



BRAZOS G
WATER PLANNING GROUP



2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

Volume II Evaluation of Water Management Strategies

October 2020



Contents

1	Water Management Strategies	1-1
1.1	Identification of Potentially Feasible Strategies.....	1-1
1.2	Evaluation and Recommendation of Strategies	1-4
1.3	Plan Development Criteria.....	1-4
1.4	Engineering.....	1-5
1.5	Cost Estimates.....	1-6
1.6	Quantitative Factors Used to Evaluate Environmental and Agricultural Impacts of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies.....	1-8
1.7	Agricultural Water Management Strategies.....	1-9
1.8	Water Conservation and Drought Preparation	1-10
1.9	Funding and Permitting by State Agencies of Projects Not in the Regional Water Plan..	1-11
2	Water Conservation.....	2-1
2.1	Municipal Water Conservation.....	2-1
2.1.1	Description of Strategy.....	2-3
2.1.2	Brazos G Municipal Water Conservation Approach	2-5
2.1.3	Available Supply.....	2-6
2.1.4	Environmental Issues.....	2-15
2.1.5	Engineering and Costing.....	2-15
2.1.6	Implementation Issues	2-22
2.1.7	Water Loss Reduction.....	2-23
2.2	Irrigation Water Conservation.....	2-24
2.2.1	Description of Strategy.....	2-24
2.2.2	Available Yield.....	2-24
2.2.3	Environmental Issues.....	2-29
2.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	2-29
2.2.5	Implementation Issues	2-32
2.3	Industrial Water Conservation	2-33
2.3.1	Description of Strategy.....	2-33
2.3.2	Available Yield.....	2-33
2.3.3	Environmental Issues.....	2-37
2.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	2-38
2.3.5	Implementation Issues	2-38
3	Wastewater Reuse	3.1-1
3.1	Overview	3.1-1
3.1.1	Direct Reuse.....	3.1-1
3.1.2	Indirect Reuse	3.1-3
3.1.3	Direct and Indirect Potable Reuse	3.1-3
3.2	General Evaluation of Direct Reuse Potential for Multiple Water User Groups.....	3.2-1
3.2.1	Description of Option.....	3.2-1
3.2.2	Available Supply.....	3.2-1
3.2.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.2-3
3.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.2-3
3.2.5	Implementation Issues	3.2-8
3.3	Bell County WCID No.1 – Reuse Projects	3.3-1

3.3.1	Description of Option.....	3.3-1
3.3.2	Available Supply.....	3.3-2
3.3.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.3-5
3.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.3-5
3.3.5	Implementation Issues	3.3-9
3.4	City of Bryan Lake Bryan Reuse	3.4-1
3.4.1	Description of Option.....	3.4-1
3.4.2	Available Supply.....	3.4-1
3.4.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.4-3
3.4.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.4-3
3.4.5	Implementation Issues	3.4-5
3.5	City of Bryan – Miramont Reuse.....	3.5-1
3.5.1	Description of Option.....	3.5-1
3.5.2	Available Supply.....	3.5-1
3.5.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.5-1
3.5.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.5-1
3.5.5	Implementation Issues	3.5-4
3.6	Cedar Park Reuse	3.6-1
3.6.1	Description of Option.....	3.6-1
3.6.2	Available Supply.....	3.6-1
3.6.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.6-1
3.6.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.6-3
3.7	City of Cleburne Reuse.....	3.7-1
3.7.1	Description of Option.....	3.7-1
3.7.2	Available Supply.....	3.7-1
3.7.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.7-2
3.7.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.7-4
3.8	City of College Station Non-Potable Reuse	3.8-1
3.8.1	Description of Option.....	3.8-1
3.8.2	Available Supply.....	3.8-1
3.8.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.8-3
3.8.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.8-4
3.8.5	Implementation Issues	3.8-4
3.9	College Station Direct Potable Reuse	3.9-1
3.9.1	Description	3.9-1
3.9.2	Available Yield.....	3.9-1
3.9.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.9-3
3.9.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.9-3
3.9.5	Implementation.....	3.9-3
3.10	City of Georgetown Reuse	3.10-1
3.10.1	Description of Option.....	3.10-1
3.10.2	Available Supply.....	3.10-1
3.10.3	Environmental Issues.....	3.10-1
3.10.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3.10-3
3.11	Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects.....	3.11-1
3.11.1	WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse	3.11-3
3.11.2	WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse	3.11-8
3.11.3	WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse.....	3.11-13



3.11.4	Waco North – China Spring WWTP	3.11-19
3.11.5	WMARSS I-84 Indirect Potable Reuse	3.11-26
4	New Reservoirs	4.1-1
4.1	Brazos River Main Stem Off-Channel Reservoirs	4.1-1
4.1.1	Description of Option	4.1-1
4.1.2	Available Yield	4.1-1
4.1.3	Environmental Issues	4.1-9
4.1.4	Engineering and Costing	4.1-11
4.1.5	Implementation Issues	4.1-12
4.2	Brushy Creek Reservoir	4.2-1
4.2.1	Description of Option	4.2-1
4.2.2	Available Yield	4.2-3
4.2.3	Environmental Issues	4.2-4
4.2.4	Engineering and Costing	4.2-9
4.2.5	Implementation Issues	4.2-10
4.3	Cedar Ridge Reservoir	4.3-1
4.3.1	Description of Option	4.3-1
4.3.2	Available Yield	4.3-1
4.3.3	Environmental Issues	4.3-5
4.3.4	Engineering and Costing	4.3-11
4.3.5	Implementation Issues	4.3-13
4.4	Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir	4.4-1
4.4.1	Description of Option	4.4-1
4.4.2	Available Yield	4.4-1
4.4.3	Environmental Issues	4.4-6
4.4.4	Engineering and Costing	4.4-11
4.4.5	Implementation Issues	4.4-13
4.5	City of Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir	4.5-1
4.5.1	Description of Option	4.5-1
4.5.2	Available Yield	4.5-4
4.5.3	Environmental Issues	4.5-8
4.5.4	Engineering and Costing	4.5-12
4.5.5	Implementation Issues	4.5-14
4.6	Hamilton County Off-Channel Reservoir	4.6-1
4.6.1	Description of Option	4.6-1
4.6.2	Available Yield	4.6-1
4.6.3	Environmental Issues	4.6-6
4.6.4	Engineering and Costing	4.6-17
4.6.5	Implementation Issues	4.6-19
4.7	NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir	4.7-1
4.7.1	Description of Option	4.7-1
4.7.2	Available Yield	4.7-1
4.7.3	Environmental Issues	4.7-8
4.7.4	Engineering and Costing	4.7-10
4.7.5	Implementation Issues	4.7-12
4.8	Red River Off-Channel Reservoir	4.8-1
4.8.1	Description of Option	4.8-1

4.8.2	Available Yield.....	4.8-3
4.8.3	Environmental Issues.....	4.8-6
4.8.4	Engineering and Costing.....	4.8-9
4.8.5	Implementation Issues	4.8-11
4.9	South Bend Reservoir.....	4.9-1
4.9.1	Description of Option.....	4.9-1
4.9.2	Available Yield.....	4.9-1
4.9.3	Environmental Issues.....	4.9-6
4.9.4	Engineering and Costing.....	4.9-10
4.9.5	Implementation Issues	4.9-12
4.10	New Throckmorton Reservoir	4.10-1
4.10.1	Description of Option.....	4.10-1
4.10.2	Available Yield.....	4.10-1
4.10.3	Environmental Issues.....	4.10-5
4.10.4	Engineering and Costing.....	4.10-9
4.11	Turkey Peak Dam – Lake Palo Pinto Enlargement.....	4.11-1
4.11.1	Description of Option.....	4.11-1
4.11.2	Available Yield.....	4.11-3
4.11.3	Environmental Issues.....	4.11-7
4.11.4	Engineering and Costing.....	4.11-13
4.11.5	Implementation Issues	4.11-14
5	Groundwater Supplies and Projects	5.1-1
5.1	City of Bryan Groundwater Strategies.....	5.1-1
5.1.1	Description of Option.....	5.1-1
5.1.2	Available Yield.....	5.1-1
5.1.3	Environmental Issues.....	5.1-2
5.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	5.1-4
5.1.5	Implementation Issues	5.1-5
5.2	College Station Groundwater Strategies	5.2-1
5.2.1	Description of Option.....	5.2-1
5.2.2	Available Yield.....	5.2-2
5.2.3	Environmental Issues.....	5.2-2
5.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	5.2-4
5.2.5	Implementation Issues	5.2-6
5.3	Williamson County Groundwater Strategies.....	5.3-1
5.3.1	Description of Option.....	5.3-1
5.3.2	Available Yield.....	5.3-2
5.3.3	Environmental Issues.....	5.3-2
5.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	5.3-5
5.3.5	Implementation Issues	5.3-6
6	System Operations.....	6.1-1
6.1	BRA System Operations.....	6.1-1
6.1.1	Description of Option.....	6.1-1
6.1.2	Available Yield.....	6.1-1
6.1.3	Environmental Issues.....	6.1-4
6.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	6.1-4



6.1.5	Implementation Issues	6.1-6
7	Conjunctive Use.....	7.1-1
7.1	Lake Granger Augmentation	7.1-1
7.1.1	Description of Option.....	7.1-1
7.1.2	Available Yield.....	7.1-1
7.1.3	Environmental Issues.....	7.1-7
7.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	7.1-7
7.1.5	Implementation Issues	7.1-11
7.2	Oak Creek Reservoir	7.2-1
7.2.1	Description of Option.....	7.2-1
7.2.2	Available Yield.....	7.2-2
7.2.3	Environmental Issues.....	7.2-5
7.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	7.2-5
7.2.5	Implementation Issues	7.2-5
8	Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR).....	8.1-1
8.1	City of Bryan ASR.....	8.1-1
8.1.1	Description	8.1-1
8.1.2	Modeling and Available Supply.....	8.1-3
8.1.3	Infrastructure Timing	8.1-5
8.1.4	ASR Aquifer.....	8.1-5
8.1.5	Environmental Issues.....	8.1-6
8.1.6	Engineering and Costing.....	8.1-7
8.1.7	Implementation.....	8.1-8
8.2	City of College Station ASR.....	8.2-1
8.2.1	Description	8.2-1
8.2.2	Available Yield.....	8.2-2
8.2.3	Environmental Issues.....	8.2-3
8.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.2-5
8.2.5	Implementation.....	8.2-7
8.3	Lake Georgetown ASR	8.3-1
8.3.1	Description of Option.....	8.3-1
8.3.2	Available Yield.....	8.3-3
8.3.3	Environmental Issues.....	8.3-6
8.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.3-8
8.3.5	Implementation.....	8.3-10
8.4	Lake Granger ASR	8.4-1
8.4.1	Description of Option.....	8.4-1
8.4.2	Available Yield.....	8.4-3
8.4.3	Environmental Issues.....	8.4-6
8.4.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.4-7
8.4.5	Implementation.....	8.4-10
8.5	Johnson County SUD and Acton MUD ASR	8.5-1
8.5.1	Description of Option.....	8.5-1
8.5.2	Available Yield.....	8.5-4
8.5.3	Environmental Issues.....	8.5-4
8.5.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.5-6

8.5.5	Implementation.....	8.5-8
8.6	Trinity ASR in McLennan County	8.6-1
8.6.1	Description of Option.....	8.6-1
8.6.2	Available Yield.....	8.6-2
8.6.3	Environmental Issues.....	8.6-2
8.6.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.6-5
8.6.5	Implementation.....	8.6-5
9	Regional Water Supply Projects	9.1-1
9.1	Bosque County Regional Project.....	9.1-1
9.1.1	Description of Option.....	9.1-1
9.1.2	Available Yield.....	9.1-2
9.1.3	Environmental	9.1-3
9.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.1-5
9.1.5	Implementation Issues	9.1-7
9.2	Milam County Groundwater and Alcoa Supply for Williamson County	9.2-1
9.2.1	Description of Option.....	9.2-1
9.2.2	Available Supply.....	9.2-2
9.2.3	Environmental Issues.....	9.2-2
9.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.2-3
9.2.5	Implementation Issues	9.2-3
9.3	Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority System	9.3-1
9.3.1	Description of Option.....	9.3-1
9.3.2	Available Yield.....	9.3-1
9.3.3	Environmental	9.3-3
9.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.3-6
9.3.5	Implementation Issues	9.3-7
9.4	East Williamson County Water Supply Project	9.4-1
9.4.1	Description of Option.....	9.4-1
9.4.2	Available Supply.....	9.4-1
9.4.3	Environmental Issues.....	9.4-2
9.4.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.4-3
9.4.5	Implementation Issues	9.4-3
9.5	Lake Belton to Lake Stillhouse Hollow Pipeline	9.5-1
9.5.1	Description of Option.....	9.5-1
9.5.2	Available Yield.....	9.5-3
9.5.3	Environmental Issues.....	9.5-3
9.5.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.5-3
9.5.5	Implementation Issues	9.5-4
9.6	Lake Whitney Water Supply Project (Cleburne).....	9.6-1
9.6.1	Description of Option.....	9.6-1
9.6.2	Available Yield.....	9.6-2
9.6.3	Environmental Issues.....	9.6-2
9.6.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.6-4
9.6.5	Implementation Issues	9.6-7
9.7	Somervell County Water Supply Project	9.7-1
9.7.1	Description of Option.....	9.7-1
9.7.2	Available Supply.....	9.7-2



9.7.3	Environmental Issues.....	9.7-2
9.7.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.7-3
9.7.5	Implementation Issues	9.7-5
9.8	Trinity Basin Supplies to Middle Brazos	9.8-1
9.8.1	Description of Option.....	9.8-1
9.8.2	Available Yield.....	9.8-2
9.8.3	Environmental Issues.....	9.8-4
9.8.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.8-6
9.8.5	Implementation Issues	9.8-6
9.9	West Texas Water Partnership.....	9.9-1
9.9.1	Description of Option.....	9.9-1
9.9.2	Available Yield.....	9.9-2
9.9.3	Environmental Issues.....	9.9-3
9.9.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.9-3
9.9.5	Implementation Issues	9.9-3
10	Augmentation of Existing Reservoir Supplies	10.1-1
10.1	Lake Aquilla Storage Reallocation	10.1-1
10.1.1	Description of Option.....	10.1-1
10.1.2	Available Yield.....	10.1-2
10.1.3	Environmental Issues.....	10.1-5
10.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	10.1-5
10.1.5	Implementation Issues	10.1-6
10.2	Lake Granger Storage Reallocation	10.2-1
10.2.1	Description of Option.....	10.2-1
10.2.2	Available Supply.....	10.2-2
10.2.3	Environmental Issues.....	10.2-4
10.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	10.2-5
10.2.5	Implementation Issues	10.2-6
10.2.6	Potential Regulatory Requirements	10.2-6
10.3	Lake Whitney Reallocation	10.3-1
10.3.1	Description of Options.....	10.3-1
10.3.2	Available Supply.....	10.3-3
10.3.3	Environmental Issues.....	10.3-4
10.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	10.3-5
10.3.5	Implementation Issues	10.3-8
10.3.6	Potential Regulatory Requirements	10.3-8
10.4	Lake Whitney Over-Drafting Supply with Off-Channel Reservoir	10.4-1
10.4.1	Description of Option.....	10.4-1
10.4.2	Available Yield.....	10.4-1
10.4.3	Environmental Issues.....	10.4-7
10.4.4	Engineering and Costing.....	10.4-9
10.4.5	Implementation Issues	10.4-11
10.5	Millers Creek Reservoir Augmentation	10.5-1
10.5.1	Description of Strategy.....	10.5-1
10.5.2	Canal Option	10.5-3
10.5.3	Pipeline Option.....	10.5-10
10.5.4	New Dam and Reservoir.....	10.5-14

10.5.5	Combined Canal Diversion with New Dam and Reservoir	10.5-21
10.5.6	Environmental Issues.....	10.5-25
11	Control of Naturally Occurring Salinity.....	11-1
11.1	Characterization of Salinity in the Brazos River	11-1
11.1.1	Sources	11-1
11.1.2	Quantification	11-2
11.1.3	Effects of Salinity on Usability of Water	11-8
11.2	Description of Salinity Control Project.....	11-13
11.3	Evaluation of the Potential Effectiveness of the Salinity Control Project	11-15
11.3.1	Modeling Approach	11-15
11.3.2	Model Output Modifications	11-22
11.3.3	Comparison of Model-Predicted TDS Concentrations With and Without Salinity Control Project.....	11-23
11.4	Environmental Issues	11-29
11.4.1	Environmental Setting.....	11-29
11.4.2	Threatened & Endangered Species.....	11-30
11.4.3	Solar Salt Production Facility Impacts	11-32
11.4.4	Possible Pipeline Impacts	11-32
11.5	Engineering and Costing	11-33
11.6	Impacts Comparison of Desalination Costs With and Without Salinity Control Project..	11-34
11.7	Implementation Issues.....	11-44
12	Brush Control.....	12-1
12.1	General Description of Brush Control.....	12-2
12.2	Brush Control in the Fort Phantom Hill Watershed	12-3
12.2.1	Watershed Characteristics.....	12-3
12.2.2	Potential Brush Control Project.....	12-5
12.3	Environmental Issues	12-7
12.3.1	Existing Environment	12-7
12.3.2	Potential Impacts.....	12-8
12.4	Engineering and Costing	12-10
12.5	Implementation Issues.....	12-11
13	Miscellaneous Strategies.....	13-1
13.1	Strategy Overview	13-1
13.2	Implementation Issues.....	13-2
13.3	Miscellaneous Pipelines, Pump Stations, and Groundwater Strategies by County	13-3
13.3.1	Bell County	13-3
13.3.2	Bosque County.....	13-6
13.3.3	Brazos County.....	13-10
13.3.4	Burleson County.....	13-11
13.3.5	Comanche County	13-12
13.3.6	Coryell County.....	13-15
13.3.7	Eastland County.....	13-17
13.3.8	Erath County	13-18
13.3.9	Fisher County.....	13-21
13.3.10	Grimes County	13-22
13.3.11	Hamilton County.....	13-25



13.3.12	Hill County	13-26
13.3.13	Hood County	13-27
13.3.14	Johnson County	13-31
13.3.15	Knox County	13-34
13.3.16	Lampasas County	13-38
13.3.17	Lee County	13-40
13.3.18	Limestone County	13-41
13.3.19	McLennan County	13-45
13.3.20	Palo Pinto County	13-46
13.3.21	Milam County	13-50
13.3.22	Robertson County	13-54
13.3.23	Somervell County	13-55
13.3.24	Stephens County	13-56
13.3.25	Stonewall County	13-57
13.3.26	Throckmorton County	13-60
13.3.27	Washington County	13-62
13.3.28	Williamson County	13-65
13.3.29	Young County	13-68
13.4	Miscellaneous Purchases, Interconnects & Reallocations	13-71
13.4.1	Bell County	13-71
13.4.2	Callahan County	13-74
13.4.3	Coryell County	13-75
13.4.4	Erath County	13-77
13.4.5	Fisher County	13-78
13.4.6	Hill County	13-78
13.4.7	Jones County	13-79
13.4.8	Johnson County	13-80
13.4.9	Limestone County	13-86
13.4.10	Lampasas County	13-86
13.4.11	McLennan County	13-87
13.4.12	Nolan County	13-90
13.4.13	Palo Pinto County	13-93
13.4.14	Stephens County	13-94
13.4.15	Taylor County	13-95
13.4.16	Williamson County	13-97
13.4.17	Young County	13-99
13.5	Miscellaneous WTP Upgrades and Facilities Expansions	13-101
13.5.1	WTP Cost Summaries	13-102

Figures

Figure 3.2-1. General Wastewater Reuse Annual Cost of Water (\$ per acft available project yield	3.2-6
Figure 3.3-1. Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse Project.....	3.3-2
Figure 3.3-2. Bell County WCID No. 1 South Reuse Project	3.3-3
Figure 3.4-1. Bryan Reuse Option 1 and Option 2	3.4-2
Figure 3.5-1 Bryan Miramont Reuse.....	3.5-2
Figure 3.6-1. Cedar Park Reuse	3.6-2
Figure 3.7-1. Cleburne Reuse	3.7-3
Figure 3.8-1. College Station Non-Potable Reuse	3.8-2
Figure 3.9-1. Location of College Station’s Direct Potable Reuse Project.....	3.9-2
Figure 3.10-1 Georgetown Reuse	3.10-2
Figure 3.11-1. Locations of Waco Area Reuse Projects	3.11-2
Figure 3.11-2. WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse.....	3.11-4
Figure 3.11-3. WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse.....	3.11-9
Figure 3.11-4. WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse	3.11-14
Figure 3.11-5. China Spring WWTP and Waco North Reuse	3.11-20
Figure 3.11-6. WMARSS I-84 Indirect Reuse.....	3.11-27
Figure 4.1-1. Locations of Identified Brazos River Main Stem OCR Sites.....	4.1-2
Figure 4.1-2 Hopes Creek Off-Channel Reservoir Diversions from Brazos River	4.1-3
Figure 4.1-3. Hopes Creek Off-Channel Reservoir Storage Trace	4.1-4
Figure 4.1-4. Hopes Creek Off-Channel Reservoir Storage Frequency	4.1-4
Figure 4.1-5. Monthly Median Streamflow Comparisons for the Brazos River with and without Diversions for Hopes Creek Off-Channel Reservoir	4.1-5
Figure 4.1-6. Streamflow Frequency Comparisons for the Brazos River with and without Diversions for Hopes Creek Off-Channel Reservoir	4.1-5
Figure 4.1-7. Spring Branch Off-Channel Reservoir Diversions	4.1-6
Figure 4.1-8 Spring Branch Off-Channel Reservoir Storage Trace	4.1-7
Figure 4.1-9 Spring Branch Off-Channel Reservoir Storage Frequency at Firm Yield	4.1-7
Figure 4.1-10 Monthly Median Streamflow Comparisons for the Brazos River with and without Diversions for Spring Branch Off-Channel Reservoir	4.1-8
Figure 4.1-11 Streamflow Frequency Comparisons for the Brazos River with and without Diversions for Spring Branch Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.1-8
Figure 4.2-1. Brushy Creek Reservoir Location	4.2-2
Figure 4.2-2. Simulated Storage in Brushy Creek Reservoir	4.2-5
Figure 4.2-3. Storage Frequency Curve for Brushy Creek Reservoir	4.2-5
Figure 4.2-4. Brushy Creek Reservoir Streamflow Frequency Comparison	4.2-7
Figure 4.3-1. Cedar Ridge Reservoir.....	4.3-2
Figure 4.3-2. Cedar Ridge Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace	4.3-3
Figure 4.3-3. Cedar Ridge Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Frequency	4.3-4
Figure 4.3-4. Cedar Ridge Reservoir Median Streamflow Comparison	4.3-4
Figure 4.3-5. Cedar Ridge Reservoir Streamflow Frequency Comparison.....	4.3-5
Figure 4.4-1. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.4-2
Figure 4.4-2. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Firm Yield Diversions from Cowhouse Creek.....	4.4-4
Figure 4.4-3. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Storage Trace	4.4-4



Figure 4.4-4. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Storage Frequency at Firm Yield4.4-5

Figure 4.4-5. Cowhouse Creek Diversion Median Streamflow Comparison.....4.4-5

Figure 4.4-6. Cowhouse Creek Diversion Streamflow Frequency Comparison.....4.4-6

Figure 4.5-1. Location of Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir4.5-2

Figure 4.5-2. Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir4.5-3

Figure 4.5-3. Groesbeck OCR Firm Yield Diversions from Navasota River4.5-5

Figure 4.5-4. Groesbeck OCR Firm Yield Storage Trace.....4.5-6

Figure 4.5-5. Storage Frequency at Firm Yield4.5-6

Figure 4.5-6. Navasota River Diversion - Median Streamflow Comparison.....4.5-7

Figure 4.5-7. Navasota River Diversion- Streamflow Frequency Comparison4.5-7

Figure 4.6-1. Hamilton County Off-Channel Reservoir.....4.6-2

Figure 4.6-2. Daily Streamflow at Leon River Diversion Site4.6-3

Figure 4.6-3. Hamilton County Reservoir Storage Trace4.6-4

Figure 4.6-4. Hamilton County Reservoir Storage Frequency4.6-4

Figure 4.6-5. Annual Diversions from Leon River.....4.6-5

Figure 4.6-6. Leon River Simulated Monthly Median Streamflow with and without Diversion.....4.6-5

Figure 4.6-7. Leon River Simulated Streamflow Frequency with and without Diversion4.6-6

Figure 4.7-1. NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir4.7-2

Figure 4.7-2. NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Components4.7-3

Figure 4.7-3. Annual NCTMWA Lake Creek Impoundments and Brazos River Diversions4.7-4

Figure 4.7-4. NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace.....4.7-5

Figure 4.7-5. NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Frequency.....4.7-5

Figure 4.7-6. Lake Creek Median Streamflow Comparison4.7-6

Figure 4.7-7. Lake Creek Streamflow Frequency Comparison4.7-6

Figure 4.7-8. Brazos River Diversion Median Streamflow Comparison4.7-7

Figure 4.7-9. Brazos River Diversion Streamflow Frequency Comparison.....4.7-7

Figure 4.8-1. Red River Off-Channel Reservoir Pipeline Route.....4.8-2

Figure 4.8-2. Red River Off-Channel Reservoir Project4.8-2

Figure 4.8-3. Red River Off-Channel Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace.....4.8-4

Figure 4.8-4. Red River Off-Channel Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Frequency4.8-4

Figure 4.8-5. Red River at Arthur City Median Streamflow Comparison4.8-5

Figure 4.8-6. Red River at Arthur City Streamflow Frequency Comparison4.8-5

Figure 4.9-1. South Bend Reservoir Location4.9-2

Figure 4.9-2. South Bend Reservoir Releases as Part of BRA System Operations4.9-3

Figure 4.9-3. South Bend Reservoir System Operations Storage Trace4.9-3

Figure 4.9-4. South Bend Reservoir Storage Frequency at Firm Yield.....4.9-4

Figure 4.9-5. Monthly Median Streamflow at Proposed South Bend Reservoir Dam.....4.9-5

Figure 4.9-6. Streamflow Frequency at Proposed South Bend Reservoir Dam4.9-5

Figure 4.10-1. New Throckmorton Reservoir4.10-2

Figure 4.10-2. New Throckmorton Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace.....4.10-3

Figure 4.10-3. New Throckmorton Reservoir Storage Frequency at Safe Yield.....4.10-3

Figure 4.10-4. North Elm Fork Diversion - Median Streamflow Comparison4.10-4

Figure 4.10-5. North Elm Fork Diversion- Streamflow Frequency Comparison.....4.10-4

Figure 4.11-1. Location of Turkey Peak Dam – Lake Palo Pinto Enlargement4.11-2

Figure 4.11-2. Expanded Lake Palo Pinto Storage Trace.....4.11-4

Figure 4.11-3. Expanded Lake Palo Pinto Reservoir Storage Frequency4.11-4

Figure 4.11-4. Releases from Expanded LPP for Water Supply.....4.11-5

Figure 4.11-5. Monthly Median Streamflow near Proposed Turkey Peak Reservoir Dam4.11-6

Figure 4.11-6. Streamflow Frequency Comparison at Turkey Peak Dam4.11-6

Figure 5.1-1. Locations of Planned Bryan Well Fields and Facilities5.1-2

Figure 5.2-1. Location of College Station Well Field and Facilities5.2-1

Figure 5.3-1. Location of Regional Williamson County Well Fields and Facilities5.3-1

Figure 6-1. Diversion Location of Entities Receiving BRA System Operations Supplies.6.1-3

Figure 6-2. Location Map of Possum Kingdom Reservoir to Abilene Delivery System6.1-5

Figure 7.1-1. Phase I – Conjunctive Use with the Trinity Aquifer7.1-2

Figure 7.1-2. Phase II – Conjunctive Use with the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer7.1-3

Figure 7.1-3. Lake Granger Storage – 2070 Conditions7.1-4

Figure 7.1-4. Distribution of Water Sources for Lake Granger Augmentation – 2070
 Conditions.....7.1-5

Figure 7.1-5. Relationship between Average Annual Groundwater Pumping and Increase in
 Yield for Two Operating Policies for Lake Granger Augmentation – 2070 Conditions 7.1-6

Figure 7.2-1. Existing Champion Well field and Oak Creek Reservoir Locations7.2-2

Figure 7.2-2. Simulated Annual Distribution of Water Sources for Conjunctive Use Operations ...7.2-4

Figure 7.2-3. Oak Creek Reservoir Simulated Storage under Conjunctive Use Operations7.2-5

Figure 7.2-4. Oak Creek Reservoir Simulated Storage Frequency under Conjunctive
 Use Operations7.2-5

Figure 8.1-1. Bryan’s Existing Well Field and Proposed ASR Well Field.....8.1-2

Figure 8.1-2. Fit of Demand Model8.1-4

Figure 8.1-3. Time series Plot of ASR Recoverable Volume8.1-4

Figure 8.1-4. ASR Injection, Capacity and Use Curves over Time8.1-5

Figure 8.2-1. Location of College Station’s ASR Project.....8.2-2

Figure 8.2-2. Geologic Profile in Target Area for ASR Well8.2-3

Figure 8.3-1. Possible Location of Lake Georgetown ASR Project.....8.3-2

Figure 8.3-2. Lake Georgetown Water Supplies and Projected Demand8.3-2

Figure 8.3-3. Source of Lake Georgetown ASR Recharge Water by Decade8.3-5

Figure 8.3-4. Simulated Timeline of Recharge by Planning Decade8.3-5

Figure 8.3-5. Zoomed-In Simulated Timeline of Recharge by Planning Decade.....8.3-6

Figure 8.4-1. Lake Granger ASR Project Location8.4-2

Figure 8.4-2. Operational Schematic of Lake Granger and ASR Project.....8.4-2

Figure 8.4-3. Utilization of Lake Granger and ASR Facility to Meet Lake Granger Demands and
 Provide Additional ASR Yield (13,015 acft/yr base plus 11,900 acft/yr additional)8.4-4

Figure 8.4-4. Combined System Storage for Lake Granger and ASR8.4-4

Figure 8.4-5. Lake Granger Storage Frequency.....8.4-5

Figure 8.4-6. Lake Granger Storage Trace Operated Conjunctively with ASR Project8.4-5

Figure 8.5-1. Location of Johnson County and Acton MUD ASR Projects.8.5-2

Figure 8.5-2. Water Supplies and Demand for JCSUD8.5-3

Figure 8.5-3. Water Supplies and Demand for AMUD8.5-3

Figure 8.5-4. Hydrogeological Profile in ASR Well Field8.5-4

Figure 8.6-1. Location of Waco and McLennan County ASR Project.8.6-1

Figure 8.6-2 Treated vs Untreated Supplies for City of Waco.....8.6-3

Figure 8.6-3. Water Treatment Capacity and Utilization of Waco’s WTP8.6-3

Figure 9.1-1. Interconnection of Bosque County Systems9.1-2

Figure 9.2-1. Proposed Infrastructure of the Milam County Groundwater and Alcoa
 Water Supply Project.....9.2-1

Figure 9.3-1. Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority System9.3-2

Figure 9.4-1. East Williamson County Water Supply Project9.4-2



Figure 9.5-1. Connection between Lakes Belton and Stillhouse Hollow9.5-2

Figure 9.6-1. Lake Whitney Water Supply Project9.6-2

Figure 9.7-1. Proposed Phases of the Somervell County Water Supply Project.....9.7-1

Figure 9.8-1. Trinity Supplies to Middle Brazos River Basin Strategy.....9.8-1

Figure 9.8-2. Lake Fairfield Firm Yield Reservoir Storage Trace9.8-2

Figure 9.8-3. Lake Fairfield Firm Yield Storage Frequency9.8-3

Figure 9.8-4. Supplemental Diversions to Lake Fairfield from Trinity River.....9.8-3

Figure 10.1-1. Map of Lake Aquilla with Elevation Contour of Reallocation10.1-1

Figure 10.1-2. 2070 Lake Aquilla Storage Trace, Current Conservation Elevation (537.5 ft-msl)10.1-4

Figure 10.1-3. 2070 Lake Aquilla Storage Trace for Conservation Elevation at 542 ft-msl.....10.1-4

Figure 10.2-1. Map of Lake Granger showing Contour at 510 ft.....10.2-2

Figure 10.3-1. Map of Lake Whitney.....10.3-2

Figure 10.3-2. Map of Lake Whitney Option to Meet Needs in Williamson County10.3-2

Figure 10.4-1. Historical Lake Whitney Storage as a Percentage of Conservation
 Pool Capacity10.4-2

Figure-10.4-2. Historical Lake Whitney Storage Frequency as a Percentage of Conservation
 Pool Capacity10.4-2

Figure 10.4-3. Location of Proposed OCR from Lake Whitney.....10.4-3

Figure 10.4-4. Annual Diversion amount under Firm Yield conditions from Lake Whitney10.4-4

Figure 10.4-5. Simulated Lake Whitney off-Channel Reservoir Storage Levels Subject to
 Firm Yield Demands.....10.4-5

Figure 10.4-6. Storage Frequency associated with Firm Yield10.4-5

Figure 10.4-7. Comparison of Median Monthly Streamflow below Lake Whitney10.4-6

Figure 10.4-8. Frequency Comparison of Streamflow below Lake Whitney10.4-7

Figure 10.5-1. WAM Incremental Drainage Areas used to calculate Naturalized Flows
 at Millers Creek Reservoir and Lake Creek Diversion Site.....10.5-2

Figure 10.5-2. Canal Option: Lake Creek Diversion to Millers Creek Reservoir.....10.5-4

Figure 10.5-3. Lake Creek Diversion Dam and Canal to Brushy Creek10.5-5

Figure 10.5-4. Millers Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace with Canal Diversion10.5-6

Figure 10.5-5. Millers Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Frequency with Canal Diversion10.5-6

Figure 10.5-6. Comparison of Median Monthly Streamflow below Lake Creek Diversion
 Point With and Without Canal Diversion10.5-7

Figure 10.5-7. Comparison of Streamflow Frequency below Lake Creek Diversion Point
 With and Without Canal Diversion10.5-7

Figure 10.5-8. Comparison of Median Monthly Streamflow below Lake Creek Diversion
 Point With and Without Pipeline Diversion10.5-11

Figure 10.5-9. Comparison of Streamflow Frequency below Lake Creek Diversion Point
 With and Without Pipeline Diversion.....10.5-11

Figure 10.5-10. New Reservoir below Millers Creek Reservoir10.5-16

Figure 10.5-11. New Reservoir Storage Trace.....10.5-17

Figure 10.5-12. New Reservoir Storage Frequency.....10.5-17

Figure 10.5-13. Comparison of Millers Creek Streamflow Frequency With and Without
 New Reservoir.....10.5-18

Figure 10.5-14. New Reservoir Storage Trace at Firm Yield with Canal Diversion10.5-22

Figure 10.5-15. New Reservoir Storage Frequency at Firm Yield with Canal Diversion10.5-22

Figure 10.5-16. Comparison of Streamflow Frequency below Lake Creek Diversion Point
 with and without New Reservoir and Canal Diversion.....10.5-23

Figure 10.5-17. Comparison of Millers Creek Streamflow Frequency With and Without New Reservoir and Canal Diversion 10.5-24

Figure 11-1. Salinity Control Study Area11-2

Figure 11-2. Selected USGS Water Quality Monitoring Stations11-5

Figure 11-3. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Seymour11-9

Figure 11-4. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Possum Kingdom.....11-10

Figure 11-5. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Whitney11-10

Figure 11-6. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at College Station11-11

Figure 11-7. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Richmond.....11-11

Figure 11-8. Project Layout Map11-14

Figure 11-9. Previously Proposed Project Layout and TDS Loads.....11-21

Figure 11-10. Well Field and TDS Loads11-23

Figure 11-11. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Seymour11-25

Figure 11-12. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Possum Kingdom Lake ...11-25

Figure 11-13. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Lake Granbury11-26

Figure 11-14. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Lake Whitney11-26

Figure 11-15. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Lake Bryan11-27

Figure 11-16. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Richmond11-27

Figure 12-1. Sub basin Map of the Fort Phantom Hill Watershed.....12-4

Figure 12-2. Annual Naturalized Flow at Lake Fort Phantom Hill12-5

Figure 13-1. Miscellaneous Strategies and Water Treatment Plant Expansions.....13-1



Tables

Table 1.1. Assessment of ASR Potential.....	1-2
Table 1.2. Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies Evaluated for the 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan	1-3
Table 1.3. Summary of Major Components Included in Preliminary Cost Estimates of Potential Water Supply Strategies	1-7
Table 2.1-1. Standards for Plumbing Fixtures.....	2-4
Table 2.1-2. Water Conservation Potentials of Low Flow Plumbing Fixtures	2-4
Table 2.1-3. Comparison of TWDB Baseline Per Capita Rates for the 2021 Brazos G Plan and Per Capita Rates With Advanced Conservation	2-8
Table 2.1-4. Estimated Annual Water Savings for WUGs with Recommended Conservation	2-11
Table 2.1-5. Environmental Issues: Municipal Water Conservation.....	2-15
Table 2.1-6. Costs and Savings of Municipal Water Conservation Techniques (BMPs).....	2-16
Table 2.1-7. Estimated Cost of Conservation to Achieve Water Savings Identified in Table 2.1-4	2-18
Table 2.1-8. Comparison of Municipal Water Conservation Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	2-22
Table 2.2-1. Cost and Savings of Possible Irrigation Water Conservation Techniques (BMPs)	2-26
Table 2.2-2. Costs and Savings by Implementing LESA/LEPA Water Conservation Techniques (BMPs).....	2-28
Table 2.2-3. Projected Irrigation Water Savings (acft/yr) with Conservation	2-29
Table 2.2-4. Brazos G Irrigation Water Savings and Estimated Costs	2-31
Table 2.2-5. Comparison of Irrigation Conservation to Plan Development Criteria	2-32
Table 2.3-1. Cost and Savings of Possible Industrial Water Conservation Techniques (BMPs).....	2-35
Table 2.3-2. Projected Water Savings for Manufacturing and Mining Water User Groups Considering up to a 7 Percent Demand Reduction by 2040	2-36
Table 2.3-3. Comparison of Industrial Conservation to Plan Development Criteria	2-39
Table 3.1-1. TCEQ Quality Standards for Reuse Water	3.1-2
Table 3.2-1. General Wastewater Reuse Potential in the Brazos G Area	3.2-2
Table 3.2-2. Environmental Issues: General Wastewater Reuse	3.2-3
Table 3.2-3. Wastewater Reuse Scenarios	3.2-4
Table 3.2-4. Required Distribution Facilities for Generalized Wastewater Reuse Scenarios	3.2-4
Table 3.2-5. Wastewater Reuse Irrigation Application Rate	3.2-5
Table 3.2-6. General Wastewater Reuse Annual Cost of Water (\$ per 1,000 gal available project yield)	3.2-5
Table 3.2-7. General Wastewater Reuse Total Project Capital Cost (\$ per gallon maximum capacity)	3.2-6
Table 3.2-8. General Wastewater Reuse Total Operations and Maintenance Cost (\$ per 1,000 gallons)	3.2-6
Table 3.2-9. Cost Estimate Summaries: Reuse as a Water Management Strategy for Multiple Water User Groups.....	3.2-7
Table 3.2-10. Comparison of General Wastewater Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.2-9
Table 3.3-1. Water Reuse Demands for Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse Project.....	3.3-1
Table 3.3-2. Water Reuse Demands for Bell County WCID No. 1 South Reuse Project	3.3-3

Table 3.3-3 Other Potential Future Water Reuse Demands for Bell County WCID No. 1 Reuse System3.3-4

Table 3.3-4. Environmental Issues: Bell County WCID No. 1 North and South Reuse Projects...3.3-5

Table 3.3-5. Required Facilities – Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse Project3.3-6

Table 3.3-6. Cost Estimate Summary: Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse Project3.3-7

Table 3.3-7. Required Facilities – Bell County WCID No. 1 South Reuse Project3.3-7

Table 3.3-8. Cost Estimate Summary: Bell County WCID No. 1 South Reuse Project3.3-8

Table 3.3-9. Total Yield and Cost for North and South Reuse Projects.....3.3-9

Table 3.3-10. Comparison of Bell County WCID No.1 North and South Reuse Projects to Plan Development Criteria..... 3.3-9

Table 3.4-1. Environmental Issues: Bryan Reuse3.4-3

Table 3.4-2. Required Facilities – Bryan Reuse Option 13.4-3

Table 3.4-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Option 1 Reuse for Bryan Utilities Lake Supply3.4-4

Table 3.4-4. Required Facilities – Bryan Indirect Potable Reuse Option 2.....3.4-4

Table 3.4-5. Cost Estimate Summary: Option 2 Indirect Potable Reuse for Bryan3.4-5

Table 3.4-6. Comparison of Bryan Reuse Options to Plan Development Criteria3.4-6

Table 3.5-1. Environmental Issues: Bryan Miramont Reuse.....3.5-3

Table 3.5-2. Required Facilities – Bryan Miramont Reuse.....3.5-3

Table 3.5-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Bryan Miramont Reuse Project3.5-4

Table 3.5-4. Comparison of Bryan Miramont Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....3.5-5

Table 3.6-1. Environmental Issues: Cedar Park Reuse3.6-2

Table 3.6-2. Required Facilities – Cedar Park Reuse3.6-3

Table 3.6-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Cedar Park Reuse.....3.6-4

Table 3.7-4. Comparison of Cedar Park Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria3.6-5

Table 3.7-1. Projected Reuse Demands for Cleburne Reuse Project3.7-2

Table 3.7-2. Environmental Issues: Cleburne Reuse.....3.7-4

Table 3.7-3. Cost Estimate Summary Cleburne Reuse Phase 13.7-5

Table 3.7-4. Cost Estimate Summary Cleburne Reuse Phase 2.....3.7-6

Table 3.7-5. Comparison of Cleburne Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....3.7-7

Table 3.8-1. Water Reuse Demands for College Station Non-Potable Reuse Project.....3.8-3

Table 3.8-2. Environmental Issues: College Station Non-Potable Reuse.....3.8-3

Table 3.8-3. Required Facilities – College Station Reuse for Veterans Park Irrigation3.8-4

Table 3.8-4. Cost Estimate Summary: College Station Non-Potable Reuse3.8-5

Table 3.8-5. Comparison of College Station Non-Potable Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria3.8-6

Table 3.9-1. Environmental Issues: College Station Direct Potable Reuse3.9-3

Table 3.9-2. Cost Estimate Summary: College Station DPR Project Option3.9-4

Table 3.9-3. Comparison of College Station DPR Option to Plan Development Criteria.....3.9-5

Table 3.10-1. Environmental Issues: Georgetown Reuse.....3.10-2

Table 3.10-2. Required Facilities –Georgetown Reuse.....3.10-3

Table 3.10-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Georgetown Reuse3.10-4

Table 3.10-4. Comparison of Georgetown Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria3.10-5

Table 3.11-1. Environmental Issues: WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse.....3.11-4

Table 3.11-2. Required Facilities – WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse.....3.11-5

Table 3.11-3. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy Lakeview Reuse.....3.11-6

Table 3.11-4. Comparison of WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....3.11-7

Table 3.11-5. Environmental Issues: WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse..... 3.11-10



Table 3.11-6. Required Facilities – WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse.....	3.11-10
Table 3.11-7. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse	3.11-11
Table 3.11-8. Comparison of WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	3.11-12
Table 3.11-9. Environmental Issues: WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse	3.11-15
Table 3.11-10. Required Facilities – WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse	3.11-15
Table 3.11-11. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse.....	3.11-17
Table 3.11-12. Comparison of Flat Creek Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	3.11-18
Table 3.11-13. Waco North Potential Reuse Water Demand	3.11-20
Table 3.11-14. Environmental Issues: Waco North – China Spring WWTP Reuse.....	3.11-21
Table 3.11-15. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Waco North Reuse	3.11-22
Table 3.11-16. Required Facilities –China Spring- Waco North	3.11-23
Table 3.11-17. Required Facilities – Chalk Bluff WSC.....	3.11-23
Table 3.11-18. Required Facilities – Gholson	3.11-23
Table 3.11-19. Comparison of Waco North China Spring Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	3.11-25
Table 3.11-20. Environmental Issues: WMARSS I-84 Reuse.....	3.11-27
Table 3.11-21. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Waco I-84 Indirect Potable Reuse.....	3.11-28
Table 3.11-22. Required Facilities –Waco I-84	3.11-29
Table 3.11-23. Comparison of Waco I-84 Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	3.11-30
Table 4.1-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Main Stem Off-Channel Reservoirs with Diversions from the Brazos River.....	4.1-12
Table 4.1-2. Evaluations of Hopes Creek and Spring Branch Off-Channel Reservoir Options to Enhance Water Supplies.....	4.1-13
Table 4.2-1. Summary of Authorizations for Certificate of Adjudication 12-4355	4.2-3
Table 4.2-2. Elevation-Area-Capacity Relationship for Brushy Creek Reservoir.....	4.2-4
Table 4.2-3. Median Monthly Streamflow for Brushy Creek Reservoir	4.2-6
Table 4.2-4. Cost Estimate Summary for Brushy Creek Reservoir.....	4.2-9
Table 4.2-5. Evaluations of Brushy Creek Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.2-11
Table 4.3-1. Cost Estimate for Cedar Ridge Reservoir	4.3-12
Table 4.3-2. Comparison of Cedar Ridge Reservoir Plan Development Criteria.....	4.3-14
Table 4.4-1. Median Monthly Streamflow: Cowhouse Creek Diversion Site.....	4.4-9
Table 4.4-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir	4.4-12
Table 4.4-3. Evaluations of Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies.....	4.4-13
Table 4.5-1. Median Monthly Streamflow: Navasota River Diversion Site.....	4.5-9
Table 4.5-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.5-13
Table 4.5-3. Evaluations of Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies.....	4.5-14
Table 4.6-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Hamilton County Off-Channel Reservoir	4.6-11
Table 4.6-2. Evaluations of Hamilton County Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.6-12
Table 4.7-1. Cost Estimate for NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir	4.7-11
Table 4.7-2. Comparison of NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir Project to Plan Development Criteria.....	4.7-12
Table 4.8-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Red River Off-Channel Reservoir	4.8-10
Table 4.8-2. Comparison of Red River Off-Channel Reservoir to Plan Development Criteria	4.8-12

Table 4.9-1. Median Monthly Streamflow at South Bend Reservoir Dam.....	4.9-8
Table 4.9-2. Cost Estimate Summary for South Bend Reservoir.....	4.9-11
Table 4.9-3. Evaluations of South Bend Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies.....	4.9-13
Table 4.10-1. Median Monthly Streamflow: North Elm Creek Diversion Site.....	4.10-7
Table 4.10-2. Cost Estimate Summary for New Throckmorton Reservoir.....	4.10-10
Table 4.10-3. Evaluations of New Throckmorton Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies.....	4.10-12
Table 4.11-1. Cost Estimate for Turkey Peak Project.....	4.11-14
Table 4.11-2. Comparison of Turkey Peak Project to Plan Development Criteria.....	4.11-15
Table 5.1-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Robertson County Well Field for Bryan.....	5.1-6
Table 5.1-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Brazos County Well Field for Bryan.....	5.1-7
Table 5.1-3. Comparison of Bryan Regional Groundwater Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	5.1-8
Table 5.2-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Carrizo-Wilcox Well Field for College Station.....	5.2-6
Table 5.2-2. Comparison of College Station Local Groundwater Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	5.2-7
Table 5.3-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Burleson and Lee County Well Fields.....	5.3-7
Table 5.3-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Milam County Well Field.....	5.3-8
Table 5.3-3. Comparison of Williamson County Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	5.3-9
Table 6.1-1. Supplies from BRA System Operations (acft/yr).....	6.1-2
Table 6.1-2. Environmental Issues: BRA System Operations.....	6.1-4
Table 6.1-3. Cost Summary for BRA System Operations Supply.....	6.1-6
Table 6.1-4. Comparison of BRA System Operations to Plan Development Criteria.....	6.1-7
Table 7.1-1. Environmental Issues: Groundwater/Surface Water Conjunctive Use (Lake Granger Augmentation).....	7.1-7
Table 7.1-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Phase I of Lake Granger Augmentation.....	7.1-9
Table 7.1-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Phase II of Lake Granger Augmentation.....	7.1-10
Table 7.1-4. Comparison of Lake Granger Augmentation to Plan Development Criteria.....	7.1-12
Table 8.1-1. Bryan’s Water Supply and Demand (acft/yr).....	8.1-2
Table 8.1-2. Timing of ASR Wellfield Infrastructure.....	8.1-7
Table 8.1-3. Cost Estimate Summary: City of Bryan ASR.....	8.1-9
Table 8.1-4. Comparison of City of Bryan ASR to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.1-10
Table 8.2-1. Cost Estimate Summary: College Station ASR Project Option.....	8.2-6
Table 8.2-2. Comparison of College Station ASR Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.2-7
Table 8.3-1. Lake Georgetown ASR Availability.....	8.3-4
Table 8.3-2. Lake Georgetown ASR Availability Assumptions and Constraints.....	8.3-4
Table 8.3-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Lake Georgetown ASR Option.....	8.3-9
Table 8.3-4. Comparison of Lake Georgetown ASR Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.3-11
Table 8.4-1 Cost Estimate Summary: Lake Granger ASR Option.....	8.4-9
Table 8.4-2 Comparison of Lake Granger ASR Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.4-10
Table 8.5-1 Johnson County SUD ASR Cost Summary.....	8.5-7
Table 8.5-2 Acton MUD ASR Cost Summary.....	8.5-8
Table 8.5-3. Comparison of Johnson County SUD and Acton MUD ASR Options to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.5-9
Table 8.6-1. Cost Estimate Summary: McLennan County ASR Project Option.....	8.6-6
Table 8.6-2. Comparison of Bryan ASR Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.6-7
Table 9.1-1. Summary of Clifton OCR Yield.....	9.1-3
Table 9.1-2. Cost Estimate Summary: Bosque County Regional Project.....	9.1-8



Table 9.1-3. Comparison of Bosque County Interconnections Option to Plan Development	
Criteria	9.1-9
Table 9.2-1. Environmental Issues: Somervell County Water Supply Project	9.2-2
Table 9.2-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Surface Water Only Option for Delivery to Williamson County.....	9.2-4
Table 9.2-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Combined Surface Water and Groundwater Option for Delivery to Williamson County	9.2-5
Table 9.2-4. Comparison of Milam County Groundwater and Alcoa Supply for Williamson County Project to Plan Development Criteria	9.2-6
Table 9.3-1. Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority System Participation with Peaking Capacity.....	9.3-3
Table 9.3-2. Allocation of New Highland Lakes Supply in Williamson County.....	9.3-3
Table 9.3-3. Summary of Costs for BCRUA Water Supply Project (Phases II- III).....	9.3-8
Table 9.3-4. Comparison of Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority System to Plan Development Criteria.....	9.3-9
Table 9.4-1. Environmental Issues: East Williamson County Water Supply Project	9.4-3
Table 9.4-2 Cost Summary of East Williamson County Water Supply Project	9.4-4
Table 9.4-3. Comparison of East Williamson County Water Supply Project to Plan Development Criteria.....	9.4-5
Table 9.5-1. Diversion and Storage Data for Lakes Belton, Stillhouse Hollow and Georgetown ..	9.5-2
Table 9.5-2. Estimated Costs for the Lake Belton to Lake Stillhouse Hollow Pipeline	9.5-5
Table 9.5-3. Comparison of Lake Belton to Lake Stillhouse Hollow Pipeline to Plan Development Criteria.....	9.5-6
Table 9.6-1. Cost Estimate for Phase I and II Lake Whitney Diversion to Cleburne	9.6-6
Table 9.6-2. Comparison of Transportation of Raw Water from Lake Whitney to Lake Aquilla to Plan Development Criteria	9.6-7
Table 9.7-1. Environmental Issues: Somervell County Water Supply Project	9.7-2
Table 9.7-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Somervell County Water Supply Project Phases 7A & 9-17	9.7-4
Table 9.7-3. Comparison of Somervell County Water Supply Project to Plan Development Criteria.....	9.7-5
Table 9.8-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir	9.8-7
Table 9.8-2. Evaluation of Trinity Supplies to Middle Brazos.....	9.8-8
Table 9.9-1. Supply to Each User from the West Texas Water Partnership (acft/yr)	9.9-2
Table 9.9-2. Cost Estimate Summary for the West Texas Water Partnership (from Region F Plan).....	9.9-4
Table 9.9-3. Comparison of West Texas Water Partnership to Plan Development Criteria	9.9-6
Table 10.1-1. Lake Aquilla Characteristics	10.1-2
Table 10.1-2. Comparison of Firm Yield of Lake Aquilla with Flood Storage Reallocation using Brazos WAM for 2020 and 2070 Conditions.....	10.1-3
Table 10.1-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Lake Aquilla Pool Reallocation	10.1-6
Table 10.1-4. Comparison of Reallocation of Storage in Lake Aquilla Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	10.1-8
Table 10.2-1. Lake Granger Characteristics.....	10.2-3
Table 10.2-2. Storage Capacities and Yields for Existing and Reallocation Scenarios in Lake Granger.....	10.2-4
Table 10.2-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Reallocation of Storage in Lake Granger	10.2-5

Table 10.2-4. Comparison of Reallocation of Storage in Lake Granger Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	10.2-6
Table 10.3-1. Lake Whitney Characteristics.....	10.3-3
Table 10.3-2. Storage Capacities and the Increase in System Yields for Existing, Hydropower Reallocation, and Hydropower plus Inactive Storage Reallocation.....	10.3-4
Table 10.3-3. Environmental Issues: Lake Whitney Reallocation.....	10.3-5
Table 10.3-4. Cost Estimate Summary for Reallocation of Hydropower Storage in Lake Whitney.....	10.3-6
Table 10.3-5. Cost Estimate Summary for Delivery of Lake Whitney Reallocation Supplies to Williamson County.....	10.3-7
Table 10.3-6. Comparison of Lake Whitney Reallocation Option to Plan Development Criteria..	10.3-8
Table 10.4-1. Median Monthly Streamflow below Lake Whitney	10.4-6
Table 10.4-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Lake Whitney Overdrafting Supply with an Off-Channel Reservoir	10.4-10
Table 10.4-3. Evaluations of Lake Whitney Overdraft with Off-Channel Storage Option to Enhance Water Supplies.....	10.4-11
Table 10.5-1. Drainage Areas used to Translate Naturalized Flows to Millers Creek Reservoir and Lake Creek Diversion Site.....	10.5-2
Table 10.5-2. Cost Estimate for Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Canal Option).....	10.5-8
Table 10.5-3. Comparison of Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Canal Option) to Plan Development Criteria.....	10.5-9
Table 10.5-4. Cost Estimate for Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Pipeline Option) ...	10.5-12
Table 10.5-5. Comparison of Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Pipeline Option) to Plan Development Criteria	10.5-14
Table 10.5-6. Cost Estimate for Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (New Reservoir Option).....	10.5-19
Table 10.5-7. Comparison of Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (New Dam and Reservoir Option) to Plan Development Criteria.....	10.5-20
Table 10.5-8. Cost Estimate for Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Combined Canal Diversion with New Dam and Reservoir Option)	10.5-25
Table 10.5-9. Comparison of Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Combined Canal Diversion with New Dam and Reservoir Option) to Plan Development Criteria.....	10.5-30
Table 11-1. Selected USGS Streamflow Gaging and Water Quality Sampling Stations	11-3
Table 11-2. Mean Discharges, Loads, and Concentrations for Period of Record	11-5
Table 11-3. Mean Discharges, Loads, and Concentrations for Comparable Time Periods	11-7
Table 11-4. Ranges in Monthly Mean Salinity Concentration for Water Years 1964 through 1986	11-8
Table 11-5. Range of Arithmetic Averages of Monthly Mean Salinity Concentrations for Each Month of the Year for Water Years 1964 through 1986.....	11-9
Table 11-6. Permissible TDS Limits for Classes of Irrigation Water	11-13
Table 11-7. Irrigation Water Quality Guidelines.....	11-13
Table 11-8. TDS Budget Summary.....	11-16
Table 11-9. TDS Data in WRAP-SALT Input File.....	11-18
Table 11-10. Flows and Loads in the Upper Brazos River Basin.....	11-20
Table 11-11. Mean Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curves With and Without Project.....	11-24
Table 11-12. Model-Predicted Exceedance Frequencies for Applicable Water Quality Limits Without and With Project	11-28



Table 11-13. Cost Estimate Summary for the Salinity Control Project11-35

Table 11-14. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Seymour with and without
Implementation of Salinity Control Project.....11-37

Table 11-15. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Possum Kingdom Lake with and
without Implementation of Salinity Control Project11-38

Table 11-16. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Lake Granbury with and without
Implementation of Salinity Control Project.....11-39

Table 11-17. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Lake Whitney with and without
Implementation of Salinity Control Project.....11-40

Table 11-18. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Bryan with and without Implementation
of Salinity Control Project.....11-41

Table 11-19. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Richmond with and without
Implementation of Salinity Control Project.....11-42

Table 11-20. Cost Estimate Summary for the Total Annual Cost of Desalination Treatment
within the Brazos River Basin11-43

Table 11-21. Evaluation of Salinity Control Project to Enhance Water Supplies.....11-44

Table 12-1. Subbasins Targeted for Potential Brush Control Project12-6

Table 12-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Brush Control Project.....12-11

Table 12-3. Evaluations of Brush Control Option to Enhance Water Supplies.....12-13

Table 13.5-1. Miscellaneous Strategies: Water Treatment Plant Strategies for WUGs/WWPs ..13-101

This page intentionally left blank.