

Appendix I
Requested Population and Water Demand
Revisions

This page intentionally left blank.

**2021 Regional Water Plan Water Demand Projections:
Summary of the Brazos (Region G) Regional Water Planning Group's Official Revision
Requests & TWDB Recommendations
1/25/2018**

The Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (Region G) submitted their official revision requests to the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) on December 21, 2017. The TWDB reviewed the requests in accordance with criteria established in Section 2 of the *First Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development* (Exhibit C), which was updated by the TWDB in April 2017. This document summarizes the recommended population and water demand projections released as draft by the TWDB, the revisions requested by Region G, and the final demand projections recommended by the TWDB staff. All the water demand projections are displayed in acre-feet.

1. Population & Municipal Water Demand Projections

Population	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft	2,371,064	2,720,696	3,097,007	3,494,544	3,918,197	4,351,042
Requested Changes	2,371,064	2,720,696	3,097,007	3,494,544	3,918,197	4,351,042
Recommended	2,371,064	2,720,696	3,097,007	3,494,544	3,918,197	4,351,042

Region G requested revisions to the TWDB draft projections for 33 Water User Groups (WUGs), mostly based on collected local information on growth trends and anticipated build-out of service areas. Most of these adjustments were made within individual counties with adjustments to the County-Other population, and the total population projected at the regional level remained the same. Population increases were requested for Bell, Brazos, and Robertson counties, while a decrease was requested for Williamson County as Region G made minor adjustments to where they project future growth to occur. The planning group requested two notable changes to the WUG list for the region. The City of Georgetown acquired the water supply assets of Chisholm Trail SUD. Thus, Georgetown absorbed the population of Chisholm Trail SUD, and Chisholm Trail SUD was removed from the WUG list. A new WUG was also created in Bell and Williamson counties called Jarrell-Schwertner Consolidated Reporting Unit (CRU). It includes Jarrell Schwertner WSC, which was previously a stand-alone WUG, and the population of the City of Jarrell, which was previously included in Williamson County-Other because it did not meet the 100 acre-feet per year WUG criteria on its own. The TWDB staff recommends the population revisions requested by Region G.

Municipal Demand	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft	409,122	457,345	510,237	568,729	634,353	702,007
Requested Changes	404,497	452,887	507,262	567,635	634,017	702,669
Recommended	406,477	455,217	510,229	571,256	638,046	707,782

Region G requested changes to the gallons per capita per day (GPCD) values for nine WUGs. The municipal demand projections submitted by Region G vary from the recommended demand projections due to Region G using a different formula to calculate demands. The TWDB staff confirmed with Region G that the demands would be recalculated using the recommended formula. The GPCD revisions along with the revised population projections result in a 0.7% decrease in water demand projections in 2020

and a 0.8% increase by 2070, compared to the TWDB draft projections. The TWDB staff recommends these requested revisions to the GPCD values and municipal demand projections.

2. Non-Municipal Water Demand Projections

2.1 Irrigation Demand Projections:

Irrigation Demand	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft	359,497	359,497	353,696	352,526	355,955	355,955
Requested Changes	359,497	359,497	353,696	352,526	355,955	355,955
Recommended	359,497	359,497	353,696	352,526	355,955	355,955

Region G did not request any changes to the irrigation demand projections.

2.2 Manufacturing Demand Projections:

Manufacturing Demand	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft	12,695	16,175	16,175	16,175	16,175	16,175
Requested Changes	12,695	16,175	16,175	16,175	16,175	16,175
Recommended	12,695	16,175	16,175	16,175	16,175	16,175

Region G did not request any changes to the manufacturing demand projections.

2.3 Steam-Electric Demand Projections:

Steam-Electric Demand	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894
Requested Changes	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894
Recommended	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894	232,894

Region G did not request any changes to the steam-electric demand projections. A facility in Milam County is in the process of closing, per approval by the Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT), which would reduce the projected demands to zero for the county and reduce the demand for the region by 32,254 acre-feet. However, Region G chose not to remove the demands because of the uncertainty about the future of the facility and water rights, thus no changes were made to Region G's steam-electric demand projections.

2.4 Livestock Demand Projections:

Livestock Demand	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939
Requested Changes	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939
Recommended	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939	47,939

Region G did not request any changes to the livestock demand projections.

2.5 Mining Demand Projections:

Mining Demand	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Draft	61,586	70,381	68,875	70,949	75,038	81,409
Requested Changes	61,586	66,272	59,340	58,423	58,917	60,838
Recommended	61,586	66,272	59,340	58,423	58,917	60,838

Region G requested changes to the mining projections for Lee and Robertson counties. In Lee County, the General Manager of the Lost Pines Groundwater Conservation District stated that a mine is expected to limit its operations and therefore, the Lee County water demand projections should be decreased. In Robertson County, water use for mining has dropped significantly since 2010, and the General Manager of the Brazos Valley Groundwater Conservation District does not expect it to increase back to pre-2010 levels. Overall, Region G requested a 6% decrease in 2020 and a 25% decrease by 2070 in mining demand projections compared to the TWDB draft projections. The TWDB staff recommend the revisions to the mining demand projections.

Memorandum

Brazos G RWPG – Recommended Revisions to the 2021 Draft Population and Water Demand Projections

TO: *David D. Dunn, P.E.*

CC: *Peter Newell, P.E.*

FROM: *Susan K. Roth, P.E.*

DATE: *December 20, 2017*

Brazos River Authority mailed out the TWDB 2021 Draft Population and Water Demand Projections to 285 Municipal Water User Groups (WUGs), 32 wholesale water providers (WWPs), 37 County Judges, 7 Councils of Government and 13 Groundwater Conservation Districts on May 31, 2017. Municipal WUGs and wholesale water providers requesting population and/or water demand revisions are listed below; additional detailed information regarding their revision requests is also provided in this memorandum.

Municipal WUGs & Wholesale Water Providers	Service Area - Primary County
Bell County WCID No. 3	Bell
Wellborn Special Utility District	Brazos
City of Bryan	Brazos
City of College Station	Brazos
City of Cleburne	Johnson
Johnson County Special Utility District	Johnson
Cities of Franklin and Hearne	Robertson
Robertson County Water Supply Corporation	Robertson
Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District	Williamson
City of Georgetown	Williamson
City of Hutto	Williamson
Jarrell CRU	Williamson
City of Leander	Williamson
City of Round Rock	Williamson
Jonah Water Special Utility District	Williamson
Manville Water Supply Corporation	Williamson

1.0 Summary of Draft Projections and Requested Revisions – Bell County

TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
439 WSC	10,220	12,327	14,490	16,700	18,961	21,285
Armstrong WSC	2,616	2,810	2,994	3,168	3,338	3,507
Bartlett	827	972	1,123	1,272	1,417	1,561
Bell County WCID 2	2,239	2,535	2,835	3,130	3,419	3,704
Bell County WCID 3	4,639	5,454	6,295	7,130	7,951	8,758
Bell-Milam Falls WSC	2,255	2,430	2,596	2,754	2,909	3,061
Belton	21,753	25,571	29,514	33,433	37,278	41,063
Central Texas College District	70	71	71	71	71	71
Chisholm Trail SUD	2,967	3,488	4,027	4,562	5,086	5,602
Bell County-Other	5,458	4,618	7,635	12,863	17,816	22,565
Dog Ridge WSC	5,211	6,126	7,070	8,008	8,930	9,836
East Bell WSC	3,486	4,122	4,781	5,436	6,079	6,710
Elm Creek WSC	2,257	2,685	3,129	3,572	4,006	4,434
Harker Heights	31,372	36,879	42,566	48,218	53,763	59,222
Holland	1,100	1,132	1,154	1,172	1,189	1,206
Jarrell-Schwertner WSC	2,264	2,826	3,488	4,182	4,956	5,751
Kempner WSC	1,900	2,166	2,393	2,603	2,803	2,991
Killeen	144,243	169,560	195,711	221,697	247,195	272,291
Little Elm Valley WSC	1,505	1,769	2,042	2,313	2,580	2,842
Moffat WSC	4,019	4,242	4,440	4,621	4,799	4,974
Morgans Point Resort	5,077	6,110	7,187	8,261	9,315	10,353
Pendleton WSC	2,284	2,430	2,565	2,691	2,813	2,934
Rogers	1,343	1,450	1,551	1,648	1,743	1,837
Salado WSC	6,001	6,648	7,288	7,913	8,525	9,128
South Fort Hood	16,936	17,196	17,282	17,282	17,282	17,282
Temple	81,736	96,082	110,900	125,626	140,074	154,295
The Grove WSC	1,218	1,306	1,509	1,709	1,904	2,098
Troy	2,049	2,321	2,598	2,869	3,136	3,398
West Bell County WSC	4,911	5,321	5,348	5,348	5,348	5,348
Total Bell County	371,956	430,647	494,582	560,252	624,686	688,107

Requested Revisions	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Bell County WCID No. 3	7,403	10,072	13,930	16,468	18,362	20,216
Georgetown (Chisholm Trail SUD)	2,967	3,488	4,027	4,562	5,086	5,602
Chisholm Trail SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bell County-Other	2,694	2,971	3,248	3,525	7,405	11,107
From Williamson County-Other	0	2,971	3,248	0	0	0
New Total Bell County	371,956	433,618	497,830	560,252	624,686	688,107

1.1 Bell County WCID No. 3

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The CCN for Bell County WCID No. 3 only includes the City of Nolanville as a result of the City's recent annexation activities.
3. Based on the Census data for the City of Nolanville, the city's population is listed as 4,593 in 2014 and 4,953 in 2016 (estimate as of July 1, 2017).
4. The City of Nolanville's revision request from the City Manager (Kara Escajeda) is based on the City's Comprehensive Plan; population projections were developed by Texas A&M for 2020 and 2030, and the City has requested to use the median between the low and high growth scenarios.
5. The source of the city's growth is Bella Charca; a very large development that is periodically constructing new phases of residential homes.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments see p. 129-136):

1. Revision request received by email on July 6, 2017 from the General Manager (Ricky Garrett).

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Methodology: Projections from 2020-2030 are based on those developed by Texas A&M for the City of Nolanville using the median between the low and high growth scenarios. Projections from 2040-2070 based on decadal growth pattern from original TWDB projections (15.4%, 13.3%, 11.5%, 10.1%).
2. Revise population projections for Bell County WCID No. 3 as shown in the table below:

Bell County WCID No. 3	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	4,639	5,454	6,295	7,130	7,951	8,758
Difference (from Bell County-Other)	2,764	4,618	7,635	9,338	10,411	11,458
Revised Population Projections	7,403	10,072	13,930	16,468	18,362	20,216

1.2 City of Georgetown (from Chisholm Trail SUD)

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The City of Georgetown has acquired all of the water supply assets of Chisholm Trail SUD; Chisholm Trail SUD is no longer a water supply entity. This change has been approved by the Public Utility Commission, and the Chisholm Trail SUD CCN has been transferred to the City of Georgetown.
3. The City's population and water demand projections need to include those previously identified for Chisholm Trail SUD. Georgetown also added as a WUG in Bell County to accommodate the portion of Chisholm Trail SUD located in Bell County.
4. Utilize Georgetown base GPCD for consistency within the new, revised Georgetown WUG.
5. Numerous entities in Williamson County, including City of Georgetown, previously met three times to discuss their population projections and agreed on their overall revisions on August 16, 2017.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 62 and 63-108):

1. Revision request received by email on June 28, 2017 from the Utility Director (Glenn Dishong).

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise the WUG's population projections as shown in the table below:

City of Georgetown (Bell County)	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference (from Chisholm Trail SUD)	2,967	3,488	4,027	4,562	5,086	5,602
Revised Population Projections	2,967	3,488	4,027	4,562	5,086	5,602

1.3 Bell County-Other

Summary of Comments Received:

1. No requests received.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received:

1. None.

RWPG Recommendation & Methodology:

2. Move population from Bell County-Other to Bell County WCID No. 3.
3. Move population from Williamson County-Other during 2030 and 2040 to Bell County-Other in order to maintain a consistent growth pattern.

Bell County-Other	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	5,458	4,618	7,635	12,863	17,816	22,565
Difference (to Bell County WCID No. 3)	(2,764)	(4,618)	(7,635)	(9,338)	(10,411)	(11,458)
Difference (from Williamson County-Other)	0	2,971	3,248	0	0	0
Revised Population Projections	2,694	2,971	3,248	3,525	7,405	11,107

2.0 Summary of Draft Projections and Requested Revisions – Brazos County

TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
City of Bryan	88,475	93,588	119,466	139,045	159,663	181,882
City of College Station	100,537	130,606	139,724	161,911	185,756	212,162
Texas A&M University	11,851	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Wellborn SUD	10,866	12,597	14,389	16,582	18,931	21,521
Wickson Creek SUD	11,202	12,965	14,731	16,815	18,992	21,339
Brazos County-Other	4,723	2,909	2,687	3,541	4,793	6,625
Total Brazos County	227,654	264,665	302,997	349,894	400,135	455,529
Requested Revisions	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
City of Bryan	84,196	99,959	118,714	140,827	167,176	211,266
City of College Station	100,854	129,102	165,261	195,852	195,852	195,852
Wellborn SUD	16,864	25,740	29,094	32,870	37,074	41,402
Brazos County-Other	2,687	2,687	2,687	2,687	2,687	2,687
From Williamson County-Other	0	17,788	39,490	51,157	33,646	29,017
New Total Brazos County	227,654	267,352	305,684	352,581	402,822	458,216

2.1 Wellborn Special Utility District (WSUD)

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The draft population projections for Wellborn Special Utility District (WSUD) in Brazos and Robertson Counties is 14,166. WSUD's current meter count is 7,021 and 1,125 in Brazos and Robinson Counties, respectively.
3. Based on WSUD historical data, they have maintained a 5% annual growth rate for the last 10 years, and their current 2017 population is 20,362.

4. WSUD's total water produced and purchased during 2016 was 3,279 acre-feet (1,065,781,818 gallons). The 2021 Draft TWDB Projections of 2,795 acre-feet for 2020 are too low for WSUD's projected water demands.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 2-4; p. 158-159; p. 167-191):

1. Letter dated May 17, 2017 from the General Manager (Stephen Cast); additional information provided on September 29, 2017.
2. Revision request received by email on May 17, 2017 from Julia Skrivanek.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Methodology: Assume WSUD's current population (8,146 connections x 2.5 people per connection) represents their 2020 population; 2030 projections for service area located in Brazos County based on WSUD average annual growth rate of 5.0%. Projections for service area located in Brazos County from 2040-2070 are based on decadal growth pattern from original TWDB projections (12%, 12%, 12%, 11%). Projections for service area located in Robertson County are based on 5.0% decadal growth from 2030-2070.
2. Increase WSUD's population projections as shown in the table below:

Wellborn SUD	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections-Brazos	10,866	12,597	14,389	16,582	18,931	21,521
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections-Robertson	3,300	3,635	3,983	4,407	4,864	5,366
Total Draft TWDB Projections	14,166	16,232	18,372	20,989	23,795	26,887
Brazos Difference (from Brazos County-Other)	5,998	13,413	14,705	16,288	18,143	19,881
Robertson Difference (from Robertson County-Other)	1,444	1,346	1,247	1,085	902	689
Revised Population-Brazos	16,864	25,740	29,094	32,870	37,074	41,402
Revised Population-Robertson	4,744	4,981	5,230	5,492	5,766	6,055
Total Revised Pop. Projections	20,362	30,721	34,324	38,362	42,840	47,457

3. Recalculate WSUD's GPCD projections using a 2015 base rate of 143 GPCD from the TWDB Water Use Survey (see Attachments p. 167-191).

Wellborn SUD	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	176	173	171	171	170	170
WSUD's revised GPCD	133	130	128	128	127	127

2.2 City of Bryan

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The draft population projections for the City of Bryan are not accurate and do not reflect the discussion and agreement between the Cities of Bryan and College Station, HDR and BRA during the 2016 Region G planning process.
3. City of College Station was listed as a wholesale water customer of the City of Bryan in the 2016 Region G Water Plan to account for College Station’s population located within Bryan’s Water CCN.
4. City of Bryan has conducted an independent analysis of population growth within their water CCN by an outside consultant; these projections are quite different than those currently proposed by TWDB for the 2021 Region G planning process.
5. City of Bryan’s Water CCN has expanded and now includes additional service area (i.e. Brushy Creek WSC).

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 5-7 and p. 160-166):

1. Letter dated June 27, 2017 from the Director of Public Works (Jayson Barfknecht).
2. City of Bryan Long-Term Water Supply Evaluation (memorandum and spreadsheet); received from Allen Woelke w/ CDM Smith on September 29, 2017.
3. Revision request received by email on June 26, 2017 from Jayson Barfknecht.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise the City of Bryan’s population projections as shown in the table below:

City of Bryan	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	88,475	93,588	119,466	139,045	159,663	181,882
Difference (to/from Brazos C-O)	(4,279)	6,371	(752)	1,782	7,513	29,384
Revised Population Projections	84,196	99,959	118,714	140,827	167,176	211,266

2.3 City of College Station

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The City of College Station has submitted population projections based on their recent Water Master Plan and a 2.5% growth rate with a ‘most dense’ scenario for future land use and development; they are estimating their population to plateau at 195,852 by 2050.
3. The City of College Station’s Water CCN is fixed (other water providers located adjacently), and their service area will not grow.
4. The City has also provided projected GPCD targets lower than TWDB’s estimates.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 8 and p. 167-191):

1. Revision request received by email on May 25, 2017 from David Coleman.
2. Phone discussion with Jennifer Nations regarding GPCD on October 2, 2017.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise the City of College Station’s population projections as shown in the table below:

City of College Station	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	100,537	130,606	139,724	161,911	185,756	212,162
Difference (to/from Brazos C-O)	317	(1,504)	25,537	33,941	10,096	(16,310)
Revised Population Projections	100,854	129,102	165,261	195,852	195,852	195,852

2. Recalculate the City of College Station’s GPCD projections using a 2011 base rate of 155 GPCD from the TWDB Water Use Survey (see Attachments p. 167-191).

City of College Station	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	168	164	162	161	160	160
City’s revised GPCD	146	142	140	139	139	138

2.4 Brazos County-Other

Summary of Comments Received:

1. No requests received.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received:

1. None.

RWPG Recommendation & Methodology:

1. Move population from Brazos County Other to City of Bryan, City of College Station and Wellborn SUD.
2. Brazos County-Other for 2020-2070 held constant at 2,687 based on population for 2040 Brazos County-Other (lowest amount during planning period).
3. Move population from Williamson County-Other during 2030-2070.

Brazos County-Other	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	4,723	2,909	2,687	3,541	4,793	6,625
Difference (to WSUD)	(5,998)	(13,413)	(14,705)	(16,288)	(18,143)	(19,881)
Difference (to/from Bryan)	4,279	(6,371)	752	(1,782)	(7,513)	(29,384)
Difference (to/from College Station)	(317)	1,504	(25,537)	(33,941)	(10,096)	16,310
Difference (from Williamson County-Other)	0	17,788	39,490	51,157	33,646	29,017
Revised Population Projections	2,687	2,687	2,687	2,687	2,687	2,687

3.0 Summary of Draft Projections and Requested Revisions – Johnson County

TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Action MUD	255	411	514	569	627	693
Alvarado	4,174	4,715	5,273	5,884	6,544	7,250
Bethany WSC	3,879	4,392	4,921	5,501	6,127	6,797
Bethesda WSC	18,180	20,976	23,861	27,024	30,437	34,090
Burleson	34,351	41,851	48,862	53,368	59,303	66,588
Cleburne	38,220	42,564	47,045	51,960	57,261	62,934
Johnson County-Other	11,470	10,919	11,145	9,624	9,334	9,209
Crowley	61	96	132	170	212	257
Double Diamond Utilities	122	127	132	136	139	249
Fort Worth CRU	0	0	0	5,036	8,057	10,072
Godley	1,009	1,139	1,271	1,418	1,574	1,743
Grandview	1,755	1,981	2,214	2,470	2,745	3,039
Johnson County SUD	39,437	45,811	52,381	59,562	67,296	75,558
Keene	7,307	8,557	9,846	11,260	12,785	14,416
Mansfield	2,576	3,695	4,849	6,115	7,481	8,942
Mountain Peak SUD	3,579	4,362	5,170	6,056	7,012	8,035
Parker WSC	3,008	3,763	4,544	5,398	6,320	7,307
Rio Vista	1,117	1,366	1,623	1,906	2,210	2,535
Venus	3,335	3,848	4,377	4,957	5,583	6,253
Total Johnson County	173,835	200,573	228,160	258,414	291,047	325,967

Requested Revisions	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Cleburne	38,220	42,564	51,236	60,121	70,546	78,919
Johnson County SUD	42,033	45,973	51,300	56,628	61,955	67,282
Johnson County-Other	8,874	10,757	8,035	4,397	1,390	1,500

3.1 City of Cleburne

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The City of Cleburne's revision request is based on the City's Long Range Water Supply Plan.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 142-147):

1. Revision request received by email on July 13, 2017 from the City's Consultant (Lissa Gregg, Freese & Nichols)

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise the City's population projections as shown in the table below:

City of Cleburne	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	38,220	42,564	47,045	51,960	57,261	62,934
Difference (from Johnson C-O)	0	0	4,191	8,161	13,285	15,985
Revised Population Projections	38,220	42,564	51,236	60,121	70,546	78,919

2. Recalculate the City of Cleburne's GPCD projections using a 2011 base rate of 180 GPCD from the TWDB Water Use Survey (see Attachments p. 167-191).:

City of Cleburne	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	163	159	156	155	155	155
City's proposed GPCD	171	167	164	163	163	163

3.2 Johnson County Special Utility District (JCSUD)

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. Johnson County Special Utility District's revision request is based on their Water Conservation Plan.
3. Johnson County SUD has coordinated their revision request with both Regions G and C.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 137-141 and p. 148-149):

1. Revision request received by email on July 31, 2017 from the City's consultant.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise Johnson County SUD's population projections as shown in the table below:

JCSUD	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections-Hill	127	147	168	191	216	243
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections -Johnson	39,437	45,811	52,381	59,562	67,296	75,558
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections-Region C	2,485	2,887	3,301	3,753	4,240	4,761
Total Draft TWDB Projections (C&G)	42,049	48,845	55,850	63,506	71,752	80,562
Difference (to/from Brazos G, Hill C-O)	8	1	(3)	(9)	(17)	(27)
Difference (to/from Brazos G, John. C-O)	2,596	162	(1,081)	(2,934)	(5,341)	(8,276)
Difference (to/from Reg. C, Tarrant C-O)	164	10	(68)	(185)	(336)	(521)
Revised Population-Hill (Brazos G)	135	148	165	182	199	216
Revised Population-Johnson (Brazos G)	42,033	45,973	51,300	56,628	61,955	67,282
Total Revised Pop. Projections (Brazos G)	42,168	46,121	51,465	56,810	62,154	67,498
Total Revised Pop. Projections (Region C)	2,649	2,897	3,233	3,568	3,904	4,240
Total Revised Population Projections (C&G)	44,817	49,018	54,698	60,378	66,058	71,738

3.3 Johnson County-Other

Summary of Comments Received:

1. No requests received.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received:

1. None.

RWPG Recommendation & Methodology:

1. Move population from Johnson County-Other to City of Cleburne and Johnson County SUD.

Johnson County-Other (Brazos G)	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	11,470	10,919	11,145	9,624	9,334	9,209
Difference (to Cleburne)	0	0	(4,191)	(8,161)	(13,285)	(15,985)
Difference (to/from JCSUD)	(2,596)	(162)	1,081	2,934	5,341	8,276
Revised Population Projections	8,874	10,757	8,035	4,397	1,390	1,500

4.0 Summary of Draft Projections and Requested Revisions – Hill County

TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Birome WSC	741	789	822	855	881	901
Bold Springs WSC	155	167	178	188	199	209
Brandon-Irene WSC	1,750	1,863	1,940	2,018	2,080	2,126
Chatt WSC	726	772	805	837	862	882
Hill County-Other	1,982	2,167	2,138	2,093	1,919	1,854
Double Diamond Utilities	1,863	1,939	2,018	2,078	2,126	2,213
Files Valley WSC	2,538	2,702	2,812	2,928	3,014	3,065
Gholson WSC	677	752	818	885	952	1,017
Hilco United Services	4,039	4,352	4,579	4,819	5,048	5,201
Hill County WSC	3,446	3,669	3,820	3,976	4,093	4,189
Hillsboro	9,313	9,916	10,324	10,744	11,063	11,226
Hubbard	1,585	1,687	1,756	1,827	1,882	1,912
Itasca	1,727	1,839	1,914	1,991	2,051	2,099
Johnson County SUD	127	147	168	191	216	243
Parker WSC	285	303	316	329	338	345
Post Oak SUD	898	963	1,020	1,112	1,239	1,369
Whitney	2,570	2,624	2,732	2,843	2,928	2,997
Woodrow-Osceola WSC	3,406	3,626	3,775	3,929	4,046	4,141
Total Hill County	37,828	40,277	41,935	43,643	44,937	45,989
Requested Revisions	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Johnson County SUD	135	148	165	182	199	216
Hill County-Other	1,974	2,166	2,141	2,102	1,936	1,881

4.1 Hill County-Other

Summary of Comments Received:

1. No requests received.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received:

1. None.

RWPG Recommendation & Methodology:

1. Move population from Hill County-Other to Johnson County SUD.

Hill County-Other	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	1,982	2,167	2,138	2,093	1,919	1,854
Difference (to/from JCSUD)	(8)	(1)	3	9	17	27
Revised Population Projections	1,974	2,166	2,141	2,102	1,936	1,881

5.0 Summary of Draft Projections and Requested Revisions – Robertson County

TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Bethany Hearne WSC	323	354	384	414	443	471
Bremond	989	1,085	1,174	1,266	1,355	1,442
Calvert	1,193	1,193	1,193	1,193	1,193	1,193
Robertson County-Other	1,353	2,007	2,564	3,075	3,509	3,860
Franklin	1,851	2,031	2,199	2,373	2,539	2,699
Hearne	4,474	4,474	4,474	4,474	4,474	4,474
Robertson County WSC	2,957	3,245	3,510	3,789	4,054	4,311
Twin Creek WSC	1,496	1,643	1,776	1,918	2,052	2,183
Wellborn SUD	3,300	3,635	3,983	4,407	4,864	5,366
Wickson Creek SUD	422	483	544	616	691	772
Total Robertson County	18,358	20,150	21,801	23,525	25,174	26,771
Requested Revisions	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
City of Franklin	1,851	2,031	2,357	2,735	3,175	3,684
City of Hearne	4,474	5,454	6,648	6,648	6,648	6,648
Robertson County WSC	2,849	3,458	4,072	4,806	5,541	6,208
Wellborn SUD	4,744	4,981	5,230	5,492	5,766	6,055

Robertson County-Other	1,353	1,353	1,353	1,353	1,353	1,353
From Williamson County-Other	1,336	1,885	2,930	2,916	3,043	3,238
New Total Robertson County	19,694	22,035	24,731	26,441	28,217	30,009

5.1 Cities of Franklin and Hearne

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The County Judge is concerned that the draft population and water demand projections for the Cities of Calvert and Hearne should be much higher.
3. Bethany WSC and Humble Addition WSC customers are now entirely served by the City of Hearne and would like the projections adjusted accordingly.
4. The City of Franklin sells water to North Hamilton Hill WSC; Franklin has 875 meters in their ETJ and service area. County Judge stated that the 2010 Census was administered incorrectly for the City of Franklin.
5. Based on population data collected by Robertson County, an increase in growth rate (approximately 3-6%) is requested for Bremond, Franklin and Hearne.
6. Calvert has minimal amenities to significantly enhance sustainable growth at this time. United Gypsum is scheduled to construct a dry wall production facility in the near future; this plant will employ 70 people and will be completed within three years.
7. Union Pacific Railroad scheduled to implement \$600M project; they will initially employ 400 people plus an additional 1,500 over a 5-year period in the City of Hearne.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 14-24 and p. 31-32):

1. Revision request received by email on June 28, 2017 from Judge Ellison
2. Supporting data provided by Cathy Lazarus (Hearne EDC Board Member) on behalf of Judge Ellison; emails including attachments submitted on June 16, 21 and 28.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Methodology: City of Franklin - Average annual growth rate of 1.5% applied to TWDB Draft 2030 population and projected through 2070; City of Hearne - Average annual growth rate of 2.0% applied to TWDB Draft 2020 population and projected through 2040. The draft TWDB population projections for the Cities of Bremond and Calvert remain unchanged.
2. Increase each of the Cities' population projections as shown in the table below:

Franklin	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	1,851	2,031	2,199	2,373	2,539	2,699
Difference (from Robertson C-O)	0	0	158	362	636	985
Revised Population-Franklin	1,851	2,031	2,357	2,735	3,175	3,684

Hearne	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	4,474	4,474	4,474	4,474	4,474	4,474
Difference (from Robertson C-O)	0	980	2,174	2,174	2,174	2,174
Revised Population-Hearne	4,474	5,454	6,648	6,648	6,648	6,648

5.2 Robertson County Water Supply Corporation (RCWSC)

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. Robertson County Water Supply Corporation (RCWSC) states that the draft population projections are incorrect and on the low side. RCWSC will compile and submit their supporting documentation soon.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 36-37, p. 155-157, and 167-191):

1. Revision request received by email on June 20, 2017 from the General Manager (John Elliott).
2. Spreadsheet summary of population growth projections (prepared by consultant) submitted by General Manager on October 2, 2017.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise Robertson County WSC's population projections as shown in the table below:

Robertson County WSC	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2,957	3,245	3,510	3,789	4,054	4,311
Difference (to/from Robertson C-O)	(108)	213	562	1,017	1,487	1,897
Revised Population Projections	2,849	3,458	4,072	4,806	5,541	6,208

2. Recalculate RCWSC's GPCD projections using a 2015 base rate of 125 GPCD from the TWDB Water Use Survey.

Robertson County WSC	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	72	68	66	64	64	64
RCWSC's revised GPCD	116	112	120	108	108	108

5.3 Robertson County-Other

Summary of Comments Received:

1. No requests received.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received:

1. None.

RWPG Recommendation & Methodology:

1. Move population from Robertson County-Other to City of Franklin, City of Hearne and Robertson County WSC.
2. Robertson County-Other for 2020-2070 held constant at 1,353 based on population for 2020 Robertson County-Other (lowest amount during planning period).

Robertson County-Other	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	1,353	2,007	2,564	3,075	3,509	3,860
Difference (to Franklin)	0	0	(158)	(362)	(636)	(985)
Difference (to Hearne)	0	(980)	(2,174)	(2,174)	(2,174)	(2,174)
Difference (to/from RCWSC)	108	(213)	(562)	(1,017)	(1,487)	(1,897)
Difference (to Wellborn SUD)	(1,444)	(1,346)	(1,247)	(1,085)	(902)	(689)
Difference (from Williamson C-O)	1,336	1,885	2,930	2,916	3,043	3,238
Revised Population Projections	1,353	1,353	1,353	1,353	1,353	1,353

6.0 Summary of Draft Projections and Requested Revisions – Williamson County

TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Bartlett	1,047	1,119	1,207	1,303	1,411	1,523
Bell-Milam Falls WSC	289	363	455	554	666	783
Block House MUD	6,419	6,419	6,419	6,419	6,419	6,419
Brushy Creek MUD	25,350	27,595	27,595	27,595	27,595	27,595
Cedar Park	81,716	90,641	90,641	90,641	90,641	90,641
Chisholm Trail SUD	24,194	30,392	38,113	46,427	55,854	65,602
Williamson County-Other	28,684	37,315	52,198	44,899	69,190	91,040
Fern Bluff MUD	5,793	5,793	5,793	5,793	5,793	5,793
Florence	1,357	1,439	1,542	1,653	1,779	1,909
Georgetown	78,297	98,358	123,342	150,248	180,757	212,304
Granger	1,551	1,659	1,796	1,942	2,108	2,280

Hutto	31,492	43,919	59,394	76,060	94,959	114,500
Jarrell-Schwertner WSC	4,106	5,049	6,202	7,436	8,810	10,224
Jonah Water SUD	15,254	19,163	24,031	29,273	35,217	41,364
Leander	41,071	69,551	115,635	188,502	238,648	293,630
Liberty Hill	2,063	2,592	3,250	3,959	4,763	5,595
Manville WSC	10,728	13,476	16,900	20,586	24,767	29,089
Paloma Lake MUD 1	1,468	1,846	2,293	2,776	3,322	3,891
Paloma Lake MUD 2	1,647	2,067	2,570	3,110	3,723	4,360
Pflugerville	373	469	588	717	862	1,013
Round Rock	157,819	198,258	248,614	302,845	364,345	427,932
Sonterra MUD	2,450	3,829	4,811	5,979	7,237	8,664
Southwest Milam WSC	1,816	2,283	2,862	3,486	4,196	4,927
Taylor	17,233	18,728	20,589	22,594	24,868	27,220
Thorndale	3	3	4	5	7	8
Walsh Ranch MUD	1,073	1,348	1,676	2,028	2,428	2,844
Williamson County MUD #10	4,487	5,638	7,070	8,612	10,361	12,169
Williamson County MUD #11	2,809	3,530	4,426	5,392	6,486	7,619
Williamson County MUD #9	4,247	5,336	6,691	8,151	9,806	11,518
Williamson County WSID 3	2,323	2,917	3,626	4,389	5,255	6,154
Williamson Travis Co. MUD 1	4,596	4,596	4,596	4,596	4,596	4,596
Total Williamson County	561,755	705,691	884,929	1,077,970	1,296,869	1,523,206

Requested Revisions	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Brushy Creek MUD	20,248	20,248	20,248	20,248	20,248	20,248
Chisholm Trail SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Georgetown	118,763	157,075	196,912	244,043	296,697	358,109
Hutto	17,326	35,646	37,963	56,194	83,181	101,202
Jarrell-Schwertner WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jarrell CRU*	4,786	5,838	7,118	8,499	10,044	11,656
Jonah Water SUD	23,500	29,522	37,022	45,097	54,255	63,275
Leander	48,575	74,150	97,757	121,365	150,905	185,879
Manville WSC	12,107	14,528	17,434	20,920	25,105	30,126
Paloma Lake MUD 1	2,339	3,210	3,210	3,210	3,210	3,210
Paloma Lake MUD 2	2,058	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,469
Round Rock	123,598	154,326	193,827	239,565	239,565	239,565
Sonterra MUD	5,895	6,195	6,495	6,795	7,095	7,395
Walsh Ranch MUD	714	714	714	714	714	714
Williamson County MUD 10	3,402	3,402	3,402	3,402	3,402	3,402
Williamson County MUD 11	4,074	4,084	4,094	4,104	4,114	4,124

Number updated from 63,725 (just a typo.)

Number updated from 25,646 to 35,646 to correct difference from Hutto to Willco-Other

Williamson County MUD 9	2,724	2,724	2,724	2,724	2,724	2,724
Williamson County WSID 3	6,828	7,128	7,428	7,728	8,028	8,328
Williamson County-Other	39,226	25,684	60,702	93,158	200,315	295,818
Revised Williamson County Total	560,419	683,047	839,261	1,023,897	1,260,180	1,490,951

* New WUG created that is comprised of both the City of Jarrell and Jarrell-Schwertner WSC (Williamson County only)

6.1 Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District (BCMUD)

Summary of Comments Received:

Corrected for Hutto correction

Corrected for Jonah SUD correction

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The Census data includes all of Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District (BCMUD), but also includes multiple other MUDs, neighborhoods, and rural areas not served by BCMUD. These other areas are served by the cities of Cedar Park, Round Rock, and Leander.
3. BCMUD is requesting to have the population estimates corrected for the Brazos G study to reflect 20,248 in all future years since BCMUD has reached build out for residential connections.
4. The documentation included in the Brazos G letter indicates that the gallons per capita per day (GPCD) amount for BCMUD is predicted to be 221 in 2020, dropping to 215 by 2070. BCMUD states this data is inconsistent with information produced by the District. Calendar year 2011 was a significant drought year and not a preferred data point for the demand baseline; BCMUD has addressed the water loss issue and consumption has been fairly consistent in the years since 2011 and 2012 BCMUD is requesting a demand revision to use an average GPCD of 146 based on 2015 data.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 44-61):

1. Revision request received by email on May 22, 2017 from the General Manager (Mike Petter).

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise BCMUD's population projections as shown in the table below:

BCMUD	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	25,350	27,595	27,595	27,595	27,595	27,595
Difference (to Williamson C-O)	(5,102)	(7,347)	(7,347)	(7,347)	(7,347)	(7,347)
Revised Population Projections	20,248	20,248	20,248	20,248	20,248	20,248

- Recalculate BCMUD's GPCD projections using a 2015 base rate of 146 GPCD from the TWDB Water Use Survey:

BCMUD	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	221	218	217	216	215	215
BCMUD's revised GPCD	136	133	132	131	131	131

6.2 City of Georgetown

Summary of Comments Received:

- Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
- The City of Georgetown has acquired all of the water supply assets of Chisholm Trail SUD; Chisholm Trail SUD is no longer a water supply entity. This change has been approved by the Public Utility Commission, and the Chisholm Trail SUD CCN has been transferred to the City of Georgetown.
- The City's population and water demand projections need to include those previously identified for Chisholm Trail SUD. Note that Georgetown also added as a WUG in Bell County to accommodate portion of Chisholm Trail SUD located in Bell County.
- Numerous entities in Williamson County, including City of Georgetown, previously met three times to discuss their population projections and agreed on their overall revisions on August 16, 2017.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 63-108):

- Revision request received by email on June 28, 2017 from the Utility Director (Glenn Dishong).

RWPG Recommendation:

- Revise the WUG's population projections as shown in the table below:

City of Georgetown	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections-Georgetown	78,297	98,358	123,342	150,248	180,757	212,304
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections-Chisholm Trail SUD (Will. Co.)	24,194	30,392	38,113	46,427	55,854	65,602
Difference (from Williamson C-O)	16,272	28,325	35,457	47,368	60,086	80,203
Revised Population Projections-Georgetown	118,763	157,075	196,912	244,043	296,697	358,109

6.3 City of Hutto

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The City of Hutto’s revision request is based on the City’s Water Master Plan.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 128):

1. Revision request received by email on June 29, 2017 from the City of Hutto (Matt Rector).

Changed difference to Willco from (18,273) to (8,273), resulting in 10,000 additional in 2030.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise the City’s population projections as shown in the table below:

City of Hutto	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	31,492	43,919	59,394	76,060	94,959	114,500
Difference (to Williamson C-O)	(14,166)	(8,273)	(21,431)	(19,866)	(11,778)	(13,298)
Revised Population Projections	17,326	35,646	37,963	56,194	83,181	101,202

6.4 New WUG - Jarrell CRU

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Jarrell-Schwertner WSC serves a substantial portion of the City of Jarrell.
2. The City of Jarrell operates a retail water system that serves several commercial properties and approximately 200 homes in a development called ‘Home Place’. The City is expecting several additional developments that will further increase the number of water connections. The City of Jarrell water system serves approximately 680 people according to the Assistant City Manager.
3. Since the City of Jarrell’s 2016 water demands are 28 acre-feet per year, the City’s use is below the criteria to be classified as a WUG. As a result, a new WUG (Jarrell CRU) will be created that is comprised of both the City of Jarrell and Jarrell-Schwertner WSC. This only applies to the portion of Jarrell-Schwertner WSC that is located in Williamson County. The Bell County portion will remain separate as Jarrell-Schwertner WSC in Bell County.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 128):

1. Revision request received by email on July 25, 2017 from the Assistant City Manager (Bill Lawson).

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Methodology: 2020 Population provided by Assistant City Manager; 2030-2070 projections based on average annual growth rate of 1.5% applied to 2020 population.
2. Revise the City’s population projections as shown in the table below:

Jarrell CRU	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
City of Jarrell - from Williamson County-Other	680	789	916	1,063	1,234	1,432
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections - Jarrell-Schwertner WSC	4,106	5,049	6,202	7,436	8,810	10,224
Total Jarrell CRU	4,786	5,838	7,118	8,499	10,044	11,656

6.5 City of Leander

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. The City of Leander's revision request is based on the City's Comprehensive Plan.
3. The City of Leander has coordinated their revision request with both Regions G and K.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 113-121 and p. 167-191):

1. Revision requests received by email on June 30 and August 4, 2017 from the Public Works Director (Pat Womack).

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Revise the City's population projections as shown in the table below:

City of Leander	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections-Brazos G	41,071	69,551	115,635	188,502	238,648	293,630
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections-Region K	9,491	24,827	43,093	46,640	48,403	50,610
Total TWDB 2021 Draft Projections (G&K)	50,562	94,378	158,728	235,142	287,051	344,240
Difference (to/from Williamson C-O) (Brazos G)	7,504	4,599	(17,878)	(67,137)	(87,743)	(107,751)
Revised Population Projections-Brazos G	48,575	74,150	97,757	121,365	150,905	185,879
Difference (to/from Travis C-O) (Region K)	1,755	1,908	(20,570)	(16,677)	(17,714)	(18,577)
Revised Population Projections-Region K	11,246	26,735	28,349	29,963	30,689	32,033
Total Revised Projections (G&K)	59,821	100,885	126,106	151,328	181,594	217,912

- Recalculate the City of Leander’s GPCD projections using a 2015 GPCD of 128, as provided by the TWDB in the Historical Population and GPCD estimates spreadsheet (see Attachment p. 192 - 198):

City of Leander	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	107	105	104	104	104	104
City’s revised GPCD	120.60	118.54	117.99	117.78	117.71	117.67

6.6 City of Round Rock

Summary of Comments Received:

- Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
- The City of Round Rock’s revision request is based on the City’s Water Master Plan prepared by the Utilities Department, the City’s Planning Department (estimated population growth) and actual growth rates occurring within the City.
- The population projections listed for Round Rock do not include the MUDs located in the City’s ETJ since they are listed separately in the Region G Water Plan.
- The City of Round Rock population projections do not include the portion of the City’s ETJ currently served by Jonah Water SUD.
- Fern Bluff MUD is completely built out; their population projections remain unchanged.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 122 and p. 124-126):

- Revision requests received by email on July 24, August 17, September 25 and October 2, 2017 from the Utility and Environmental Services Director (Michael Thane).

RWPG Recommendation:

- Revise the City’s population projections as shown in the table below:

City of Round Rock	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	157,819	198,258	248,614	302,845	364,345	427,932
Difference (to Williamson C-O)	(34,221)	(43,932)	(54,787)	(63,280)	(124,780)	(188,367)
Revised Population Projections	123,598	154,326	193,827	239,565	239,565	239,565

- Revisions to the population projections for the MUDs (all WUGs) located within the City’s ETJ are shown in the table below:

Paloma Lake MUD No. 1	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	1,468	1,846	2,293	2,776	3,322	3,891
Difference (to/from Williamson County-Other)	871	1,364	917	434	(112)	(681)
Revised Population Projections*	2,339	3,210	3,210	3,210	3,210	3,210

*Developer estimates construction of total 1070 lots (3 persons/lot) completed about 2022 and built out afterwards. The average of the original 2020 and new 2030 values were used to calculate the new 2020.

Paloma Lake MUD No. 2	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	1,647	2,067	2,570	3,110	3,723	4,360
Difference (to/from Williamson County-Other)	411	402	(101)	(641)	(1,254)	(1,891)
Revised Population Projections**	2,058	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,469

**Developer estimates construction of total 823 lots (3 persons/lot) completed about 2022 and built out afterwards. The average of the original 2020 and new 2030 values were used to calculate the new 2020.

Sonterra MUD	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2,450	3,829	4,811	5,979	7,237	8,664
Difference (to/from Williamson County-Other)	3,445	2,366	1,684	816	(142)	(1,269)
Revised Population Projections	5,895	6,195	6,495	6,795	7,095	7,395

Walsh Ranch MUD	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	1,073	1,348	1,676	2,028	2,428	2,844
Difference (to/from Williamson County-Other)	(359)	(634)	(962)	(1,314)	(1,714)	(2,130)
Revised Population Projections	714	714	714	714	714	714

Williamson Co. MUD #9	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	4,247	5,336	6,691	8,151	9,806	11,518
Difference (to Williamson C-O)	(1,523)	(2,612)	(3,967)	(5,427)	(7,082)	(8,794)
Revised Population Projections	2,724	2,724	2,724	2,724	2,724	2,724

Williamson Co. MUD #10	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	4,487	5,638	7,070	8,612	10,361	12,169
Difference (to Williamson C-O)	(1,085)	(2,236)	(3,668)	(5,210)	(6,959)	(8,767)
Revised Population Projections	3,402	3,402	3,402	3,402	3,402	3,402

Williamson Co. MUD #11	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2,809	3,530	4,426	5,392	6,486	7,619
Difference (to/from Williamson County-Other)	1,265	554	(332)	(1,288)	(2,372)	(3,495)
Revised Population Projections	4,074	4,084	4,094	4,104	4,114	4,124

Williamson Co. WSID No. 3	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	2,323	2,917	3,626	4,389	5,255	6,154
Difference (from Williamson C-O)	4,505	4,211	3,802	3,339	2,773	2,174
Revised Population Projections	6,828	7,128	7,428	7,728	8,028	8,328

6.7 Jonah Water Special Utility District

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. Jonah Water Special Utility District's revision request is based on their water master plan.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments):

1. Revision request submitted by the General Manager during the Williamson County discussion at the City of Georgetown on August 9, 2017.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Methodology: Assume today's population at 23,500 (6,728 connections x 3.5 persons/connection). Projections from 2030-2070 based on decadal growth pattern from original TWDB projections (26%, 25%, 22%, 20%, 17%).
2. Revise Jonah Water SUD's population projections as shown in the table below:

Jonah Water SUD	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	15,254	19,163	24,031	29,273	35,217	41,364
Difference (from Williamson C-O)	8,246	10,359	12,991	15,824	19,038	21,911
Revised Population Projections	23,500	29,522	37,022	45,097	54,255	63,275

Corrected transcription error,
from 63,725 to 63,275.

6.8 Manville Water Supply Corporation

Summary of Comments Received:

1. Request for revision to population and water demand projections.
2. Manville Water Supply Corporation's revision request is based on their historical connection trend.
3. Manville WSC is coordinating their revision request with both Regions G and K.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received (reference attachments p. 154):

1. Revision request submitted via email by the General Manager's Assistant (Rexanne Pilkenton) on October 2, 2017.

RWPG Recommendation:

1. Methodology: Determine today's population based on 1.4% average annual growth rate applied to 2016 population. Projections from 2030-2070 based on decadal growth pattern from original TWDB projections (assume 20% for each decade).
2. Revise Manville WSC's population projections as shown in the table below:

Manville WSC	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	10,728	13,476	16,900	20,586	24,767	29,089
Difference (from Williamson C-O)	1,379	1,052	534	334	338	1,037
Revised Population Projections	12,107	14,528	17,434	20,920	25,105	30,126

6.9 Williamson County-Other

Summary of Comments Received:

1. No requests received.

Summary of Supporting Materials Received:

1. None.

RWPG Recommendation & Methodology:

1. Move population from Williamson County-Other to/from Brushy Creek MUD, City of Georgetown, City of Hutto, Jarrell CRU, City of Leander, City of Round Rock, Paloma Lake MUD No. 1, Paloma Lake MUD No. 2, Sonterra MUD, Walsh Ranch MUD, Williamson County MUD #9, Williamson County MUD #10, Williamson County MUD #11, Williamson County WSID No. 3, Jonah Water SUD, and Manville WSC.

Williamson County-Other	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TWDB 2021 Draft Projections	28,684	37,315	52,198	44,899	69,190	91,040
Difference (to Bell County-Other)	0	(2,971)	(3,248)	0	0	0
Difference (to Brazos County-Other)	0	(17,788)	(39,490)	(51,157)	(33,646)	(29,017)
Difference (to Robertson C-O)	(1,336)	(1,885)	(2,930)	(2,916)	(3,043)	(3,238)
Difference (from Brushy Creek MUD)	5,102	7,347	7,347	7,347	7,347	7,347
Difference (to City of Georgetown)	(16,272)	(28,325)	(35,457)	(47,368)	(60,086)	(80,203)
Difference (from City of Hutto)	14,166	8,273	21,431	19,866	11,778	13,298
Difference (to Jarrell CRU)	(680)	(789)	(916)	(1,063)	(1,234)	(1,432)
Difference (to/from City of Leander)	(7,504)	(4,599)	17,878	67,137	87,743	107,751
Difference (from City of Round Rock)	34,221	43,932	54,787	63,280	124,780	188,367
Difference (to/from Paloma Lake MUD No. 1)	(871)	(1,364)	(917)	(434)	112	681
Difference (to/from Paloma Lake MUD No. 2)	(411)	(402)	101	641	1,254	1,891
Difference (to/from Sonterra MUD)	(3,445)	(2,366)	(1,684)	(816)	142	1,269
Difference (from Walsh Ranch MUD)	359	634	962	1,314	1,714	2,130
Difference (from Williamson Co. MUD #9)	1,523	2,612	3,967	5,427	7,082	8,794
Difference (from Williamson Co. MUD #10)	1,085	2,236	3,668	5,210	6,959	8,767
Difference (to/from Williamson Co. MUD #11)	(1,265)	(554)	332	1,288	2,372	3,495
Difference (to Williamson Co. WSID No. 3)	(4,505)	(4,211)	(3,802)	(3,339)	(2,773)	(2,174)
Difference (to Jonah Water SUD)	(8,246)	(10,359)	(12,991)	(15,824)	(19,038)	(21,911)
Difference (to Manville WSC)	(1,379)	(1,052)	(534)	(334)	(338)	(1,037)
Revised Population Projections	39,226	25,684	60,702	93,158	200,315	295,818

From: Temple McKinnon <Temple.McKinnon@twdb.texas.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2018 3:24 PM
To: wlwilsoncattlecompany@gmail.com
Cc: 'stephen.hamlin@Brazos.org'; 'amy.muttoni@Brazos.org'; Trey Buzbee (Trey.Buzbee@brazos.org); Dunn, David; Thomas Barnett; Ron Ellis; Sarah Backhouse; Yun Cho; Matt Nelson; Jessica Zuba
Subject: TWDB Response to Revision Request from Region G
Attachments: TWDB_Review_Region G.zipx

Dear Chairman Wilson,

The TWDB Staff and representatives of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, and Texas Department of Agriculture have reviewed the request to revise the 2021 Regional Water Plan draft population and water demand projections submitted by Region G.

It is the consensus of the four agencies that the requested revisions to the draft projections are reasonable and consistent with criteria and data requirements as identified in the General Guidelines for the Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development (Exhibit C) and will be recommended to our Board to consider for adoption.

The Board is responsible for adopting population and water demand projections as specified in 31 TAC §357.31(e)(1). We plan to present the projections to our Board for consideration of adoption at an April Board meeting.

Attached are copies of the recommended population and water demand projections for all water user groups in your region. Basin split level projections for both municipal and non-municipal projections are also included in the attached file #4. **While the review period for whole WUG projections has ended, please take this opportunity to review both sets of basin level projections and send any suggested changes to us in the attached Excel file by February 22nd** or anytime earlier. If we do not hear from you by then, it is assumed that the planning group has no suggested changes to the basin level projections provided by the TWDB.

Attached are:

1. **Region G_Summary_Revision (pdf):** The summary of the region's overall request and the TWDB staff review and recommendations
2. **Region G_Population and Municipal Revision Request_TWDBReview:** (Excel table): The TWDB staff comment & recommendation for each municipal WUG level request
3. **Region G_Non-Municipal Revision Request_TWDBReview:** (Excel table – 5 separate tabs for each water demand category): The TWDB staff comment & recommendation for each non-municipal WUG level request
4. **Region G_Recommended Projections split by basin** (Excel table – 2 separate tabs): basin level municipal & non-municipal projections

If you or any member of your group has any questions regarding this matter, please contact Yun Cho, Manager of Economic and Demographic Analysis.

Thank you.

Temple

Temple McKinnon

Director, Water Use, Projections & Planning Division

Texas Water Development Board www.twdb.texas.gov

1700 N. Congress Avenue, P.O. Box 13231, Austin, TX 78711-3231

(512) 475-2057

[FB](#) | [Twitter](#) | [TWDB News Sign-up](#)