



Table of Contents

1	Water Management Strategies.....	1-1
1.1	Evaluation of Strategies	1-2
1.2	Plan Development Criteria	1-2
1.3	Engineering	1-3
1.4	Cost Estimates	1-3
1.5	Methods Used to Investigate Environmental Effects of Proposed Regional Water Management Strategies	1-5
1.6	Agricultural Water Management Strategies	1-6
1.7	Water Conservation and Drought Preparation	1-6
1.8	Funding and Permitting by State Agencies of Projects Not in the Regional Water Plan	1-7
2	Water Conservation.....	2-1
2.1	Municipal Water Conservation	2-1
2.1.1	Description of Strategy	2-2
2.1.2	Brazos G Municipal Water Conservation Approach.....	2-4
2.1.3	Available Supply.....	2-5
2.1.4	Additional Advanced Conservation	2-11
2.1.5	Environmental Issues	2-12
2.1.6	Engineering and Costing.....	2-12
2.1.7	Implementation Issues	2-17
2.1.8	Water Loss Reduction	2-18
2.2	Irrigation Water Conservation	2-23
2.2.1	Description of Strategy.....	2-23
2.2.2	Brazos G Irrigation Water Conservation Approach.....	2-23
2.2.3	Available Yield.....	2-30
2.2.4	Environmental Issues	2-35
2.2.5	Engineering and Costing.....	2-35
2.2.6	Implementation Issues	2-37
2.3	Industrial Water Conservation	2-38
2.3.1	Description of Strategy.....	2-38
2.3.2	Brazos G Industrial Water Conservation Approach	2-40
2.3.3	Available Yield.....	2-41
2.3.4	Environmental Issues	2-52
2.3.5	Engineering and Costing.....	2-53
2.3.6	Implementation Issues	2-53
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
3.2	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	3-2-6
3.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	3-2-6
3.2.5	Implementation Issues	3-2-9
3.3	City of College Station Non-Potable Reuse	3-3-1
3.3.1	Description of Option.....	3-3-1
3.3.2	Available Supply.....	3-3-1
3.3.3	Environmental Issues	3-3-3

3.3.4	Engineering and Costing	3.3-4
3.3.5	Implementation Issues	3.3-4
3.4	College Station Direct Potable Reuse	3.4-1
3.4.1	Description	3.4-1
3.4.2	Available Yield	3.4-1
3.4.3	Environmental Issues	3.4-2
3.4.4	Engineering and Costing	3.4-3
3.4.5	Implementation	3.4-3
3.5	City of Bryan Lake Bryan 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	3.5-3
3.5.4	Engineering and Costing	3.5-3
3.5.5	Implementation Issues	3.5-6
3.6	City of Bryan – Miramont 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	3.6-1
3.6.5	Implementation Issues	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	Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects	3.8-1
3.8.1	Waco East –Cities of Hallsburg, Mart, and Riesel Reuse	3.8-3
3.8.2	WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse	3.8-8
3.8.3	WMARSS Bullhide Creek Reuse	3.8-13
3.8.4	WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse	3.8-18
3.8.5	Waco North – Chalk Bluff WSC and Gholson Reuse	3.8-23
3.9	Bell County WCID No.1 – Reuse	3.9-1
3.9.1	Description of Option	3.9-1
3.9.2	Available Supply	3.9-2
3.9.3	Environmental Issues	3.9-5
3.9.4	Engineering and Costing	3.9-5
3.9.5	Implementation Issues	3.9-8
4	New Reservoirs	4.1-1
4.1	Brushy Creek Reservoir	4.1-1
4.1.1	Description of Option	4.1-1
4.1.2	Available Yield	4.1-3
4.1.3	Environmental Issues	4.1-6
4.1.4	Engineering and Costing	4.1-12
4.1.5	Implementation Issues	4.1-14
4.2	Cedar Ridge Reservoir	4.2-1
4.2.1	Description of Option	4.2-1
4.2.2	Available Yield	4.2-1
4.2.3	Environmental Issues	4.2-6
4.2.4	Engineering and Costing	4.2-15
4.2.5	Implementation Issues	4.2-17
4.3	Coryell County Off-Channel 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	4.3-7
4.3.4	Engineering and Costing	4.3-14
4.3.5	Implementation Issues	4.3-16
4.4	City of Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir	4.4-1
4.4.1	Description of Option	4.4-1
4.4.2	Available Yield	4.4-4
4.4.3	Environmental Issues	4.4-8
4.4.4	Engineering and Costing	4.4-15
4.4.5	Implementation Issues	4.4-17
4.5	Hamilton County Off-Channel Reservoir	4.5-1
4.5.1	Description of Option	4.5-1
4.5.2	Available Yield	4.5-1
4.5.3	Environmental Issues	4.5-6
4.5.4	Engineering and Costing	4.5-13
4.5.5	Implementation Issues	4.5-15
4.6	Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir	4.6-1
4.6.1	Description of Option	4.6-1
4.6.2	Available Yield	4.6-2
4.6.3	Environmental Issues	4.6-6
4.6.4	Engineering and Costing	4.6-15
4.6.5	Implementation Issues	4.6-15
4.7	Little River Off-Channel 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	4.7-9
4.7.4	Engineering and Costing	4.7-18
4.7.5	Implementation Issues	4.7-22
4.8	Main Stem Off-Channel Reservoir	4.8-1
4.8.1	Description of Option	4.8-1
4.8.2	Environmental Issues	4.8-4
4.8.3	Engineering and Costing	4.8-4
4.8.4	Implementation Issues	4.8-6
4.9	Meridian Off-Channel 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	4.9-2
4.9.4	Engineering and Costing	4.9-9
4.9.5	Implementation Issues	4.9-9
4.10	Lake Creek 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	4.10-8
4.10.4	Engineering and Costing	4.10-13
4.10.5	Implementation Issues	4.10-15
4.11	South Bend Reservoir	4.11-1
4.11.1	Description of Option	4.11-1
4.11.2	Available Yield	4.11-1
4.11.3	Environmental Issues	4.11-5
4.11.4	Engineering and Costing	4.11-12
4.11.5	Implementation Issues	4.11-14
4.12	Throckmorton Reservoir	4.12-1
4.12.1	Description of Option	4.12-1

4.12.2	Available Yield	4.12-1
4.12.3	Environmental Issues	4.12-5
4.12.4	Engineering and Costing	4.12-11
4.12.5	Implementation Issues	4.12-13
4.13	Turkey Peak Dam – Lake Palo Pinto Enlargement.....	4.13-1
4.13.1	Description of Option.....	4.13-1
4.13.2	Available Yield.....	4.13-3
4.13.3	Environmental Issues	4.13-5
4.13.4	Engineering and Costing.....	4.13-14
4.13.5	Implementation Issues	4.13-15
4.14	Peach Creek Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.14-1
4.14.1	Description of Option.....	4.14-1
4.14.2	Available Yield.....	4.14-1
4.14.3	Environmental Issues	4.14-6
4.14.4	Engineering and Costing.....	4.14-15
4.14.5	Implementation Issues	4.14-17
5	Acquisition of Existing Supplies.....	5.1-1
5.1	Lake Aquilla Augmentation.....	5.1-1
5.1.1	Description of Option.....	5.1-1
5.1.2	Available Yield.....	5.1-3
5.1.3	Environmental Issues	5.1-3
5.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	5.1-9
5.1.5	Implementation Issues	5.1-12
5.2	Potential Purchase and Use of Water from Possum Kingdom Reservoir.....	5.2-1
5.2.1	Description of Option.....	5.2-1
5.2.2	Available Yield – Possum Kingdom Reservoir.....	5.2-1
5.2.3	Water Quality.....	5.2-2
5.2.4	Water Treatment Facilities	5.2-2
5.2.5	Treated Water Transmission.....	5.2-7
5.2.6	Environmental Issues	5.2-10
5.2.7	Engineering and Costing.....	5.2-17
5.2.8	Implementation Issues	5.2-19
6	Conjunctive Use	6.1-1
6.1	Lake Granger Augmentation	6.1-1
6.1.1	Description of Option.....	6.1-1
6.1.2	Available Yield.....	6.1-2
6.1.3	Environmental Issues	6.1-6
6.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	6.1-6
6.1.5	Implementation Issues	6.1-10
6.2	Oak Creek Reservoir.....	6.2-1
6.2.2	Description of Option.....	6.2-1
6.2.3	Available Yield.....	6.2-2
6.2.4	Environmental Issues	6.2-7
7	Management of Existing Supplies.....	7.1-1
7.1	Lake Belton to Lake Stillhouse Hollow Pipeline	7.1-1
7.1.1	Description of Option.....	7.1-1
7.1.2	Available Yield.....	7.1-2
7.1.3	Environmental Issues	7.1-3
7.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	7.1-7
7.1.5	Implementation Issues	7.1-7
7.2	Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority System	7.2-1



7.2.1	Description of Option.....	7.2-1
7.2.2	Available Yield.....	7.2-1
7.2.3	Environmental	7.2-3
7.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	7.2-11
7.2.5	Implementation Issues	7.2-12
7.3	Control of Naturally Occurring Salinity	7.3-1
7.3.1	Characterization of Salinity in the Brazos River.....	7.3-1
7.3.2	Description of Salinity Control Project.....	7.3-14
7.3.3	Evaluation of the Potential Effectiveness of the Salinity Control Project	7.3-16
7.3.4	Environmental Issues	7.3-32
7.3.5	Engineering and Costing.....	7.3-38
7.3.6	Implementation Issues	7.3-50
7.4	Gibbons Creek Reservoir Expansion	7.4-1
7.4.1	Available Yield.....	7.4-1
7.4.2	Environmental Issues	7.4-7
7.4.3	Engineering and Costing.....	7.4-11
7.4.4	Implementation Issues	7.4-13
7.5	Millers Creek Reservoir Augmentation.....	7.5-1
7.5.1	Description of Strategy.....	7.5-1
7.5.2	Canal Option	7.5-3
7.5.3	Pipeline Option.....	7.5-11
7.5.4	New Dam and Reservoir	7.5-16
7.5.5	Combined Canal Diversion with New Dam and Reservoir.....	7.5-23
7.5.6	Environmental Issues	7.5-29
7.6	Lake Aquilla Storage Reallocation	7.6-1
7.6.1	Description of Option.....	7.6-1
7.6.2	Available Yield.....	7.6-2
7.6.3	Environmental Issues	7.6-5
7.6.4	Engineering and Costing.....	7.6-6
7.6.5	Implementation Issues	7.6-7
7.7	Lake Granger Reallocation.....	7.7-1
7.7.1	Description of Option.....	7.7-1
7.7.2	Available Supply.....	7.7-3
7.7.3	Environmental Issues	7.7-4
7.7.4	Engineering and Costing.....	7.7-5
7.7.5	Implementation Issues	7.7-7
7.7.6	Potential Regulatory Requirements	7.7-7
7.8	Lake Stillhouse Hollow Reallocation	7.8-1
7.8.1	Description	7.8-1
7.8.2	Available Supply.....	7.8-3
7.8.3	Environmental Issues	7.8-4
7.8.4	Engineering and Costing.....	7.8-4
7.8.5	Implementation Issues	7.8-6
7.8.6	Potential Regulatory Requirements	7.8-6
7.9	Lake Whitney Reallocation.....	7.9-1
7.9.1	Description of Option.....	7.9-1
7.9.2	Available Supply.....	7.9-3
7.9.3	Environmental Issues	7.9-4
7.9.4	Engineering and Costing.....	7.9-5
7.9.5	Implementation Issues	7.9-7
7.9.6	Potential Regulatory Requirements	7.9-7
7.10	BRA Sediment Reduction Program.....	7.10-1
7.10.1	Description of Option.....	7.10-1

7.10.2	Available Yield	7.10-1
7.10.3	Environmental Factors	7.10-3
7.10.4	Engineering and Cost.....	7.10-3
7.10.5	Implementation Issues	7.10-4
7.11	Brazos River Authority System Operation of Reservoirs	7.11-1
7.11.1	Description of Option.....	7.11-1
7.11.2	Available Yield.....	7.11-1
7.11.3	Environmental Issues	7.11-5
7.11.4	Implementation Issues	7.11-7
8	Regional Water Supply Projects.....	8.1-1
8.1	Bosque County Regional Project	8.1-1
8.1.1	Description of Option.....	8.1-1
8.1.2	Available Yield.....	8.1-2
8.1.3	Environmental	8.1-3
8.1.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.1-11
8.1.5	Implementation Issues	8.1-14
8.2	East Williamson County Water Supply Project	8.2-1
8.2.1	Description of Option.....	8.2-1
8.2.2	Available Supply.....	8.2-2
8.2.3	Environmental Issues	8.2-3
8.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.2-3
8.2.5	Implementation Issues	8.2-4
8.3	Somervell County Water Supply Project.....	8.3-1
8.3.1	Description of Option.....	8.3-1
8.3.2	Available Supply.....	8.3-2
8.3.3	Environmental Issues	8.3-2
8.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.3-3
8.3.5	Implementation Issues	8.3-5
8.4	West Central Brazos Water Distribution System	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	8.4-4
8.4.4	Engineering and Costing.....	8.4-5
8.4.5	Implementation Issues	8.4-6
9	Groundwater.....	9.1-1
9.1	Regional Groundwater for Bryan.....	9.1-1
9.1.1	Description of Option.....	9.1-1
9.1.2	Available Yield.....	9.1-1
9.1.3	Environmental Issues	9.1-2
9.1.4	Engineering and Costing	9.1-9
9.1.5	Implementation Issues	9.1-13
9.2	Local Groundwater for College Station	9.2-1
9.2.1	Description of Option.....	9.2-1
9.2.2	Available Yield.....	9.2-2
9.2.3	Environmental Issues	9.2-2
9.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.2-10
9.2.5	Implementation Issues	9.2-12
9.3	Regional Groundwater for Williamson County	9.3-1
9.3.1	Description of Option.....	9.3-1
9.3.2	Available Yield.....	9.3-2
9.3.3	Environmental Issues	9.3-2
9.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	9.3-12



9.3.5	Implementation Issues	9.3-18
10	Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR)	10.1-1
10.1	City of Bryan ASR	10.1-1
10.1.1	Description	10.1-1
10.1.2	Modeling and Available Supply	10.1-3
10.1.3	Infrastructure Timing	10.1-5
10.1.4	ASR Aquifer.....	10.1-5
10.1.5	Environmental Issues	10.1-6
10.1.6	Engineering and Costing.....	10.1-10
10.1.7	Implementation.....	10.1-12
10.2	City of College Station ASR	10.2-1
10.2.1	Description	10.2-1
10.2.2	Available Yield.....	10.2-3
10.2.3	Environmental Issues	10.2-4
10.2.4	Engineering and Costing.....	10.2-9
10.2.5	Implementation.....	10.2-10
10.3	Johnson County SUD and Acton MUD ASR.....	10.3-1
10.3.1	Description of Option.....	10.3-1
10.3.2	Available Yield.....	10.3-5
10.3.3	Environmental Issues	10.3-5
10.3.4	Engineering and Costing.....	10.3-9
10.3.5	Implementation.....	10.3-12
10.4	Lake Granger ASR	10.4-1
10.4.1	Description of Option.....	10.4-1
10.4.2	Available Yield.....	10.4-3
10.4.3	Environmental Issues	10.4-6
10.4.4	Engineering and Costing.....	10.4-10
10.4.5	Implementation.....	10.4-12
10.5	Waco and McLennan County ASR	10.5-1
10.5.1	Description of Option.....	10.5-1
10.5.2	Available Yield.....	10.5-3
10.5.3	Environmental Issues	10.5-3
10.5.4	Engineering and Costing.....	10.5-7
10.5.5	Implementation.....	10.5-8
11	Brackish Groundwater.....	11-1
11.1	Hydrogeology	11-2
11.2	Seymour Aquifer.....	11-4
11.3	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer	11-4
11.4	Blaine Aquifer	11-5
11.5	Dockum Aquifer.....	11-5
11.6	Marble Falls, Ellenburger-San Saba, and Hickory Aquifers.....	11-5
11.7	Trinity Aquifer	11-6
11.8	Edwards (Balcones Fault Zone) Aquifer	11-7
11.9	Woodbine Aquifer.....	11-8
11.10	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer.....	11-9
11.11	Sparta and Queen City Aquifers	11-10
11.12	Gulf Coast Aquifer	11-11
11.13	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	11-12
11.14	Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer.....	11-12

11.15 Discussion	11-13
12 Miscellaneous Strategies	12-1
12.1 Strategy Overview	12-1
12.2 Implementation Issues	12-1
12.3 Miscellaneous Pipelines, Pump Stations, and Groundwater Options by County.....	12-2
12.3.1 Bell County	12-2
12.3.2 Bosque County.....	12-4
12.3.3 Brazos County.....	12-5
12.3.4 Burleson County.....	12-5
12.3.5 Callahan County.....	12-6
12.3.6 Comanche County.....	12-6
12.3.7 Coryell County.....	12-7
12.3.8 Eastland County.....	12-8
12.3.9 Erath County	12-9
12.3.10 Falls County	12-9
12.3.11 Fisher County.....	12-10
12.3.12 Grimes County	12-10
12.3.13 Hamilton County.....	12-11
12.3.14 Hill County	12-12
12.3.15 Hood County	12-13
12.3.16 Johnson County	12-14
12.3.17 Knox County.....	12-16
12.3.18 Lampasas County	12-17
12.3.19 Lee County	12-17
12.3.20 Limestone County	12-18
12.3.21 McLennan County	12-19
12.3.22 Nolan County.....	12-20
12.3.23 Robertson County	12-20
12.3.24 Shackelford County.....	12-21
12.3.25 Somervell County	12-21
12.3.26 Stephens County.....	12-22
12.3.27 Stonewall County	12-22
12.3.28 Throckmorton County.....	12-23
12.3.29 Washington County	12-23
12.3.30 Williamson County.....	12-24
12.3.31 Young County.....	12-25
12.4 Miscellaneous Purchases, Interconnects & Reallocations.....	12-26
12.4.1 Bell County	12-26
12.4.2 Brazos County.....	12-28
12.4.3 Burleson County.....	12-29
12.4.4 Coryell County.....	12-30
12.4.5 Falls County	12-30
12.4.6 Fisher County.....	12-31
12.4.7 Grimes County	12-31
12.4.8 Hood County	12-31
12.4.9 Lampasas County	12-32
12.4.10 McLennan County	12-32
12.4.11 Nolan County.....	12-34
12.4.12 Palo Pinto County.....	12-36
12.4.13 Robertson County	12-36
12.4.14 Taylor County.....	12-36
12.4.15 Williamson County.....	12-38
12.4.16 Young County.....	12-39
12.5 Miscellaneous WTP Upgrades and Facilities Expansions	12-40



13	Brush Control	13-1
13.1	Brush Control in the Fort Phantom Hill Watershed	13-4
13.1.1	Watershed Characteristics	13-4
13.1.2	Potential Brush Control Project	13-8
13.2	Environmental Issues	13-9
13.2.1	Existing Environment.....	13-9
13.2.2	Potential Impacts.....	13-10
13.3	Engineering and Costing	13-16
13.4	Implementation Issues	13-17

List of Figures

Figure 3.2-1. Year 2070 Confirmed Discharges from WWTP and County Needs.....	3.2-2
Figure 3.2-2 Year 2070 Municipal Water User Group Needs.....	3.2-3
Figure 3.2-3. General Wastewater Reuse Annual Cost of Water (\$ per acft available project yield).....	3.2-8
Figure 3.3-1. College Station Non-Potable Reuse.....	3.3-2
Figure 3.4-1. Location of College Station’s Direct Potable Reuse Project.....	3.4-2
Figure 3.5-1. Bryan Reuse Option 1 and Option 2.....	3.5-2
Figure 3.7-1. Cleburne Reuse.....	3.7-3
Figure 3.8-1. Locations of Waco Area Reuse Projects.....	3.8-2
Figure 3.8-2. Waco East Reuse Project.....	3.8-4
Figure 3.8-3. WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse.....	3.8-10
Figure 3.8-4. WMARSS Bullhide Creek Reuse.....	3.8-14
Figure 3.8-5. WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse.....	3.8-19
Figure 3.8-6. Waco North Reuse.....	3.8-25
Figure 3.9-1. Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse Project.....	3.9-2
Figure 3.9-2. Bell County WCID No. 1 South Reuse Project.....	3.9-3
Figure 4.1-1. Brushy Creek Reservoir Location.....	4.1-2
Figure 4.1-2. Simulated Storage in Brushy Creek Reservoir.....	4.1-5
Figure 4.1-3. Storage Frequency Curve for Brushy Creek Reservoir.....	4.1-5
Figure 4.1-4. Brushy Creek Reservoir Streamflow Frequency Comparison.....	4.1-8
Figure 4.2-1. Cedar Ridge Reservoir.....	4.2-2
Figure 4.2-2. Cedar Ridge Reservoir Safe Yield Storage Trace.....	4.2-4
Figure 4.2-3. Cedar Ridge Reservoir Safe Yield Storage Frequency.....	4.2-4
Figure 4.2-4. Cedar Ridge Reservoir Median Streamflow Comparison.....	4.2-5
Figure 4.2-5. Cedar Ridge Reservoir Streamflow Frequency Comparison.....	4.2-5
Figure 4.3-1. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.3-2
Figure 4.3-2. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.3-3
Figure 4.3-3. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Firm Yield Diversions from Cowhouse Creek.....	4.3-5
Figure 4.3-4. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Storage Trace.....	4.3-5
Figure 4.3-5. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Storage Frequency at Firm Yield.....	4.3-6
Figure 4.3-6. Cowhouse Creek Diversion Streamflow Comparisons.....	4.3-6
Figure 4.3-7. Cowhouse Creek Diversion Streamflow Comparisons.....	4.3-7
Figure 4.4-1. Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.4-2
Figure 4.4-2. Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.4-3
Figure 4.4-3. Groesbeck OCR Firm Yield Diversions from Navasota River.....	4.4-5
Figure 4.4-4. Groesbeck OCR Firm Yield Storage Trace.....	4.4-6
Figure 4.4-5. Storage Frequency at Firm Yield.....	4.4-6
Figure 4.4-6. Navasota River Diversion - Median Streamflow Comparison.....	4.4-7
Figure 4.4-7. Navasota River Diversion- Streamflow Frequency Comparison.....	4.4-7
Figure 4.5-1. Hamilton County Off-Channel Reservoir.....	4.5-2
Figure 4.5-2. Daily Streamflow at Leon River Diversion Site.....	4.5-3
Figure 4.5-3. Hamilton County Reservoir Storage Frequency.....	4.5-4
Figure 4.5-4. Hamilton County Reservoir Storage Frequency.....	4.5-4
Figure 4.5-5. Annual Diversions from Leon River.....	4.5-5
Figure 4.5-6. Leon River Simulated Monthly Median Streamflow with and without Diversion.....	4.5-5



Figure 4.5-7. Leon River Simulated Streamflow Frequency with and without Diversion 4.5-6

Figure 4.6-1. Lake Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir 4.6-3

Figure 4.6-2. Lake Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir 4.6-4

Figure 4.6-3. Lake Palo Pinto Storage when Operated With Lake Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir 4.6-5

Figure 4.6-4. Comparison of Lake Palo Pinto Storage Frequency when Operated With and Without Lake Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir 4.6-6

Figure 4.7-1. Little River Off-Channel Reservoir 4.7-2

Figure 4.7-2. Little River OCR with Little River Diversion - Firm Yield Storage Trace 4.7-3

Figure 4.7-3. Little River OCR with Little River Diversion – Firm Yield Storage Frequency 4.7-3

Figure 4.7-4. Little River OCR with Little River Diversion - Median Streamflow Comparison 4.7-4

Figure 4.7-5. Little River Diversion - Median Streamflow Comparison 4.7-4

Figure 4.7-6. Little River OCR with Little River Diversion - Streamflow Frequency Comparison 4.7-5

Figure 4.7-7. Little River Diversion - Streamflow Frequency Comparison 4.7-5

Figure 4.7-8. Little River OCR with Brazos River Diversion - Firm Yield Storage Trace 4.7-6

Figure 4.7-9. Little River OCR with Brazos River Diversion – Firm Yield Storage Frequency 4.7-6

Figure 4.7-10. Little River OCR with Brazos River Diversion - Median Streamflow Comparison 4.7-7

Figure 4.7-11. Brazos River Diversion - Median Streamflow Comparison 4.7-7

Figure 4.7-12. Little River OCR with Brazos River Diversion - Streamflow Frequency Comparison 4.7-8

Figure 4.7-13. Brazos River Diversion - Streamflow Frequency Comparison 4.7-8

Figure 4.7-14. Pipeline Routing from Little River OCR to East Williamson County 4.7-20

Figure 4.8-1. Locations of Identified Brazos Main Stem OCR Sites 4.8-2

Figure 4.8-2. Location of Milam and Little River OCR Sites and Diversion Pipeline Routes 4.8-3

Figure 4.9-1. Meridian Off-Channel Reservoir Location 4.9-3

Figure 4.10-1. Lake Creek Reservoir 4.10-2

Figure 4.10-2. Lake Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Components 4.10-3

Figure 4.10-3. Annual Lake Creek Impoundments and Brazos River Diversions 4.10-4

Figure 4.10-4. Lake Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace 4.10-5

Figure 4.10-5. Lake Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Frequency 4.10-5

Figure 4.10-6. Lake Creek Reservoir Median Streamflow Comparison 4.10-6

Figure 4.10-7. Lake Creek Reservoir Streamflow Frequency Comparison 4.10-6

Figure 4.10-8. Brazos River Diversion Median Streamflow Comparison 4.10-7

Figure 4.10-9. Brazos River Diversion Streamflow Frequency Comparison 4.10-7

Figure 4.11-1. South Bend Reservoir Location 4.11-2

Figure 4.11-2. South Bend Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace 4.11-3

Figure 4.11-3. Storage Frequency at Firm Yield 4.11-3

Figure 4.11-4. Monthly Median Streamflow at Proposed South Bend Reservoir Dam 4.11-4

Figure 4.11-5. Streamflow Frequency at Proposed South Bend Reservoir Dam 4.11-5

Figure 4.12-1. Throckmorton Reservoir 4.12-2

Figure 4.12-2. Throckmorton Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace 4.12-3

Figure 4.12-3. Storage Frequency at Safe Yield 4.12-3

Figure 4.12-4. North Elm Fork Diversion - Median Streamflow Comparison 4.12-4

Figure 4.12-5. North Elm Fork Diversion- Streamflow Frequency Comparison 4.12-4

Figure 4.13-1. Location of Turkey Peak Project 4.13-2

Figure 4.13-2. Turkey Peak/Palo Pinto Reservoir Storage Trace 4.13-4

Figure 4.13-3. Turkey Peak/Palo Pinto Reservoir Storage Frequency 4.13-5

Figure 4.14-1. Peach Creek Off-Channel Reservoir	4.14-2
Figure 4.14-2. Peach Creek Off-Channel Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace.....	4.14-3
Figure 4.14-3. Peach Creek Storage Frequency at Firm Yield.....	4.14-3
Figure 4.14-4. Peach Creek Median Streamflow Comparison	4.14-4
Figure 4.14-5. Navasota River Diversion Median Streamflow Comparison	4.14-4
Figure 4.14-6. Peach Creek Reservoir Streamflow Frequency Comparison.....	4.14-5
Figure 4.14-7. Navasota River Streamflow Frequency Comparison	4.14-5
Figure 5.1-1. Lake Aquilla Augmentation Options A, B and C.....	5.1-2
Figure 5.2-1. Exceedance Frequencies for Chloride Concentrations, Possum Kingdom Lake (TCEQ Site 11866: 1997 to 2007)	5.2-3
Figure 5.2-2. Preliminary WTP Flow Schematic	5.2-5
Figure 5.2-3. Proposed WTP Site and Existing Intake Area Map.....	5.2-6
Figure 5.2-4. System Layout for the Possum Kingdom to Abilene Water Supply Option.....	5.2-9
Figure 5.2-5. Hydraulic Profile of Transmission System Route	5.2-10
Figure 6.1-1. Phase I – Conjunctive Use with Trinity Aquifer	6.1-3
Figure 6.1-2. Phase II – Conjunctive Use with Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer.....	6.1-4
Figure 6.1-3. Lake Granger Storage – 2070 Conditions.....	6.1-5
Figure 6.1-4. Annual Carrizo-Wilcox Pumping – 2070 Conditions	6.1-5
Figure 6.2-1. Existing Champion Well field and Oak Creek Reservoir Locations.....	6.2-2
Figure 6.2-2. Strategy 1 Distribution of Water Sources for Sweetwater for 2070 Demands with 1940-2014 Hydrologic Conditions	6.2-3
Figure 6.2-3. Strategy 1 Storage Trace for Oak Creek with 2070 Demands and 1940-2014 Hydrologic Conditions	6.2-4
Figure 6.2-4. Strategy 2 Distribution of Water Sources for Sweetwater for 2070 Demands with 1940-2014 Hydrologic Conditions	6.2-5
Figure 6.2-5. Strategy 2 Storage Trace for Oak Creek with 2070 Demands and 1940-2014 Hydrologic Conditions	6.2-5
Figure 6.2-6. Strategy 3 Distribution of Water Sources for Sweetwater for 2070 Demands with 1940-2014 Hydrologic Conditions	6.2-6
Figure 6.2-7. Strategy 3 Storage Trace for Oak Creek with 2070 Demands and 1940-2014 Hydrologic Conditions	6.2-7
Figure 7.1-1. Connection between Lakes Belton and Stillhouse Hollow	7.1-2
Figure 7.1-2. Lake Stillhouse Hollow Storage under 2070 Conditions With and Without Proposed Belton to Stillhouse Pipeline	7.1-4
Figure 7.1-3. Lake Stillhouse Hollow Storage Exceedance Frequency under 2070 Conditions With and Without Proposed Belton to Stillhouse Pipeline.....	7.1-4
Figure 7.1-4. Lake Georgetown Storage under 2070 Conditions With and Without Proposed Belton to Stillhouse Pipeline	7.1-5
Figure 7.1-5. Lake Georgetown Storage Exceedance Frequency under 2070 Conditions With and Without Proposed Belton to Stillhouse Pipeline.....	7.1-5
Figure 7.1-6. Lake Belton Storage under 2070 Conditions with and without Proposed Belton to Stillhouse Pipeline.....	7.1-6
Figure 7.1-7. Lake Belton Storage Exceedance Frequency under 2070 Conditions With and Without Proposed Belton to Stillhouse Pipeline.....	7.1-6
Figure 7.2-1. Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority System	7.2-2
Figure 7.3-1. Salinity Control Study Area.....	7.3-2
Figure 7.3-2. Selected USGS Water Quality Monitoring Stations.....	7.3-5
Figure 7.3-3. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Seymour.....	7.3-10



Figure 7.3-4. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Possum Kingdom 7.3-10

Figure 7.3-5. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Whitney 7.3-11

Figure 7.3-6. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at College Station 7.3-11

Figure 7.3-7. TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Richmond 7.3-12

Figure 7.3-8. Project Layout Map 7.3-15

Figure 7.3-9. Well Fields and TDS Loads 7.3-22

Figure 7.3-10. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Seymour 7.3-28

Figure 7.3-11. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Possum Kingdom Lake 7.3-28

Figure 7.3-12. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Lake Granbury 7.3-29

Figure 7.3-13. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Lake Whitney 7.3-29

Figure 7.3-14. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Lake Bryan 7.3-30

Figure 7.3-15. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curve at Richmond 7.3-30

Figure 7.4-1. Gibbons Creek Reservoir 7.4-2

Figure 7.4-2. Gibbons Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace at Existing Capacity with No
Critical Operating Limit Imposed 7.4-4

Figure 7.4-3. Gibbons Creek Storage Frequency at Firm Yield at Existing Capacity with No
Critical Operating Limit Imposed 7.4-4

Figure 7.4-4. Gibbons Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace at Existing Capacity with Critical
Operating Limit Imposed 7.4-5

Figure 7.4-5. Gibbons Creek Storage Frequency at Firm Yield at Existing Capacity with Critical
Operating Limit Imposed 7.4-5

Figure 7.4-6. Gibbons Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace at Proposed Capacity with
Critical Operating Limit Imposed 7.4-6

Figure 7.4-7. Gibbons Creek Storage Frequency at Firm Yield at Proposed Capacity with Critical
Operating Limit Imposed 7.4-6

Figure 7.5-1. WAM Incremental Drainage Areas used to Calculate Naturalized Flows at Millers
Creek Reservoir and Lake Creek Diversion Site 7.5-2

Figure 7.5-2. Canal Option: Lake Creek Diversion to Millers Creek Reservoir 7.5-4

Figure 7.5-3. Lake Creek Diversion Dam and Canal to Brushy Creek 7.5-5

Figure 7.5-4. Millers Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Trace with Canal Diversion 7.5-7

Figure 7.5-5. Millers Creek Reservoir Firm Yield Storage Frequency with Canal Diversion 7.5-7

Figure 7.5-6. Comparison of Median Monthly Streamflow below Lake Creek Diversion Point With
and Without Canal Diversion 7.5-8

Figure 7.5-7. Comparison of Streamflow Frequency below Lake Creek Diversion Point With and
Without Canal Diversion 7.5-8

Figure 7.5-8. Comparison of Median Monthly Streamflow below Lake Creek Diversion Point With
and Without Pipeline Diversion 7.5-12

Figure 7.5-9. Comparison of Streamflow Frequency below Lake Creek Diversion Point With and
Without Pipeline Diversion 7.5-13

Figure 7.5-10. New Reservoir Storage Trace 7.5-19

Figure 7.5-11. New Reservoir Storage Frequency 7.5-19

Figure 7.5-12. Comparison of Millers Creek Streamflow Frequency With and Without New
Reservoir 7.5-20

Figure 7.5-13. New Reservoir Storage Trace at Firm Yield with Canal Diversion 7.5-24

Figure 7.5-14. New Reservoir Storage Frequency at Firm Yield with Canal Diversion 7.5-24

Figure 7.5-15. Comparison of Streamflow Frequency below Lake Creek Diversion Point with and
without New Reservoir and Canal Diversion 7.5-25

Figure 7.5-16. Comparison of Millers Creek Streamflow Frequency With and Without New
Reservoir and Canal Diversion 7.5-26

Figure 7.6-1. Aerial Map of Lake Aquilla with Elevation Contours 7.6-1

Figure 7.6-2. 2020 and 2070 Yield vs. Storage Elevation for Lake Aquilla 7.6-3

Figure 7.6-3. 2070 Lake Aquilla Storage Trace, Current Conservation Elevation (537.5 ft-msl) 7.6-4

Figure 7.6-4. 2070 Lake Aquilla Storage Trace, Alternative 2 (Conservation Elevation at 542 ft-msl)..... 7.6-5

Figure 7.7-1. Map of Lake Granger showing Contour at 510 ft 7.7-2

Figure 7.8-1. Map of Lake Stillhouse Hollow showing Contour at 629 ft 7.8-2

Figure 7.9-1. Map of Lake Whitney 7.9-2

Figure 7.11-1. Brazos G Area Needs by County for BRA System Operations Consideration 7.11-4

Figure 7.11-2. Monthly Distribution of Streamflow at Brazos River at Gulf of Mexico Control Point with and without BRA System Operations 7.11-6

Figure 7.11-3. Frequency Distribution of Streamflow at Brazos River at Gulf of Mexico Control Point with and without BRA System Operations 7.11-6

Figure 8.1-1. Interconnection of Bosque County Systems 8.1-2

Figure 8.2-1. East Williamson County Water Supply Project..... 8.2-2

Figure 8.3-1. Proposed Phases of the Somervell County Water Supply Project..... 8.3-1

Figure 8.4-1. Schematic of Midway Group Interconnections Using the WCBWDS Facilities (Not to Scale) 8.4-3

Figure 9.1-1. Locations of planned Bryan well fields and facilities 9.1-2

Figure 9.2-1. Location of College Station well field and facilities 9.2-1

Figure 9.3-1. Location of Regional Williamson County Well Fields and Facilities 9.3-1

Figure 10.1-1. Bryan’s Existing Well Field and Proposed ASR Well Field 10.1-2

Figure 10.1-2. Fit of Demand Model 10.1-4

Figure 10.1-3. Time series Plot of ASR Recoverable Volume..... 10.1-4

Figure 10.1-4. ASR Injection, Capacity and Use Curves over Time..... 10.1-5

Figure 10.2-1. Location of College Station’s ASR Project 10.2-2

Figure 10.2-2. Water Supplies and Demand for College Station..... 10.2-2

Figure 10.2-3. Geologic Profile in Target Area for ASR Well..... 10.2-4

Figure 10.3-1. Location of Johnson County and Acton MUD ASR Projects 10.3-2

Figure 10.3-2. Water Supplies and Demand for JCSUD 10.3-3

Figure 10.3-3. Water Treatment Capacity and Utilization of JCSUD’s share of BRPUA WTP 10.3-3

Figure 10.3-4. Water Supplies and Demand for AMUD..... 10.3-4

Figure 10.3-5. Water Treatment Capacity and Utilization of AMUD’s share of BRPUA 10.3-4

Figure 10.3-6. Hydrogeologic Profile in ASR Well Field 10.3-5

Figure 10.4-1. Project Location 10.4-2

Figure 10.4-2. Operational Schematic of Lake Granger and ASR Project 10.4-2

Figure 10.4-3. Utilization of Lake Granger and ASR Facility to Meet Firm Yield and Additional Demands (17,017 acft/yr firm plus 9,050 acft/yr additional) 10.4-4

Figure 10.4-4. Combined System Storage for Lake Granger and ASR..... 10.4-4

Figure 10.4-5. Lake Granger Storage Frequency 10.4-5

Figure 10.4-6. Lake Granger Storage Trace for a Conjunctive Use Project..... 10.4-5

Figure 10.5-1. Location of Waco and McLennan County ASR Project..... 10.5-2

Figure 10.5-2. Water Supplies and Demand for City of Waco..... 10.5-2

Figure 10.5-3. Water Treatment Capacity and Utilization of Waco’s WTP 10.5-3

Figure 11-1. Schematic showing Transition of Groundwater Salinity in Trinity and Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers 11-3

Figure 11-2. Location of Seymour and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifers 11-4



Figure 11-3. Location of Blain, Dockum, Marble Falls, Ellenburger-San Saba, and Hickory Aquifers 11-6

Figure 11-4. Location of Trinity Aquifer 11-7

Figure 11-5. Location of Edwards (Balcones Fault Zone) Aquifer 11-8

Figure 11-6. Location of Woodbine Aquifer 11-9

Figure 11-7. Location of Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer 11-10

Figure 11-8. Location of Sparta and Queen City Aquifers 11-11

Figure 11-9. Location of Gulf Coast Aquifer..... 11-11

Figure 11-10. Location of Yegua-Jackson Aquifer..... 11-12

Figure 11-11. Location of Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer 11-13

Figure 13-1. Watersheds of Completed Feasibility Studies 13-2

Figure 13-2. Sub basin Map of the Fort Phantom Hill Watershed 13-5

List of Tables

Table 1.1-1. Potential Water Supply Categories 1-1

Table 1.4-1. Summary of Major Components Included in Preliminary Cost Estimates of Potential Water Supply Strategies 1-4

Table 2.1-1. Standards for Plumbing Fixtures 2-3

Table 2.1-2. Caption Water Conservation Potentials of Low Flow Plumbing Fixtures 2-3

Table 2.1-3. Comparison of TWDB Baseline Per Capita Rates for the 2016 Brazos G Plan and Per Capita Rates With Advanced Conservation 2-6

Table 2.1-4. Estimated Water Savings for WUGs with Recommended Conservation 2-8

Table 2.1-5. Projected Reduction Rates and Decadal GPCDs for Additional Advanced Conservation for selected WUGs in Williamson County 2-11

Table 2.1-6. Estimated Water Savings for Reductions Identified for WUGs in Williamson County with Additional Advanced Conservation..... 2-11

Table 2.1-7. Environmental Issues: Municipal Water Conservation 2-12

Table 2.1-8. Estimated Cost of Conservation to Achieve Water Savings Identified in Table 2.1-4..... 2-13

Table 2.1-9. Estimated Costs to Achieve Additional Advanced Conservation Costs for Select WUGs in Williamson County 2-16

Table 2.1-10. Caption Comparison of Municipal Water Conservation Option to Plan Development Criteria..... 2-17

Table 2.1-11. Summary of Brazos G Water Loss Audit and Estimated Savings and Costs with Pipe replacement Program for WUGs with Real Loss Greater than 15% 2-20

Table 2.2-1. Projected Irrigation Water Demands, Supplies, and Needs (Shortages) in Counties Having Projected Irrigation Shortages 2-24

Table 2.2-2. Projected Water Demands and Needs (Shortages) for Irrigation Users after Recommended Irrigation Water Conservation..... 2-31

Table 2.2-3. Brazos G Irrigation Water Savings and Estimated Costs 2-36

Table 2.2-4. Comparison of Irrigation Conservation to Plan Development Criteria 2-37

Table 2.3-1. Projected Water Demands, Supplies, and Needs (Shortages) for Industrial Uses 2-39

Table 2.3-2. Projected Water Demands and Needs (Shortages) for Manufacturing Users Considering up to a 7 Percent Demand Reduction by 2040..... 2-41

Table 2.3-3. Projected Water Demands and Needs (Shortages) for Steam-Electric Users Considering up to a 7% Percent Demand Reduction by 2040 2-44

Table 2.3-4. Projected Water Demands and Needs (Shortages) for Mining Users Considering up to a 7% Percent Demand Reduction by 2040..... 2-46

Table 2.3-5. Comparison of Industrial Conservation to Plan Development Criteria 2-54

Table 3.1-1. TCEQ Quality Standards for Reuse Water	3.1-2
Table 3.1-2. Current and Pending Indirect Reuse Applications Filed at TCEQ in Region G as of August 5, 2014	3.1-4
Table 3.2-1. General Wastewater Reuse Potential	3.2-4
Table 3.2-2. Environmental Issues: General Wastewater Reuse	3.2-6
Table 3.2-3. Wastewater Reuse Scenarios	3.2-6
Table 3.2-4. Wastewater Reuse Scenarios 1, and 2 Required Distribution Facilities	3.2-7
Table 3.2-5. Wastewater Reuse Irrigation Application Rate	3.2-7
Table 3.2-6. General Wastewater Reuse Annual Cost of Water (\$ per 1,000 gal available project yield).....	3.2-8
Table 3.2-7. General Wastewater Reuse Total Project Capital Cost (\$ per gallon maximum capacity)	3.2-9
Table 3.2-8. General Wastewater Reuse Total Operations and Maintenance Cost (\$ per 1,000 gallons).....	3.2-9
Table 3.2-9. Cost Estimate Summaries: Reuse as a Water Management Strategy for Multiple Water User Groups	3.2-10
Table 3.2-10. Comparison of General Wastewater Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.2-12
Table 3.3-1. Water Reuse Demands for College Station Non-Potable Reuse Project.....	3.3-3
Table 3.3-2. Environmental Issues: College Station Non-Potable Reuse	3.3-3
Table 3.3-3. Required Facilities – College Station Reuse for Veterans Park Irrigation.....	3.3-4
Table 3.3-4. Cost Estimate Summary: College Station Non-Potable Reuse.....	3.3-5
Table 3.3-5. Comparison of College Station Non-Potable Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	3.3-6
Table 3.4-1. Environmental Issues: College Station Direct Potable Reuse.....	3.4-2
Table 3.4-2. Cost Estimate Summary: College Station DPR Project Option.....	3.4-4
Table 3.4-3. Comparison of College Station DPR Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.4-5
Table 3.5-1. Environmental Issues: Bryan Reuse	3.5-3
Table 3.5-2. Required Facilities – Bryan Reuse Option 1.....	3.5-4
Table 3.5-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Option 1 Reuse for Bryan Utilities Lake Supply	3.5-4
Table 3.5-4. Required Facilities – Bryan Indirect Potable Reuse Option 2	3.5-5
Table 3.5-5. Cost Estimate Summary: Option 2 Indirect Potable Reuse for Bryan	3.5-5
Table 3.5-6. Comparison of Bryan Reuse Options to Plan Development Criteria	3.5-6
Table 3.6-1. Environmental Issues: Bryan Miramont Reuse	3.6-2
Table 3.6-2. Required Facilities – Bryan Miramont Reuse	3.6-2
Table 3.6-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Bryan Miramont Reuse Project.....	3.6-3
Table 3.6-4. Comparison of Bryan Miramont Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.6-4
Table 3.7-1. Projected Reuse Demands for Cleburne Reuse Project.....	3.7-2
Table 3.7-2. Environmental Issues: Cleburne Reuse	3.7-4
Table 3.7-3. Cost Estimate Summary Cleburne Reuse	3.7-5
Table 3.7-4. Comparison of Cleburne Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.7-6
Table 3.8-1. Waco East Reuse Water Demand.....	3.8-5
Table 3.8-2. Environmental Issues: Waco East Reuse	3.8-6
Table 3.8-3. Required Facilities – Waco East.....	3.8-6
Table 3.8-4. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS East Reuse Project.....	3.8-7
Table 3.8-5. Comparison of Waco East Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	3.8-8
Table 3.8-6. Environmental Issues: WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse.....	3.8-10
Table 3.8-7. Required Facilities – WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse	3.8-11



Table 3.8-8. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy Lakeview Reuse	3.8-12
Table 3.8-9. Comparison of WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.8-13
Table 3.8-10. Environmental Issues: WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse	3.8-15
Table 3.8-11. Required Facilities – WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse	3.8-16
Table 3.8-12. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse	3.8-17
Table 3.8-13. Comparison of WMARSS Bull Hide Creek Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.8-18
Table 3.8-14. Environmental Issues: WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse	3.8-20
Table 3.8-15. Required Facilities – WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse	3.8-21
Table 3.8-16. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Flat Creek Reuse	3.8-22
Table 3.8-17. Comparison of Flat Creek Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.8-23
Table 3.8-18. Waco North Reuse Water Demand	3.8-25
Table 3.8-19. Environmental Issues: Waco North Reuse	3.8-26
Table 3.8-20. Cost Estimate Summary: WMARSS Waco North Reuse	3.8-27
Table 3.8-21. Required Facilities – Waco North	3.8-28
Table 3.8-22. Required Facilities – Chalk Bluff WSC	3.8-28
Table 3.8-23. Required Facilities – Gholson	3.8-28
Table 3.8-24. Comparison of Waco North Reuse Option to Plan Development Criteria	3.8-30
Table 3.9-1. Water Reuse Demands for Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse Project	3.9-1
Table 3.9-2. Water Reuse Demands for Bell County WCID South Reuse Project	3.9-3
Table 3.9-3. Other Potential Future Water Reuse Demands for Bell County WCID Reuse System	3.9-4
Table 3.9-4. Environmental Issues: Bell County WCID No. 1 North and South Reuse Projects	3.9-5
Table 3.9-5. Required Facilities – Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse Project	3.9-6
Table 3.9-6. Cost Estimate Summary: Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse Project	3.9-7
Table 3.9-7. Required Facilities – Bell County WCID No. 1 South Reuse Project	3.9-7
Table 3.9-8. Cost Estimate Summary: Bell County WCID No. 1 South Reuse Project	3.9-8
Table 3.9-9. Total Yield and Cost for North and South Reuse Projects	3.9-9
Table 3.9-10. Comparison of Bell County WCID No.1 North and South Reuse Projects to Plan Development Criteria	3.9-9
Table 4.1-1. Summary of Authorizations for Certificate of Adjudication 12-4355	4.1-3
Table 4.1-2. Elevation-Area-Capacity Relationship for Brushy Creek Reservoir	4.1-4
Table 4.1-3. Median Monthly Streamflow for Brushy Creek Reservoir	4.1-7
Table 4.1-4. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Falls County	4.1-9
Table 4.1-5. Cost Estimate Summary for Brushy Creek Off-Channel Reservoir	4.1-13
Table 4.1-6. Evaluations of Brushy Creek Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.1-15
Table 4.2-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Haskell, Jones, Shackelford and Throckmorton Counties	4.2-10
Table 4.2-2. Cost Estimate for Cedar Ridge Reservoir	4.2-16
Table 4.2-3. Comparison of Cedar Ridge Reservoir Plan Development Criteria	4.2-18
Table 4.3-1. Median Monthly Streamflow: Cowhouse Creek Diversion Site	4.3-10
Table 4.3-2. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Coryell County	4.3-11
Table 4.3-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir	4.3-15
Table 4.3-4. Evaluations of Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.3-16

Table 4.4-1. Median Monthly Streamflow: Navasota River Diversion Site	4.4-9
Table 4.4-2. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Limestone County	4.4-11
Table 4.4-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir	4.4-16
Table 4.4-4. Evaluations of Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.4-17
Table 4.5-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Hamilton County	4.5-9
Table 4.5-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Hamilton County Off-Channel Reservoir	4.5-14
Table 4.5-3. Evaluations of Hamilton County Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.5-15
Table 4.6-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Palo Pinto County	4.6-9
Table 4.6-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Lake Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir	4.6-17
Table 4.6-3. Evaluations of Lake Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.6-18
Table 4.7-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Milam and Williamson Counties	4.7-12
Table 4.7-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Little River Off-Channel Reservoir with Little River Diversion and Brazos River Diversion	4.7-19
Table 4.7-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Delivery of Little River OCR supplies to East Williamson County for Little River and Brazos River Diversion Options	4.7-21
Table 4.7-4. Comparison of Little River Off-Channel Reservoir Project to Plan Development Criteria	4.7-22
Table 4.8-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Milam County Off-Channel Reservoir with Diversions from Brazos River	4.8-5
Table 4.8-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Little River Off-Channel Reservoir with Diversions from Brazos River	4.8-6
Table 4.9-1. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Bosque County	4.9-4
Table 4.9-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Meridian Off-Channel Reservoir	4.9-11
Table 4.9-3. Evaluations of Meridian Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.9-12
Table 4.10-1. Important Species Habitat or Known to Occur in Baylor and Knox Counties	4.10-9
Table 4.10-2. Cost Estimate for Lake Creek Reservoir	4.10-14
Table 4.10-3. Comparison of Lake Creek Reservoir Project to Plan Development Criteria	4.10-15
Table 4.11-1. Median Monthly Streamflow at South Bend Reservoir Dam	4.11-8
Table 4.11-2. Table Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Young and Stephens County	4.11-9
Table 4.11-3. Cost Estimate Summary for South Bend Reservoir	4.11-13
Table 4.11-4. Evaluations of South Bend Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.11-15
Table 4.12-1. Median Monthly Streamflow: North Elm Creek Diversion Site	4.12-7
Table 4.12-2. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Palo Pinto County	4.12-8
Table 4.12-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Throckmorton Reservoir	4.12-12
Table 4.12-4. Evaluations of Throckmorton Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.12-14
Table 4.13-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Palo Pinto County	4.13-12
Table 4.13-2. Cost Estimate for Turkey Peak Project	4.13-15
Table 4.13-3. Comparison of Turkey Peak Project to Plan Development Criteria	4.13-17
Table 4.14-1. Median Monthly Streamflow: Peach Creek Off-Channel Reservoir	4.14-8



Table 4.14-2. Median Monthly Streamflow: Navasota River Diversion Site	4.14-9
Table 4.14-3. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Brazos County	4.14-10
Table 4.14-4. Cost Estimate Summary for Peach Creek Off-Channel Reservoir	4.14-16
Table 4.14-5. Evaluations of Peach Creek Off-Channel Reservoir Option to Enhance Water Supplies	4.14-18
Table 5.1-1. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Bosque, Hill and Johnson Counties	5.1-4
Table 5.1-2. Cost Estimate for Lake Aquilla Augmentation Options A & B	5.1-10
Table 5.1-3. Cost Estimate for Parallel Pipeline from Lake Aquilla to the City of Cleburne for Options A & B.....	5.1-11
Table 5.1-4. Cost Estimate for Phase I Lake Whitney Diversion to Cleburne Only.....	5.1-12
Table 5.1-5. Comparison of Transportation of Raw Water from Lake Whitney to Lake Aquilla to Plan Development Criteria	5.1-14
Table 5.2-1. Possum Kingdom Reservoir Water Quality (1996 – 2001).....	5.2-2
Table 5.2-2. Gross/Waste/Net Volumes	5.2-4
Table 5.2-3. Preliminary WTP Process Summary	5.2-5
Table 5.2-4. Transmission System Pump Station Requirements	5.2-10
Table 5.2-5. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Jones, Palo Pinto, Taylor, Shackelford, Stephens, and Young Counties	5.2-13
Table 5.2-6. Cost Estimate for Possum Kingdom to Abilene Water Supply Project.....	5.2-18
Table 5.2-7. Comparison of Potential Purchase and Use of Water from Possum Kingdom Reservoir to Plan Development Criteria.....	5.2-19
Table 6.1-1. Potential Supply from First Phase of Lake Granger Augmentation Project (Values in acft/yr)	6.1-2
Table 6.1-2. Environmental Issues: Groundwater/Surface Water Conjunctive Use (Lake Granger Augmentation).....	6.1-6
Table 6.1-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Phase I of Lake Granger Augmentation	6.1-8
Table 6.1-4. Cost Estimate Summary for Phase II of Lake Granger Augmentation	6.1-9
Table 6.1-5. Comparison of Lake Granger Augmentation to Plan Development Criteria.....	6.1-11
Table 7.1-1. Diversion and Storage Data for Lakes Belton, Stillhouse Hollow and Georgetown	7.1-2
Table 7.1-2. Estimated Costs for the Lake Belton to Lake Stillhouse Hollow Pipeline	7.1-8
Table 7.1-3. Comparison of Lake Belton to Lake Stillhouse Hollow Pipeline to Plan Development Criteria.....	7.1-9
<i>Table 7.2-1. Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority System Participation with Peaking Capacity</i>	<i>7.2-3</i>
Table 7.2-2. Allocation of New Highland Lakes Supply in Williamson County	7.2-3
Table 7.2-3. Endangered, Threatened and Candidate Species Listed for Travis County, Texas	7.2-5
Table 7.2-4. Summary of Costs for BCRUA Water Supply Project (Phases II- III).....	7.2-13
Table 7.2-5. Comparison of Lake Travis Supply to Williamson County Option to Plan Development Criteria	7.2-14
Table 7.3-1. Selected USGS Streamflow Gaging and Water Quality Sampling Stations.....	7.3-3
Table 7.3-2. Mean Discharges, Loads, and Concentrations for Period-of-Record.....	7.3-5
Table 7.3-3. Mean Discharges, Loads, and Concentrations for Comparable Time Periods	7.3-7
Table 7.3-4. Ranges in Monthly Mean Salinity Concentration for Water Years 1964 through 1986	7.3-8
Table 7.3-5. Range of Arithmetic Averages of Monthly Mean Salinity Concentrations for Each Month of the Year for Water Years 1964 through 1986.....	7.3-9
Table 7.3-6. Permissible TDS Limits for Classes of Irrigation Water.....	7.3-13
Table 7.3-7. Irrigation Water Quality Guidelines	7.3-13

Table 7.3-8. TDS Budget Summary	7.3-17
Table 7.3-9. TDS Data in WRAP-SALT Input File	7.3-19
Table 7.3-10. Flows and Loads in the Upper Brazos River Basin	7.3-21
Table 7.3-11. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curves Without Project	7.3-25
Table 7.3-12. Model-Predicted TDS Concentration-Duration Curves With Project	7.3-26
Table 7.3-13. Model-Predicted Exceedance Frequencies for Applicable Water Quality Limits Without and With Project.....	7.3-31
Table 7.3-14. Threatened, Endangered and Rare Species of Kent, King, and Stonewall Counties, Texas.....	7.3-34
Table 7.3-15. Cost Estimate Summary for Brine Collection and Transmission System.....	7.3-39
Table 7.3-16. Cost Estimate Summary for Brine Utilization and Management Complex	7.3-40
Table 7.3-17. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Seymour with and without Implementation of Salinity Control Project	7.3-43
Table 7.3-18. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Possum Kingdom Lake with and without Implementation of Salinity Control Project	7.3-44
Table 7.3-19. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Lake Granbury with and without Implementation of Salinity Control Project	7.3-45
Table 7.3-20. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Lake Whitney with and without Implementation of Salinity Control Project	7.3-46
Table 7.3-21. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Bryan with and without Implementation of Salinity Control Project.....	7.3-47
Table 7.3-22. Cost Estimate Summary for Desalination at Richmond with and without Implementation of Salinity Control Project	7.3-48
Table 7.3-23. Cost Estimate Summary for the Total Annual Cost of Desalination Treatment within the Brazos River Basin.....	7.3-49
Table 7.3-24. Evaluation of Salinity Control Project to Enhance Water Supplies.....	7.3-50
Table 7.4-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Grimes County	7.4-9
Table 7.4-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Gibbons Creek Reservoir Expansion	7.4-14
Table 7.4-3. Evaluations of Gibbons Creek Reservoir Expansion Option to Enhance Water Supplies	7.4-15
Table 7.5-1. Drainage Areas used to Translate Naturalized Flows to Millers Creek Reservoir and Lake Creek Diversion Site.....	7.5-2
Table 7.5-2. Cost Estimate for Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Canal Option).....	7.5-9
Table 7.5-3. Comparison of Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Canal Option) to Plan Development Criteria	7.5-10
Table 7.5-4. Cost Estimate for Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Pipeline Option)	7.5-14
Table 7.5-5. Comparison of Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Pipeline Option) to Plan Development Criteria	7.5-16
Table 7.5-6. Cost Estimate for Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (New Reservoir Option)	7.5-21
Table 7.5-7. Comparison of Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (New Dam and Reservoir Option) to Plan Development Criteria	7.5-22
Table 7.5-8. Cost Estimate for Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Combined Canal Diversion with New Dam and Reservoir Option)	7.5-27
Table 7.5-9. Comparison of Augmentation of Millers Creek Reservoir (Combined Canal Diversion with New Dam and Reservoir Option) to Plan Development Criteria	7.5-29
Table 7.5-10. Important Species Having Habitat or Known to Occur in Baylor, Haskell and Throckmorton Counties.....	7.5-33
Table 7.6-1. Lake Aquilla Characteristics	7.6-2



Table 7.6-2. Comparison of Firm Yield of Lake Aquilla with Flood Storage Reallocation using Brazos G WAM for 2020 and 2070 Conditions	7.6-3
Table 7.6-3. Comparison of Water Surface Areas with Reallocation	7.6-6
Table 7.6-4. Cost Estimate Summary for Lake Aquilla Pool Reallocation	7.6-7
Table 7.6-5. Comparison of Reallocation of Storage in Lake Aquilla Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	7.6-9
Table 7.7-1. Lake Granger Characteristics	7.7-3
Table 7.7-2. Storage Capacities and Yields for Existing and Reallocation Scenarios in Lake Granger	7.7-4
Table 7.7-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Reallocation of Storage in Lake Granger	7.7-6
Table 7.7-4. Comparison of Reallocation of Storage in Lake Granger Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	7.7-7
Table 7.8-1. Lake Stillhouse Hollow Characteristics.....	7.8-3
Table 7.8-2. Storage Capacities and Firm Yields for Existing Storage and Flood Pool Storage Reallocation in Lake Stillhouse Hollow	7.8-4
Table 7.8-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Reallocation of Storage in Lake Stillhouse Hollow	7.8-5
Table 7.8-4. Comparison of Reallocation of Storage in Lake Stillhouse Hollow Option to Plan Development Criteria	7.8-6
Table 7.9-1. Lake Whitney Characteristics	7.9-3
Table 7.9-2. Storage Capacities and Firm Yields for Existing, Hydropower Reallocation, and Hydropower plus Inactive Storage Reallocation	7.9-4
Table 7.9-3. Environmental Issues: Lake Whitney Reallocation.....	7.9-5
Table 7.9-4. Cost Estimate Summary for Reallocation of Hydropower Storage in Lake Whitney	7.9-6
Table 7.9-5. Comparison of Lake Whitney Reallocation Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	7.9-7
Table 7.10-1. Estimated Sedimentation Rates, Projected Capacities and Firm Yields	7.10-2
Table 7.10-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Lake Limestone Sediment Reduction Strategy	7.10-4
Table 7.10-3. Comparison of BRA Sediment Reduction Program to Plan Development Criteria	7.10-5
Table 7.11-1. Water Availability from BRA System Operations (acft/yr)	7.11-3
Table 7.11-2. Potential WUGs for Sys-Ops Availability	7.11-4
Table 7.11-3. Environmental Issues: BRA System Operations	7.11-7
Table 7.11-4. Comparison of BRA System Operations to Plan Development Criteria	7.11-8
Table 8.1-1. Summary of Clifton OCR Yield	8.1-3
Table 8.1-2. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Bosque County	8.1-5
Table 8.1-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Bosque County Regional Project.....	8.1-13
Table 8.1-4. Comparison of Bosque County Interconnections Option to Plan Development Criteria ..	8.1-14
Table 8.2-1. Environmental Issues: East Williamson County Water Supply Project	8.2-3
Table 8.2-2. Cost Estimate Summary for East Williamson County Water Project.....	8.2-4
Table 8.2-3. Comparison of East Williamson County Water Supply Project to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.2-5
Table 8.3-1. Environmental Issues: Somervell County Water Supply Project.....	8.3-2
Table 8.3-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Somervell County Water Supply Project Phases 7A & 9-17	8.3-4
Table 8.3-3. Comparison of Somervell County Water Supply Project to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.3-5
Table 8.4-1. Demands for WCBWDS Hydraulic Analyses.....	8.4-2
Table 8.4-2. Environmental Issues: Midway Group Option using the WCBWDS.....	8.4-5
Table 8.4-3. Estimated Cost for the Midway Group Interconnections	8.4-6

Table 8.4-4. Caption Comparison of Midway Group Interconnections to Plan Development Criteria.....	8.4-8
Table 9.1-1. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Brazos and Robertson Counties	9.1-4
Table 9.1-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Robertson Well Field for Bryan	9.1-11
Table 9.1-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Brazos Well Field for Bryan	9.1-12
Table 9.1-4. Comparison of Bryan Regional Groundwater Option to Plan Development Criteria	9.1-14
Table 9.2-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Brazos County	9.2-4
Table 9.2-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Yegua-Jackson Well Field for College Station	9.2-11
Table 9.2-3. Comparison of College Station Local Groundwater Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	9.2-13
Table 9.3-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Burleson, Lee, Milam and Williamson Counties	9.3-5
Table 9.3-2. Cost Estimate Summary for Burleson County Well Field Component of the System	9.3-14
Table 9.3-3. Cost Estimate Summary for Lee County Well Field Component of the System	9.3-15
Table 9.3-4. Cost Estimate Summary for Shared Distribution Pipeline	9.3-16
Table 9.3-5. Cost Estimate Summary for Individual WUGs.....	9.3-17
Table 9.3-6. Comparison of Williamson County Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	9.3-19
Table 10.1-1. Bryan’s Water Supply and Demand	10.1-2
Table 10.1-2. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Brazos County	10.1-7
Table 10.1-3. Timing of ASR Wellfield Infrastructure.....	10.1-10
Table 10.1-4. Cost Estimate Summary: City of Bryan ASR Project Option	10.1-11
Table 10.1-5. Comparison of Bryan ASR Conjunctive Use Option to Plan Development Criteria	10.1-12
Table 10.2-1. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Brazos County	10.2-5
Table 10.2-2. Cost Estimate Summary: College Station ASR Project Option	10.2-10
Table 10.2-3. Comparison of College Station ASR Option to Plan Development Criteria	10.2-11
Table 10.3-1. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Hood and Johnson Counties ...	10.3-7
Table 10.3-2. Cost Estimate Summary: Johnson County SUD ASR Project Option.....	10.3-11
Table 10.3-3. Cost Estimate Summary: Acton MUD ASR Project Option	10.3-12
Table 10.3-4. Comparison of Johnson County SUD and Acton MUD ASR Options to Plan Development Criteria	10.3-13
Table 10.4-1. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for Williamson County	10.4-7
Table 10.4-2. Cost Estimate Summary: Lake Granger ASR Option.....	10.4-12
Table 10.4-3. Comparison of Lake Granger ASR Option to Plan Development Criteria	10.4-13
Table 10.5-1. Endangered, Threatened, and Species of Concern for McLennan County	10.5-5
Table 10.5-2. Cost Estimate Summary: McLennan County ASR Project Option	10.5-8
Table 10.5-3. Comparison of Bryan ASR Option to Plan Development Criteria.....	10.5-9
Table 11-1. Saline Water Classifications	11-1
Table 11-2. List of Aquifers and Classification.....	11-2
Table 12.5-1. Miscellaneous Strategies: Water Treatment Plant Strategies for WUGs/WWPs	12-40
Table 13.1-1. Subbasins Targeted for Potential Brush Control Project.....	13-8
Table 13.2-1. Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and Species of Concern Listed for Jones, Taylor, Callahan, and Nolan Counties	13-12
Table 13.3-1. Cost Estimate Summary for Brush Control Project	13-17
Table 13.4-1. Evaluations of Brush Control Option to Enhance Water Supplies.....	13-19

