceeds existing water supply
  • Projected total water demand is greater than 140 gpcd
  • Measure is not already implemented
  • Measure is applicable to WUG
  • A sponsor can be identified to implement the measure
Approach to Water Conservation Recommendations

- In the 2016 Region C Water Plan, the following Water Conservation Package was recommended for each municipal WUG:
  - Low flow plumbing fixture rules
  - Efficient new residential clothes washer standards
  - Efficient new residential dishwasher standards
  - Enhanced public and school education
  - Price elasticity/rate structure impacts
  - Enhanced water loss control program
  - Time-of-day irrigation restrictions
  - Water waste prohibition
Approach to Water Conservation

Recommendations

• Develop water conservation policy recommendations
• Update model water conservation plans
• Develop water conservation recommendations subchapter
E. Task 8 Unique Stream Segments, Unique Reservoir Sites and Legislative Recommendations

Brian McDonald
Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.
Information Presented Today

• Task 8 objective
• Summary of recommendations from 2016 Region C Plan
• Discussion of process to develop Task 8 recommendations for current planning cycle
Task 8 Objective

• Provide recommendations for
  • Unique stream segment designations
  • Unique reservoir site designations
  • Legislative, administrative and regulatory actions
Summary of Recommendations from 2016 Region C Plan- Task 8

- Unique stream segments
  - Convene a working group comprised of representatives of TWDB, TPWD, TCEQ, and the sixteen regions to bring clarity, purpose, and direction to the legislative mandate to “identify river and stream segments of unique ecological value.”
Summary of Recommendations from 2016 Region C Plan- Task 8

• Unique reservoir sites
  • Continue to designate following sites as unique sites
    • Ralph Hall
    • Lower Bois d’Arc Creek
    • Marvin Nichols
    • Tehuacana
    • Fastrill
    • Columbia
  • Recommend that Texas Legislature designate George Parkhouse (North) as an additional unique site for reservoir construction
  • Encourage continued affirmative votes by sponsors of these reservoirs to make expenditures to construct or apply for permits to preserve the designations
Summary of Recommendations from 2016 Region C Plan- Task 8

- Policy and Legislative Recommendations
  - Regional Planning Process
  - TCEQ Policy and Water Rights
  - State Funding and Water Supply Programs
  - Water Reuse and Desalination
  - State and Federal Program- Water Supply Issues
Discussion of Process to Develop Task 8 Recommendations for Current Planning Cycle

• Consultant budget for task: $13,402
  • Indicates TWDB’s expectation of limited effort by consultants for this task
• Process for last cycle
  • Subcommittee established to discuss and make recommendations to planning group
  • Final adopted recommendations were not substantially different from previous cycle
• Discussion of changes since last planning cycle
• Discussion of process for this cycle
Bills from 85th Legislature

• SB347
  • Requires all RWPG Members and Alternates to take Open Meetings Act Training (training was due by Nov 30, 2017)

• HB2215
  • Changes GMA process/timing of adopting Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) to sync with 5-year regional planning cycles
Bills from 85th Legislature

- SB 1511
  - Adds new non-voting member to RWPG, Texas State Soil & Water Conservation Board
  - RWPG meetings locations “readily accessible to the public”
  - Simplified planning option
  - Remove “infeasible” projects from the Plan (no action by sponsor when project is needed)
  - TWDB assess impediments to projects not implemented when needed
G. Public Participation Strategies

Colby Walton
Cooksey Communications Inc.
Goal: Public Awareness

• In lieu of quarterly/semiannual newsletters…

• *How to keep the public better informed and engaged through informational materials and communications channels, regarding the latest Region C WPG news, activities and opportunities for public participation/input?*

• Not only the general public, but also the private sector, civic and business groups, etc.
Proposed Strategies and Materials

- **One-Pager or Small Brochure: Overview of Region C Water Planning**
  - Who/What is the RCWPG (members, role)
  - Where is Region C: geographic area/map
  - The Need: demand & population projections
  - Current Plan: summary of recommended Water Management Strategies
  - The Importance of Conservation and Reuse
  - Current Process and Next Steps (including opportunities for public input)
  - Contact Info
Proposed Strategies and Materials

• PowerPoint Presentation/Slides for Use in Speaking Engagements by Members
  • Review existing slides and update to include current planning information, key messages
  • Review for consistent look/feel with updated website (see subsequent recommendation)
  • Review to ensure messages and visuals are clear, easy to understand, impactful
Proposed Strategies and Materials

• **Elevator Speech and Key Messages**
  - Internal Guide/Reference Material for Planning Group Members
    - Elevator Speech: 2-3 sentence description of what Region C Water Planning is, why it’s important
    - Key Messages/Q&A: summary of key information on various Regional Water Planning topics
Proposed Strategies and Materials

- **Website Updates**
  - Conversion to a more user-friendly, easily updated and mobile-responsive format (WordPress)
  - Addition of one-pager/brochure
  - Update of keywords/terms glossary
  - Updates to media materials (newsroom, fact sheet, press releases, resource guide, etc.)
  - Feature quarterly theme/key messages highlighting what’s happening now, most important
Proposed Strategies and Materials

• **Need Input from Planning Group**
  • What are the key messages you’d like emphasized for the next 3-6 months?
  • What presentations have you recently made?
  • What feedback/questions are you getting, that we can help address through Region C’s communications materials (handouts, website, etc.)?
H. Next Steps

Amy Kaarlela
Freese and Nichols, Inc.
Next Steps

- Begin finalizing existing supplies
- Allocate existing supplies
- Determine Needs (demand vs. existing supply)
- Produce Technical Memo Task 4C
- Begin Identifying Potentially Feasible WMSs
- Develop region-specific portion of scope for Task 5A
Other Discussion

A. Updates from the Chair
B. Report from Regional Liaisons
C. Report from Texas Water Development Board
Texas Regional Water Planning

Update for Region C Meeting
December 18, 2017

Connie Townsend, P.E.
Project Manager
Water Use, Projections, & Planning
Texas Water Development Board
The following presentation is based upon professional research and analysis within the scope of the Texas Water Development Board’s statutory responsibilities and priorities but, unless specifically noted, does not necessarily reflect official Board positions or decisions.
Proposed updates to TWDB rules/guidance:

• TWDB is updating our rules and guidance to address the statutory changes that occurred during the 85th Texas Legislative Regular Session (SB347, HB2215, & SB1511)

• December 7th TWDB Board approved publishing proposed draft rules and these are posted on our website. Anticipate to post to Texas Register December 22nd & public comments will be accepted through January 31, 2018.

• The associated proposed revisions to RWP Contract Exhibit C Guidance have also been posted for public comment with same timeline.
State Water Plan Amendment: 2 hearings were held Nov. 8th and Dec. 4th to take public comment on incorporating recent RWP amendments for Regions G, K, & L; and a newly designated minor aquifer “Cross Timbers Aquifer” - to the 2017 State Water Plan. The SWP amendment was approved Dec. 7th.

SWIFT (FY18): The Fiscal Year 2018 SWIFT program just opened December 8th and Abridged Applications will be accepted through February 2nd.
• **January 12, 2018**: Deadline to submit RWPG projections revision requests & WWP List to TWDB. Region C consultants have been great working with our EDA Team throughout this process – thanks!

• **March - April 2018**: This is the anticipated timeframe that projections for the 2021 RWPs will be taken to TWDB’s governing Board for adoption consideration.

  – Following Board adoption, these projections data will then be uploaded into the DB22 database for use by the RWPG consultants.
• Next RWPG items to consider:

  – Determination & Approval of Region C’s *process* for identifying Potentially Feasible WMSs.

  – Determination of *needs* once final water demand projections have been approved by TWDB Board this spring & the RWPG has determined existing supplies.

  – Then, as the RWPG develops *SOW* for WMS evaluations, these can be submitted to TWDB for amendment into its contract and receive notice to proceed for evaluations.

Online planning resources:

- Current 2021 RWPlanning Documents webpage link:

- New item is the *Political Subdivision BMPs Guide*

- 2017 Interactive State Water Plan application weblink:
  [https://2017.texasstatewaterplan.org/statewide](https://2017.texasstatewaterplan.org/statewide)
Questions?

Connie Townsend, P.E.
Project Manager
Water Use, Projections, & Planning
Texas Water Development Board
Other Discussion

D. Report from Texas Department of Agriculture
E. Report from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
F. Other Reports
Other Discussion

G. Confirm Date and Location of Next Meeting
H. Public Comments
Adjournment
Thank you for attending.

Materials are available at
www.regioncwater.org