

5.37 Young County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.37-1 lists each water user group in Young County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2040 and 2070. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.37-1. Young County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage) ¹		Comment
	2040 (acft/yr)	2070 (acft/yr)	
Fort Belknap WSC	(41)	(81)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Graham	379	88	Projected surplus
City of Newcastle	0	0	Demand equals supply
County-Other	82	15	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	0	0	Demand equals supply
Steam-Electric	11,869	10,542	Projected surplus
Mining	(196)	(73)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Irrigation	(48)	(44)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Livestock	0	0	Demand equals supply

1 – From Tables C-59 and C-60, Appendix C – Comparison of Water Demands with Water Supplies to Determine Needs.

5.37.1 Fort Belknap WSC

Description of Supply

Fort Belknap WSC obtains water from the City of Graham and shows no projected shortages. This WUG is located in multiple counties (Young, Palo Pinto, Throckmorton, and Stephens). The surplus shown in Table 5.37-1 represents the cumulative totals for Fort Belknap WSC.

Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Fort Belknap WSC. Conservation was considered, but the entity's per capita use is less than the target per capita of 140 gpcd.

- a. Purchase Additional Water from City of Graham:
- Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 12
 - Date to be Implemented: before 2020
 - Unit Cost: \$880/acft (\$2.70/kgal) assumed treated wholesale rate. Existing infrastructure is assumed sufficient for additional supply
 - Annual Cost: \$74,800

Table 5.37-2. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fort Belknap WSC

Plan Element	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<i>Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (acft/yr)</i>	(27)	(36)	(41)	(51)	(66)	(81)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (acft/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Annual Cost (\$/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (acft/yr)</i>	(27)	(36)	(41)	(51)	(66)	(81)
Purchase Additional Water from City of Graham						
Supply From Plan Element (acft/yr)	85	85	85	85	85	85
Annual Cost (\$/yr)	\$74,800	\$74,800	\$74,800	\$74,800	\$74,800	\$74,800
Unit Cost (\$/acft)	\$880	\$880	\$880	\$880	\$880	\$880

5.37.2 City of Graham

Description of Supply

The City of Graham obtains surface water from Lakes Graham and Eddleman and a contract with BRA for 1,000 acft/yr. There is some estimated exempt groundwater pumping within the city limits. The City has contracts to sell treated and raw water supply totaling 848 acft/yr to Newcastle, Bryson, Fort Belknap WSC, entities in Young County-Other, Young County Manufacturing and Young County Steam-Electric. No future shortages are projected and no changes in water supply are recommended.

Water Supply Plan

Although the City has sufficient supplies, working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, conservation is recommended for the City as the current per capita use rate is above the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

- a. Conservation
- Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 2
 - Date to be Implemented: before 2020 – use rate exceeds 140 gpcd
 - Annual Cost: \$597,224 in 2070
 - Unit Cost: \$474/acft



Table 5.37-3. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Graham

Plan Element	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<i>Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (acft/yr)</i>	539	444	379	291	190	88
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (acft/yr)	140	354	568	795	1,029	1,260
Annual Cost (\$/yr)	\$66,267	\$167,589	\$269,394	\$376,678	\$487,688	\$597,224
<i>Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (acft/yr)</i>	679	798	947	1,086	1,219	1,348

5.37.3 City of Newcastle

The City of Newcastle receives all of its water supply from the City of Graham. No future shortages are projected for the City of Newcastle and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered, but the entity’s per capita use is less than the target per capita of 140 gpcd.

5.37.4 County-Other

Entities in Young County-Other receive water supply from City of Graham and groundwater. A portion of Young County-Other is located in Region B. No future shortages are projected and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered, but the entity’s per capita use is less than the target per capita of 140 gpcd.

5.37.5 Manufacturing

Young County Manufacturing is supplied by Graham and entities in Young County-Other. No future shortages are projected and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.37.6 Steam-Electric

No future shortages are projected and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.37.7 Mining

Description of Supply

Mining is projected to have shortages beginning in 2020. No supplies have been allocated to Mining in Young County.

Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for Young County Mining. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

- a. Conservation
 - Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 2
 - Date to be Implemented: before 2020
 - Annual Cost: not determined
- b. Groundwater Development – Undifferentiated “Other” Aquifers
 - Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 12
 - Date to be Implemented: before 2020
 - Project Cost: \$3,089,000
 - Unit Cost: Max of \$1,048/acft

Table 5.37-4. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County – Mining

Plan Element	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<i>Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (acft/yr)</i>	(187)	(276)	(196)	(151)	(105)	(73)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (acft/yr)	6	14	14	11	7	5
Annual Cost (\$/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
<i>Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (acft/yr)</i>	(181)	(262)	(182)	(140)	(98)	(68)
Groundwater Development – Undifferentiated “Other” Aquifers						
Supply From Plan Element (acft/yr)	270	270	260	260	260	260
Annual Cost (\$/yr)	\$282,900	\$282,900	\$22,900	\$22,900	\$22,900	\$22,900
Unit Cost (\$/acft)	\$1,048	\$1,048	\$85	\$85	\$85	\$85

ND – Not determined. Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location

5.37.8 Irrigation

Description of Supply

An increase of Irrigation demand is projected for Young County, but no supplies are currently allocated and a shortage is projected beginning in 2020.

Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for Young County Irrigation. Associated costs are included for each strategy.



- a. Conservation
 - Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 2
 - Date to be Implemented: before 2020
 - Annual Cost: \$690
 - Unit Cost: \$273/acft
- b. Groundwater Development – Undifferentiated “Other” Aquifers
 - Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 12
 - Date to be Implemented: 2020
 - Project Cost: \$1,172,000
 - Unit Cost: \$2,148/acft

Table 5.37-5. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<i>Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (acft/yr)</i>	(51)	(50)	(48)	(47)	(45)	(44)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (acft/yr)	2	3	3	3	3	3
Annual Cost (\$/yr)	\$460	\$690	\$690	\$690	\$690	\$690
<i>Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (acft/yr)</i>	(49)	(48)	(45)	(44)	(42)	(41)
Groundwater Development – Undifferentiated “Other” Aquifers						
Supply From Plan Element (acft/yr)	50	50	50	50	50	50
Annual Cost (\$/yr)	\$107,418	\$107,418	\$8,418	\$8,418	\$8,418	\$8,418
Unit Cost (\$/acft)	\$2,148	\$2,148	\$168	\$168	\$168	\$168

5.37.9 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2070 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

This page intentionally left blank.