2026 BRAZOS G REGIONAL WATER PLAN
VOLUME I

Prepared for

The Brazos G
Regional Water Planning Group

October 20, 2025

carollo®

TBPELS NO. F-558

In association with:

AGS
Advanced Groundwater Solutions, LLC

PLUMMER

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

2026 BRAZOS G REGIONAL WATER PLAN – VOLUME I

Prepared for

BRAZOS G REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

October 20, 2025

Carollo Engineers, Inc.

Plummer, Inc.

Advanced Groundwater Solutions, LLC.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

BRAZOS G REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP
Executive Committee
Voting Members

MEMBER	COUNTY	INTEREST
Mr. Wayne Wilson, (Chair)	Brazos	Agriculture
Ms. Gail Peek (Vice-Chair)	McLennan	Small Business
Mr. David Collinsworth (Secretary/Treasurer)	McLennan	River Authorities
Mr. Dirk Aaron	Bell	GMA 8
Mr. Dale Adams	Nolan	GMA 7
Mr. Ryan Bayle	Hood	Electric Generating Utilities
Mr. Charles Beseda	Hill	Water Utilities
Mr. David Blackburn	Bell	Counties
Mr. Jim Briggs	Williamson	Municipalities
Ms. Luci Dunn	Taylor	Environmental
Judge Scott M. Felton	McLennan	Counties
Mr. Alan Gardenhire	Milam	Industries
Mr. Zach Holland	Grimes	GMA 14
Commissioner Gary Myers	Stonewall	Counties
Ms. Jennifer Nations	Brazos	Municipalities
Mr. Gary Newman	Williamson	Public
Mr. Lynn Smith	Knox	GMA 6
Mr. Dale Spurgin	Jones	Agriculture
Ms. Kathy Turner Jones	Johnson	Water Districts
Ms. Lisa Tyer	McLennan	Municipalities
Mr. Patrick Wagner	Erath	Water Districts
Mr. Jerry K. “Kenny” Weldon	Erath	Municipalities
Mr. Gary Westbrook	Milam	GMA 12

Plan Administrator
Brazos River Authority

Ms. Pam Hanneman
Water Resources Regional Planner

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

PREPARED BY:

DRAFT DOCUMENTS

These Draft Documents are released for the purpose of information exchange review and planning only under the authority of Tony L. Smith, September 2025, Texas PE 92620. They are not to be used for bidding, permit, or construction purposes.

Carollo Engineers, Inc.
TBPELS No. F-882

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 Background ES-1
ES.2 Description of the Brazos G Area ES-4
ES.3 Population and Water Demand Projections ES-4
ES.4 Water Supply ES-9
ES.1.1 Surface Water Supplies ES-9
ES.1.2 Groundwater Supplies ES-11
ES.1.3 Water Quality ES-12
ES.1.4 Supply and Demand Comparison ES-13
ES.1.5 Water Supply Strategies to Meet Needs ES-13
ES.5 Water Plan Findings ES-14
ES.6 Other Aspects of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan ES-21
ES.7 Executive Summary Appendix – Required Reports from DB27 (reflecting database entries as of September 22, 2025) ES-22

CHAPTER 1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING AREA

1.1 Background 1-1
1.1.1 Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area 1-1
1.2 Population 1-5
1.2.1 Regional Trends 1-5
1.2.2 Rolling Plains 1-6
1.2.3 IH-35 Corridor 1-7
1.2.4 Lower Basin 1-7
1.3 Economic Activities 1-10
1.4 Climate 1-11
1.5 Sources of Water 1-12
1.5.1 Groundwater 1-13
1.5.2 Surface Water 1-19
1.5.3 Reuse 1-21
1.6 Wholesale Water Providers 1-21
1.6.1 BRA 1-22
1.6.2 Aquilla WSD 1-23
1.6.3 Bell County WCID No. 1 1-23
1.6.4 Bluebonnet WSC 1-23
1.6.5 Central Texas WSC 1-23
1.6.6 Eastland County WSD 1-23
1.6.7 FHLM WSC 1-24
1.6.8 North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority 1-24
1.6.9 Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No. 1 1-24
1.6.10 Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation 1-24

1.6.11 Upper Leon Municipal Water District 1-24
1.6.12 West Central Texas Municipal Water District 1-25
1.7 Major Water Providers 1-25
1.8 Current Water Users and Demand Centers 1-26
1.8.1 Regional Water Use 1-26
1.8.2 Municipal Use 1-26
1.8.3 Industrial Use 1-29
1.8.4 Agricultural Use 1-31
1.8.5 Non-Consumptive Use 1-32
1.9 Natural Resources 1-32
1.9.1 Regional Vegetation 1-32
1.9.2 Regional Geology 1-34
1.9.3 Soils 1-34
1.9.4 Wetlands 1-37
1.9.5 Water Resources 1-37
1.9.6 Wildlife Resources 1-38
1.9.7 Agricultural Resources 1-41
1.9.8 Susceptibility of Water Supplies to Drought 1-43
1.9.9 Identified Water Quality Problems 1-45
1.9.10 Identified Threats to Agricultural and Natural Resources 1-48
1.10 Drought Preparations 1-52
1.11 Existing Programs and Goals 1-53
1.11.1 Groundwater Regulation 1-53
1.11.2 Clean Water Act 1-58
1.11.3 Safe Drinking Water Act 1-59
1.11.4 Source Water Assessment and Protection Program 1-59
1.11.5 State Water Availability Modeling Initiatives 1-60
1.12 Previous Water Supply Planning in the Brazos G Area 1-61
1.12.1 Brazos G Regional and State Water Plans 1-61
1.12.2 Bosque County Regional Water Treatment and Distribution Facilities Plan 1-66
1.12.3 FHLM – TWDB Regional Water Facility Planning Study 1-66
1.12.4 Regional Water Supply and Wastewater Service Study for Johnson and Parker Counties, Phase I 1-66
1.12.5 West Central Brazos River Basin Regional Water Treatment and Distribution Facility Study 1-67
1.13 Summary of Water Loss Audits in Brazos G Area 1-68

CHAPTER 2 PROJECTED POPULATION AND WATER DEMANDS

2.1 Introduction 2-1
2.2 Population Projections 2-1
2.2.1 Revisions in Municipal WUGs from the 2021 Planning Cycle 2-18
2.2.2 Revisions to Population Projections 2-19

2.3 Water Demand Projections 2-20
2.3.1 Revisions to Municipal Demand Projections 2-20
2.3.2 Municipal Water Demand 2-20
2.3.3 Manufacturing Water Demand 2-47
2.3.4 Steam-Electric Water Demand 2-48
2.3.5 Mining Water Demand 2-50
2.3.6 Irrigation Water Demand 2-52
2.3.7 Livestock Water Demand 2-54
2.3.8 Wholesale Water Providers 2-56
2.3.9 Major Water Providers 2-57

CHAPTER 3 EVALUATION OF CURRENT WATER SUPPLIES

3.1 Surface Water Supplies 3-1
3.1.1 Texas Water Right System 3-1
3.1.2 Types of Water Rights 3-2
3.1.3 Water Rights in the Brazos River Basin 3-2
3.1.4 Water Supply Contracts 3-17
3.2 Determination of Surface Water Availability 3-34
3.2.1 Modified TCEQ Water Availability Model of the Brazos River Basin 3-34
3.2.2 Reliability of Surface Water Supplies and New Upper Basin Drought of Record 3-37
3.2.3 Yield Analysis for Large Reservoirs 3-38
3.2.4 Reliability of Run-of-the-River and Small Reservoir Water Rights 3-42
3.2.5 Reliability of BRA System Operations Permit 3-42
3.2.6 Unappropriated Flows in the Brazos River Basin 3-44
3.2.7 Local Surface Water Supplies 3-51
3.3 Water Quality Considerations Affecting Supply 3-56
3.3.1 Point and Non-Point Source Pollution Water Quality 3-56
3.3.2 Comparison of Supplies with Water Quality Standards 3-61
3.3.3 Special Water Quality Studies and Activities in the Brazos River Basin 3-61
3.4 Groundwater Availability 3-62
3.4.1 Method of Determination 3-62
3.4.2 Western Area 3-72
3.4.3 Central Area 3-75
3.4.4 Southeastern Area 3-78
3.5 Existing Reuse Water Availability 3-78
3.6 Supplies from Other Regions 3-79
3.7 Methods to Estimate Available Water Supplies in the Brazos G Area 3-85
3.7.1 Surface Water Supplies 3-85
3.7.2 Groundwater Allocation 3-85
3.7.3 Constraints on Surface Water Supplies 3-86
3.7.4 Constraint s on Groundwater Supplies 3-87
3.8 Existing Supplies Allocated to WUGs 3-87
3.9 Existing Supplies for Major Water Providers 3-87

CHAPTER 4 COMPARISON OF WATER DEMANDS WITH WATER SUPPLIES TO DETERMINE NEEDS

4.1 Introduction 4-1
4.2 Water Needs Projected for Water User Groups 4-1
4.2.1 Projected Municipal Needs 4-1
4.2.2 Projected Manufacturing Needs 4-7
4.2.3 Projected Steam-Electric Needs 4-7
4.2.4 Projected Mining Needs 4-8
4.2.5 Projected Irrigation Needs 4-8
4.2.6 Projected Livestock Needs 4-9
4.3 Water Needs Projected for WWPs 4-9
4.4 Water Needs Projected for Major Water Providers 4-10

CHAPTER 5 COUNTY AND WHOLESALE WATER PROVIDER PLANS

5.1 Bell County Water Supply Plan 5.1-1
5.1.1 439 WSC 5.1-2
5.1.2 Armstrong WSC 5.1-4
5.1.3 Bell County WCID No. 2 5.1-4
5.1.4 Bell County WCID No. 3 5.1-5
5.1.5 Bell-Milam-Falls WSC 5.1-6
5.1.6 City of Belton 5.1-7
5.1.7 Dog Ridge WSC 5.1-9
5.1.8 East Bell WSC 5.1-10
5.1.9 Elm Creek WSC 5.1-10
5.1.10 Fort Hood (Fort Cavazos) 5.1-12
5.1.11 City of Harker Heights 5.1-13
5.1.12 City of Holland 5.1-14
5.1.13 City of Killeen 5.1-14
5.1.14 Little Elm Valley WSC 5.1-15
5.1.15 Moffat WSC 5.1-16
5.1.16 Morgan's Point Resort 5.1-17
5.1.17 Pendleton WSC 5.1-17
5.1.18 City of Rogers 5.1-18
5.1.19 Salado WSC 5.1-19
5.1.20 City of Temple 5.1-20
5.1.21 The Grove WSC 5.1-22
5.1.22 City of Troy 5.1-23
5.1.23 West Bell County WSC 5.1-23
5.1.24 Bell County-Other 5.1-23
5.1.25 Manufacturing 5.1-24
5.1.26 Steam-Electric 5.1-25
5.1.27 Mining 5.1-25

5.1.28 Irrigation 5.1-25
5.1.29 Livestock 5.1-26
5.2 Bosque County Water Supply Plan 5.2-1
5.2.1 Childress Creek WSC 5.2-1
5.2.2 City of Clifton 5.2-3
5.2.3 Highland Park WSC 5.2-4
5.2.4 City of Meridian 5.2-5
5.2.5 Mustang Valley WSC 5.2-5
5.2.6 Smith Bend WSC 5.2-6
5.2.7 City of Valley Mills 5.2-6
5.2.8 County-Other 5.2-7
5.2.9 Manufacturing 5.2-8
5.2.10 Steam-Electric 5.2-8
5.2.11 Mining 5.2-8
5.2.12 Irrigation 5.2-9
5.2.13 Livestock 5.2-10
5.3 Brazos County Water Supply Plan 5.3-1
5.3.1 City of Bryan 5.3-1
5.3.2 City of College Station 5.3-4
5.3.3 Texas A&M University 5.3-6
5.3.4 Wellborn SUD 5.3-8
5.3.5 Wickson Creek SUD 5.3-10
5.3.6 County-Other 5.3-10
5.3.7 Manufacturing 5.3-11
5.3.8 Steam-Electric 5.3-11
5.3.9 Mining 5.3-12
5.3.10 Irrigation 5.3-13
5.3.11 Livestock 5.3-13
5.4 Burleson County Water Supply Plan 5.4-1
5.4.1 Cade Lakes WSC 5.4-1
5.4.2 City of Caldwell 5.4-2
5.4.3 Deanville WSC 5.4-3
5.4.4 City of Snook 5.4-3
5.4.5 City of Somerville 5.4-4
5.4.6 County-Other 5.4-5
5.4.7 Manufacturing 5.4-5
5.4.8 Steam-Electric 5.4-6
5.4.9 Mining 5.4-6
5.4.10 Irrigation 5.4-7
5.4.11 Livestock 5.4-7
5.5 Callahan County Water Supply Plan 5.5-1
5.5.1 City of Baird 5.5-1
5.5.2 Callahan County WSC 5.5-2
5.5.3 City of Clyde 5.5-2

5.5.4 City of Cross Plains 5.5-3
5.5.5 Eula WSC 5.5-4
5.5.6 County-Other 5.5-4
5.5.7 Manufacturing 5.5-5
5.5.8 Steam-Electric 5.5-5
5.5.9 Mining 5.5-5
5.5.10 Irrigation 5.5-5
5.5.11 Livestock 5.5-5
5.6 Comanche County Water Supply Plan 5.6-1
5.6.1 City of Comanche 5.6-1
5.6.2 City of De Leon 5.6-2
5.6.3 County-Other 5.6-2
5.6.4 Manufacturing 5.6-3
5.6.5 Steam-Electric 5.6-3
5.6.6 Mining 5.6-3
5.6.7 Irrigation 5.6-4
5.6.8 Livestock 5.6-5
5.7 Coryell County Water Supply Plan 5.7-1
5.7.1 Central Texas College District 5.7-1
5.7.2 City of Copperas Cove 5.7-2
5.7.3 Coryell City WSD 5.7-3
5.7.4 Flat Creek WSC 5.7-4
5.7.5 Fort Gates WSC 5.7-5
5.7.6 City of Gatesville 5.7-6
5.7.7 Mountain WSC 5.7-8
5.7.8 Multi-County WSC 5.7-9
5.7.9 City of Oglesby 5.7-10
5.7.10 County-Other 5.7-10
5.7.11 Manufacturing 5.7-11
5.7.12 Steam-Electric 5.7-11
5.7.13 Mining 5.7-11
5.7.14 Irrigation 5.7-12
5.7.15 Livestock 5.7-12
5.8 Eastland County Water Supply Plan 5.8-1
5.8.1 City of Cisco 5.8-1
5.8.2 City of Eastland 5.8-2
5.8.3 City of Gorman 5.8-3
5.8.4 City of Ranger 5.8-3
5.8.5 City of Rising Star 5.8-4
5.8.6 Staff WSC 5.8-4
5.8.7 Westbound WSC 5.8-5
5.8.8 County-Other 5.8-5
5.8.9 Manufacturing 5.8-6
5.8.10 Steam-Electric 5.8-6

5.8.11 Mining 5.8-6
5.8.12 Irrigation 5.8-7
5.8.13 Livestock 5.8-7
5.9 Erath County Water Supply Plan 5.9-1
5.9.1 City of Dublin 5.9-1
5.9.2 City of Stephenville 5.9-1
5.9.3 County-Other 5.9-2
5.9.4 Manufacturing 5.9-3
5.9.5 Steam-Electric 5.9-4
5.9.6 Mining 5.9-4
5.9.7 Irrigation 5.9-4
5.9.8 Livestock 5.9-4
5.10 Falls County Water Supply Plan 5.10-1
5.10.1 Cego-Durango WSC 5.10-1
5.10.2 City of Marlin 5.10-2
5.10.3 City of Rosebud 5.10-3
5.10.4 West Brazos WSC 5.10-4
5.10.5 County-Other 5.10-5
5.10.6 Manufacturing 5.10-7
5.10.7 Steam-Electric 5.10-7
5.10.8 Mining 5.10-7
5.10.9 Irrigation 5.10-7
5.10.10 Livestock 5.10-7
5.11 Fisher County Water Supply Plan 5.11-1
5.11.1 City of Roby 5.11-1
5.11.2 City of Rotan 5.11-2
5.11.3 County-Other 5.11-3
5.11.4 Manufacturing 5.11-4
5.11.5 Steam-Electric 5.11-4
5.11.6 Mining 5.11-4
5.11.7 Irrigation 5.11-5
5.11.8 Livestock 5.11-5
5.12 Grimes County Water Supply Plan 5.12-1
5.12.1 Dobbin-Plantersville WSC 5.12-1
5.12.2 G&W WSC 5.12-1
5.12.3 City of Navasota 5.12-2
5.12.4 TDCJ - Luther Units 5.12-3
5.12.5 TDCJ – W. Pack Unit 5.12-3
5.12.6 County-Other 5.12-4
5.12.7 Manufacturing 5.12-5
5.12.8 Steam-Electric 5.12-5
5.12.9 Mining 5.12-5
5.12.10 Irrigation 5.12-6
5.12.11 Livestock 5.12-7

5.13 Hamilton County Water Supply Plan 5.13-1
5.13.1 City of Hamilton 5.13-1
5.13.2 City of Hico 5.13-2
5.13.3 County-Other 5.13-3
5.13.4 Manufacturing 5.13-3
5.13.5 Steam-Electric 5.13-3
5.13.6 Mining 5.13-4
5.13.7 Irrigation 5.13-4
5.13.8 Livestock 5.13-4
5.14 Haskell County Water Supply Plan 5.14-1
5.14.1 City of Haskell 5.14-1
5.14.2 County-Other 5.14-2
5.14.3 Manufacturing 5.14-3
5.14.4 Steam-Electric 5.14-3
5.14.5 Mining 5.14-3
5.14.6 Irrigation 5.14-3
5.14.7 Livestock 5.14-4
5.15 Hill County Water Supply Plan 5.15-1
5.15.1 Birome WSC 5.15-2
5.15.2 Brandon-Irene WSC 5.15-2
5.15.3 Chatt WSC 5.15-3
5.15.4 Double Diamond Utilities 5.15-4
5.15.5 Files Valley WSC 5.15-6
5.15.6 HILCO United Services 5.15-8
5.15.7 Hill County WSC 5.15-8
5.15.8 City of Hillsboro 5.15-9
5.15.9 City of Hubbard 5.15-10
5.15.10 City of Itasca 5.15-10
5.15.11 Post Oak SUD 5.15-11
5.15.12 City of Whitney 5.15-12
5.15.13 Woodrow-Osceola WSC 5.15-13
5.15.14 County-Other 5.15-14
5.15.15 Manufacturing 5.15-15
5.15.16 Steam-Electric 5.15-15
5.15.17 Mining 5.15-15
5.15.18 Irrigation 5.15-15
5.15.19 Livestock 5.15-15
5.16 Hood County Water Supply Plan 5.16-1
5.16.1 Acton MUD 5.16-1
5.16.2 City of Granbury 5.16-2
5.16.3 City of Lipan 5.16-3
5.16.4 City of Tolar 5.16-4
5.16.5 County-Other 5.16-5
5.16.6 Manufacturing 5.16-6

5.16.7 Steam-Electric 5.16-6
5.16.8 Mining 5.16-6
5.16.9 Irrigation 5.16-7
5.16.10 Livestock 5.16-7
5.17 Johnson County Water Supply Plan 5.17-1
5.17.1 City of Alvarado 5.17-2
5.17.2 Bethany SUD 5.17-2
5.17.3 Bethesda WSC 5.17-2
5.17.4 City of Burleson 5.17-3
5.17.5 City of Cleburne 5.17-4
5.17.6 City of Crowley 5.17-6
5.17.7 City of Fort Worth 5.17-7
5.17.8 City of Godley 5.17-7
5.17.9 City of Grandview 5.17-8
5.17.10 Johnson County SUD 5.17-9
5.17.11 City of Keene 5.17-11
5.17.12 City of Mansfield 5.17-11
5.17.13 Mountain Peak SUD 5.17-11
5.17.14 Parker WSC 5.17-11
5.17.15 City of Rio Vista 5.17-12
5.17.16 City of Venus 5.17-13
5.17.17 County-Other 5.17-14
5.17.18 Manufacturing 5.17-14
5.17.19 Steam-Electric 5.17-14
5.17.20 Mining 5.17-15
5.17.21 Irrigation 5.17-15
5.17.22 Livestock 5.17-16
5.18 Jones County Water Supply Plan 5.18-1
5.18.1 City of Anson 5.18-1
5.18.2 Hamby WSC 5.18-1
5.18.3 City of Hamlin 5.18-2
5.18.4 Hawley WSC 5.18-2
5.18.5 City of Stamford 5.18-2
5.18.6 County-Other 5.18-3
5.18.7 Manufacturing 5.18-4
5.18.8 Steam-Electric 5.18-4
5.18.9 Mining 5.18-4
5.18.10 Irrigation 5.18-5
5.18.11 Livestock 5.18-5
5.19 Kent County Water Supply Plan 5.19-1
5.19.1 City of Jayton 5.19-1
5.19.2 County-Other 5.19-2
5.19.3 Manufacturing 5.19-2
5.19.4 Steam-Electric 5.19-2

5.19.5 Mining 5.19-3
5.19.6 Irrigation 5.19-3
5.19.7 Livestock 5.19-3
5.20 Knox County Water Supply Plan 5.20-1
5.20.1 City of Benjamin 5.20-1
5.20.2 Knox City 5.20-2
5.20.3 City of Munday 5.20-4
5.20.4 County-Other 5.20-5
5.20.5 Manufacturing 5.20-5
5.20.6 Steam-Electric 5.20-5
5.20.7 Mining 5.20-5
5.20.8 Irrigation 5.20-5
5.20.9 Livestock 5.20-7
5.21 Lampasas County Water Supply Plan 5.21-1
5.21.1 Kempner WSC 5.21-1
5.21.2 City of Lampasas 5.21-3
5.21.3 County-Other 5.21-5
5.21.4 Manufacturing 5.21-5
5.21.5 Steam-Electric 5.21-6
5.21.6 Mining 5.21-6
5.21.7 Irrigation 5.21-7
5.21.8 Livestock 5.21-8
5.22 Lee County Water Supply Plan 5.22-1
5.22.1 Aqua WSC 5.22-1
5.22.2 City of Giddings 5.22-1
5.22.3 Lee County WSC 5.22-2
5.22.4 City of Lexington 5.22-2
5.22.5 Lee County-Other 5.22-3
5.22.6 Manufacturing 5.22-4
5.22.7 Steam-Electric 5.22-4
5.22.8 Mining 5.22-4
5.22.9 Irrigation 5.22-4
5.22.10 Livestock 5.22-5
5.23 Limestone County Water Supply Plan 5.23-1
5.23.1 Bistone Municipal Water Supply District 5.23-1
5.23.2 City of Coolidge 5.23-2
5.23.3 City of Groesbeck 5.23-3
5.23.4 City of Mexia 5.23-5
5.23.5 Point Enterprise WSC 5.23-6
5.23.6 Prairie Hill WSC 5.23-6
5.23.7 SLC WSC 5.23-7
5.23.8 Tri-County SUD 5.23-8
5.23.9 White Rock Water SUD 5.23-8
5.23.10 County-Other 5.23-9

5.23.11 Manufacturing 5.23-9
5.23.12 Steam-Electric 5.23-10
5.23.13 Mining 5.23-11
5.23.14 Irrigation 5.23-12
5.23.15 Livestock 5.23-12
5.24 McLennan County Water Supply Plan 5.24-1
5.24.1 Axtell WSC 5.24-2
5.24.2 City of Bellmead 5.24-3
5.24.3 Bold Springs WSC 5.24-4
5.24.4 City of Bruceville-Eddy 5.24-4
5.24.5 Central Bosque WSC 5.24-5
5.24.6 Chalk Bluff WSC 5.24-6
5.24.7 City of Crawford 5.24-7
5.24.8 Cross Country WSC 5.24-8
5.24.9 East Crawford WSC 5.24-9
5.24.10 EOL WSC 5.24-10
5.24.11 Gholson WSC 5.24-11
5.24.12 H & H WSC 5.24-11
5.24.13 City of Hewitt 5.24-11
5.24.14 Hilltop WSC 5.24-13
5.24.15 Hog Creek WSC 5.24-13
5.24.16 City of Lacy-Lakeview 5.24-14
5.24.17 Leroy Tours Gerald WSC 5.24-14
5.24.18 Levi WSC 5.24-15
5.24.19 City of Lorena 5.24-16
5.24.20 City of Mart 5.24-17
5.24.21 City of McGregor 5.24-18
5.24.22 McLennan County WCID No. 2 5.24-19
5.24.23 City of Moody 5.24-20
5.24.24 North Bosque WSC 5.24-20
5.24.25 City of Riesel 5.24-21
5.24.26 City of Robinson 5.24-22
5.24.27 Ross WSC 5.24-23
5.24.28 Spring Valley WSC 5.24-23
5.24.29 Texas State Technical College 5.24-24
5.24.30 City of Waco 5.24-25
5.24.31 City of West 5.24-28
5.24.32 Windsor Water 5.24-28
5.24.33 City of Woodway 5.24-29
5.24.34 County-Other 5.24-30
5.24.35 Manufacturing 5.24-31
5.24.36 Steam-Electric 5.24-32
5.24.37 Mining 5.24-32

5.24.38 Irrigation 5.24-32
5.24.39 Livestock 5.24-33
5.25 Milam County Water Supply Plan 5.25-1
5.25.1 City of Cameron 5.25-1
5.25.2 Milano WSC 5.25-2
5.25.3 North Milam WSC 5.25-3
5.25.4 City of Rockdale 5.25-4
5.25.5 Salem Elm Ridge WSC 5.25-5
5.25.6 Southwest Milam WSC 5.25-6
5.25.7 City of Thorndale 5.25-8
5.25.8 County-Other 5.25-9
5.25.9 Manufacturing 5.25-10
5.25.10 Steam-Electric 5.25-10
5.25.11 Mining 5.25-10
5.25.12 Irrigation 5.25-11
5.25.13 Livestock 5.25-11
5.26 Nolan County Water Supply Plan 5.26-1
5.26.1 Bitter Creek WSC 5.26-1
5.26.2 City of Roscoe 5.26-2
5.26.3 City of Sweetwater 5.26-3
5.26.4 County-Other 5.26-4
5.26.5 Manufacturing 5.26-5
5.26.6 Steam-Electric 5.26-6
5.26.7 Mining 5.26-6
5.26.8 Irrigation 5.26-7
5.26.9 Livestock 5.26-8
5.27 Palo Pinto County Water Supply Plan 5.27-1
5.27.1 City of Gordon 5.27-1
5.27.2 Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC 5.27-3
5.27.3 City of Mineral Wells 5.27-3
5.27.4 North Rural WSC 5.27-5
5.27.5 Palo Pinto WSC 5.27-5
5.27.6 Possum Kingdom WSC 5.27-5
5.27.7 Santo SUD 5.27-6
5.27.8 Sportsmans World MUD 5.27-6
5.27.9 City of Strawn 5.27-6
5.27.10 Sturdivant Progress WSC 5.27-8
5.27.11 County-Other 5.27-8
5.27.12 Manufacturing 5.27-8
5.27.13 Steam-Electric 5.27-9
5.27.14 Mining 5.27-9
5.27.15 Irrigation 5.27-10
5.27.16 Livestock 5.27-11

5.28 Robertson County Water Supply Plan 5.28-1
5.28.1 City of Bremond 5.28-1
5.28.2 City of Calvert 5.28-2
5.28.3 City of Franklin 5.28-3
5.28.4 City of Hearne 5.28-3
5.28.5 Robertson County WSC 5.28-3
5.28.6 Twin Creek WSC 5.28-4
5.28.7 County-Other 5.28-5
5.28.8 Manufacturing 5.28-6
5.28.9 Steam-Electric 5.28-6
5.28.10 Mining 5.28-6
5.28.11 Irrigation 5.28-7
5.28.12 Livestock 5.28-7
5.29 Shackelford County Water Supply Plan 5.29-1
5.29.1 City of Albany 5.29-1
5.29.2 County-Other 5.29-2
5.29.3 Manufacturing 5.29-2
5.29.4 Steam-Electric 5.29-2
5.29.5 Mining 5.29-2
5.29.6 Irrigation 5.29-3
5.29.7 Livestock 5.29-3
5.30 Somervell County Water Supply Plan 5.30-1
5.30.1 City of Glen Rose 5.30-1
5.30.2 Somervell County Water District 5.30-2
5.30.3 County-Other 5.30-4
5.30.4 Manufacturing 5.30-4
5.30.5 Steam-Electric 5.30-4
5.30.6 Mining 5.30-5
5.30.7 Irrigation 5.30-6
5.30.8 Livestock 5.30-6
5.31 Stephens County Water Supply Plan 5.31-1
5.31.1 City of Breckenridge 5.31-1
5.31.2 Fort Griffin SUD 5.31-2
5.31.3 Stephens Regional SUD 5.31-3
5.31.4 County-Other 5.31-3
5.31.5 Manufacturing 5.31-3
5.31.6 Steam-Electric 5.31-3
5.31.7 Mining 5.31-4
5.31.8 Irrigation 5.31-4
5.31.9 Livestock 5.31-5
5.32 Stonewall County Water Supply Plan 5.32-1
5.32.1 City of Aspermont 5.32-1
5.32.2 County-Other 5.32-2

5.32.3 Manufacturing 5.32-2
5.32.4 Steam-Electric 5.32-2
5.32.5 Mining 5.32-2
5.32.6 Irrigation 5.32-3
5.32.7 Livestock 5.32-3
5.33 Taylor County Water Supply Plan 5.33-1
5.33.1 City of Abilene 5.33-2
5.33.2 City of Lawn 5.33-5
5.33.3 City of Merkel 5.33-6
5.33.4 North Runnels WSC 5.33-6
5.33.5 Potosi WSC 5.33-6
5.33.6 S U N WSC 5.33-7
5.33.7 Steamboat Mountain WSC 5.33-8
5.33.8 City of Tye 5.33-8
5.33.9 View Caps WSC 5.33-8
5.33.10 County-Other 5.33-9
5.33.11 Manufacturing 5.33-10
5.33.12 Steam-Electric 5.33-11
5.33.13 Mining 5.33-11
5.33.14 Irrigation 5.33-12
5.33.15 Livestock 5.33-12
5.34 Throckmorton County Water Supply Plan 5.34-1
5.34.1 City of Throckmorton 5.34-1
5.34.2 County-Other 5.34-2
5.34.3 Manufacturing 5.34-2
5.34.4 Steam-Electric 5.34-3
5.34.5 Mining 5.34-3
5.34.6 Irrigation 5.34-4
5.34.7 Livestock 5.34-4
5.35 Washington County Water Supply Plan 5.35-1
5.35.1 City of Brenham 5.35-1
5.35.2 Central Washington County WSC 5.35-2
5.35.3 Chappell Hill WSC 5.35-3
5.35.4 Corix Utilities 5.35-4
5.35.5 County-Other 5.35-4
5.35.6 Manufacturing 5.35-4
5.35.7 Steam-Electric 5.35-5
5.35.8 Mining 5.35-5
5.35.9 Irrigation 5.35-6
5.35.10 Livestock 5.35-6
5.36 Williamson County Water Supply Plan 5.36-1
5.36.1 City of Bartlett 5.36-2
5.36.2 Blockhouse MUD 5.36-3

5.36.3 Brushy Creek MUD 5.36-4
5.36.4 City of Cedar Park 5.36-5
5.36.5 Fern Bluff MUD 5.36-6
5.36.6 City of Florence 5.36-7
5.36.7 City of Georgetown 5.36-8
5.36.8 City of Granger 5.36-12
5.36.9 City of Hutto 5.36-12
5.36.10 Jarrell-Schwertner WSC 5.36-13
5.36.11 Jonah Water SUD 5.36-15
5.36.12 City of Leander 5.36-16
5.36.13 Liberty Hill 5.36-17
5.36.14 Manville WSC 5.36-18
5.36.15 Noack WSC 5.36-18
5.36.16 Paloma Lake MUD 1 5.36-19
5.36.17 Paloma Lake MUD 2 5.36-20
5.36.18 City of Round Rock 5.36-20
5.36.19 Sonterra MUD 5.36-23
5.36.20 City of Taylor 5.36-23
5.36.21 Vista Oaks MUD 5.36-24
5.36.22 Walsh Ranch MUD 5.36-25
5.36.23 Williamson County MUD 10 5.36-26
5.36.24 Williamson County MUD 11 5.36-26
5.36.25 Williamson County WSID 3 5.36-27
5.36.26 Williamson-Travis Counties MUD 1 5.36-28
5.36.27 County-Other 5.36-29
5.36.28 Manufacturing 5.36-31
5.36.29 Steam-Electric 5.36-32
5.36.30 Mining 5.36-32
5.36.31 Irrigation 5.36-32
5.36.32 Livestock 5.36-33
5.37 Young County Water Supply Plan 5.37-1
5.37.1 Fort Belknap WSC 5.37-1
5.37.2 City of Graham 5.37-2
5.37.3 County-Other 5.37-4
5.37.4 Manufacturing 5.37-5
5.37.5 Steam-Electric 5.37-5
5.37.6 Mining 5.37-6
5.37.7 Irrigation 5.37-6
5.37.8 Livestock 5.37-7
5.38 Wholesale Water Provider Supply Plan 5.38-1
5.38.1 BRA (Lake Aquilla System) 5.38-2
5.38.2 BRA (Little River System) 5.38-2
5.38.3 BRA (Main Stem/Lower Basin System) 5.38-5
5.38.4 Aquilla Water Supply District 5.38-7

5.38.5 Bell County WCID No. 1 5.38-8
5.38.6 Bluebonnet Water Supply Corporation 5.38-10
5.38.7 Central Texas Water Supply Corporation 5.38-11
5.38.8 FHLM Water Supply Corporation 5.38-12
5.38.9 Eastland County WSD 5.38-13
5.38.10 North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority 5.38-13
5.38.11 Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No. 1 5.38-14
5.38.12 Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation 5.38-15
5.38.13 Upper Leon River MWD 5.38-15
5.38.14 West Central Texas MWD 5.38-15
5.39 Water Conservation Recommendations 5.39-1
5.40 Major Projects 5.40-1
5.41 Documentation of Implementation Status and Anticipated Timeline for Certain Types of Recommended Water Management Strategies 5-1

CHAPTER 6 CONSISTENCY WITH LONG-TERM PROTECTION OF THE STATE'S WATER, AGRICULTURAL, AND NATURAL RESOURCES

6.1 Cumulative Hydrologic Effects of Implementing the Brazos G Regional Water Plan 6-3
6.1.1 Surface Water 6-3
6.1.2 Groundwater 6-7
6.2 Summary of the Environmental Effects of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan 6-17
6.3 Impacts of Recommended WMS on Key Parameters of Water Quality and Moving Water from Rural and Agricultural Areas 6-17
6.3.1 Impacts of WMS on Key Parameters of Water Quality 6-17
6.3.2 Impacts of Voluntary Redistribution of Water from Rural and Agricultural Areas 6-18
6.3.3 Consistency with Protection of Agricultural Resources 6-23
6.3.4 Consistency with Protection of Natural Resources 6-23
6.4 Social and Economic Impacts of Not Meeting Projected Water Needs 6-24
6.5 Needs Left Unmet in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan 6-25
6.5.1 Municipal Needs Unmet in 2030 6-25
6.5.2 Non-Municipal Needs Unmet 6-27

CHAPTER 7 DROUGHT RESPONSE INFORMATION, ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Droughts of Record in the Brazos G Area 7-1
7.1.1 Background 7-1
7.1.2 Current DOR 7-3
7.1.3 Drought Indicators 7-4
7.1.4 Recent Droughts and New DORs 7-14
7.2 Uncertainty and Drought(s) Worse Than DOR 7-15
7.2.1 Planning for Uncertainty 7-15
7.2.2 Existing Measures for Preparation of the DWDOR 7-15
7.2.3 Potential Additional Measures for DWDOR Resilience 7-16

7.3 Current Drought Preparations and Response 7-17
7.3.1 Current Drought Preparations and Response 7-17
7.3.2 Assessment of Local DCPs 7-17
7.4 RWPA Drought Response Triggers and Actions 7-55
7.5 Existing and Potential Emergency Interconnects 7-55
7.6 Drought Management WMS 7-64
7.7 Emergency Responses to Local Drought Conditions or Loss of Water Supply 7-64
7.8 Other Drought-Related Considerations and Recommendations 7-83
7.8.1 Drought Response Recommendations for Surface Water 7-83
7.8.2 Drought Response Recommendations for Groundwater 7-89
7.9 Development of Region-Specific Model DCPs 7-90
7.10 Drought Preparedness Council Report 7-90
7.11 Other Drought Recommendations 7-91
7.11.1 Recommendations to the Drought Preparedness Council 7-91
7.11.2 Monitoring and Assessment 7-91

CHAPTER 8 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNIQUE STREAM SEGMENTS, UNIQUE RESERVOIR SITES, AND OTHER LEGISLATIVE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Recommendations Concerning River and Stream Segments Having Unique Ecological Value 8-1
8.2 Recommendations Concerning Sites Uniquely Suited for Reservoir Construction 8-2
8.3 Brazos G – A Valuable Texas Resource 8-2
8.4 Legislative and Policy Recommendations 8-3
8.4.1 Issue No. 1: Streamlining the Processes for Project Implementation 8-4
8.4.2 Issue No. 2: Plan Implementation 8-4
8.4.3 Issue No. 3: Coordination between RWPGs and GCDs 8-4
8.4.4 Issue No. 4: System Operation of Water Facilities 8-5
8.4.5 Issue No. 5: Interbasin Transfers of Surface Water 8-6
8.4.6 Issue No. 6: Groundwater Governance 8-6
8.4.7 Issue No. 7: Conjunctive Use of Groundwater and Surface Water 8-7
8.4.8 Issue No. 8: Aquifer Storage and Recovery 8-7
8.4.9 Issue No. 9: Municipal Per Capita Water Use 8-8
8.4.10 Issue No. 10: Reservoir Water Management 8-8
8.4.11 Issue No. 11: Watershed Planning/Source Water Protection 8-8
8.4.12 Issue No. 12: Water Pricing and Conservation 8-9
8.4.13 Issue No. 13: Reuse of Wastewater Effluent 8-9
8.4.14 Issue No. 14: Education 8-9
8.4.15 Issue No. 15: Effects of the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act on Water Supply Systems 8-9
8.4.16 Issue No. 16: Planning Process Improvements 8-10

CHAPTER 9 IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPARISON TO THE PREVIOUS REGIONAL WATER PLAN

9.1 Introduction 9-1
9.2 Implementation of Previous Regional Water Plan 9-1
9.3 Progress of Regionalization 9-1
9.3.1 Overview of Regional Projects 9-2
9.3.2 RWPA's Progress in Achieving Economies of Scale 9-2
9.4 Comparison To Previous Plan 9-3
9.4.1 Changes to WUGs 9-3
9.4.2 Drought of Record 9-4
9.4.3 Water Demand Projections 9-4
9.4.4 Water Supply Assumptions 9-5
9.4.5 Existing Water Supplies 9-8
9.4.6 Needs 9-10
9.4.7 WMS and Projects 9-11

CHAPTER 10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND ADOPTION OF PLAN

10.1 Public Participation 10-1
10.1.1 Rural Outreach Efforts 10-1
10.2 BGRWPG Website (www.brazosgwater.org) 10-2
10.3 Coordination with WUGs, WWPs, and MWPs 10-2
10.4 Coordination with Other Planning Regions 10-3
10.5 BGRWPG Meetings 10-3
10.6 Public Hearing and BGRWPG Responses to Public and Agency Comments on the Initially Prepared Plan 10-3
10.6.1 Comments Received from WUGs, WWPs and MWPs 10-4
10.6.2 Comments Received from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 10-7
10.6.3 Comments Received from Public 10-7
10.7 TWDB Comments on the Initially Prepared Plan and BGRWPG Responses 10-13
10.7.1 Level 1 TWDB Comments 10-13
10.7.2 Level 2 TWDB Comments 10-45
10.8 Plan Adoption 10-46

Appendices

APPENDIX A HISTORICAL SUPPLEMENTAL DATA
APPENDIX B AQUIFER DESCRIPTIONS AND GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY
APPENDIX C PERMITTED AND REPORTED WATER USE
APPENDIX D DESCRIPTIONS OF VEGETATIVE REGIONS AND BIOTIC REGIONS
APPENDIX E DETAILED INFORMATION FOR AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES
APPENDIX F SURFACE WATER SUPPLIES

APPENDIX G ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF NOT MEETING NEEDS
APPENDIX H WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE INITIALLY PREPARED PLAN
APPENDIX I REQUESTED POPULATION AND WATER DEMAN REVISIONS
APPENDIX J MODEL DROUGHT AND WATER CONSERVATION PLANS
APPENDIX K MAG PEAK FACTORS
APPENDIX L WATER AVAILABILITY MODEL FILES
APPENDIX M IMPLEMENTATION
APPENDIX N HYDROLOGIC VARIANCE REQUEST
APPENDIX O MAJOR WATER PROVIDER TABLES
APPENDIX P WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS MATRIX
APPENDIX Q ENTITIES LACKING RESPONSES TO BGWRPG ENGAGEMENT

Tables

Table ES-1	Current and Recent Brazos G RWPG Members	ES-3
Table ES-2	Brazos G Area Total Water Demand by Type of Use (acre-feet/year)	ES-6
Table ES-3	Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies Evaluated for the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan	ES-13
Table ES-4	Summary of Strategies and Projects Recommended for WUGs and/or WWPs	ES-15
Table ES-5	Needs for WUGs Left Unmet in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan	ES-18
Table 1.1	Current and Recent Brazos G RWPG Members	1-4
Table 1.2	Population of Major Cities in the BGRWPA (Greater than 10,000 People in 2020)	1-8
Table 1.3	2022 Economic Data (x$1,000)	1-10
Table 1.4	Historical Pumpage and Future Availability in Brazos G Area Aquifer	1-17
Table 1.5	Major Reservoirs in BGRWPA (Authorized Capacity Greater than 10,000 ac-ft)	1-19
Table 1.6	Permitted Surface Water Diversions by Subregion	1-21
Table 1.7	WWPs in the Brazos G Area	1-22
Table 1.8	MWPs in the Brazos G Area	1-25
Table 1.9	Historical Water Use(1) (in ac-ft/yr)	1-28
Table 1.10	Summary of Regional Threats to Biological Resources in the Brazos River Basin	1-50
Table 1.11	Location of Threats to Biological Resources Related to Water Quality in the Brazos River	1-51
Table 1.12	GCD Management Plan Approval Dates	1-56
Table 1.13	GCDs, Aquifers, DFCs, and MAG Status by GMA for the Brazos G Area	1-56
Table 1.14	Summary of Water Loss Audits in the Brazos G Area	1-69
Table 2.1	Historical and Projected Population by WUG/County	2-3
Table 2.2	Revisions in Brazos G WUGs list from 2021 Planning Cycle	2-19
Table 2.3	Brazos G Area Total Water Demand by Type of Use (ac-ft/yr)	2-20
Table 2.4	Per Capita Water Use for WUGs in the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area (gpcd)	2-23

Table 2.5	Projected Municipal Water Demand by WUG/County in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)	2-35
Table 2.6	Projected Manufacturing Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)	2-47
Table 2.7	Projected Steam-Electric Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)	2-49
Table 2.8	Projected Mining Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)	2-51
Table 2.9	Projected Irrigation Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)	2-53
Table 2.10	Projected Livestock Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)	2-55
Table 2.11	Brazos G Related Contractual Demands for non-WUG WWPs (ac-ft/yr)	2-57
Table 3.1a	Major Reservoirs(1) of the Brazos River Basin	3-11
Table 3.1b	Major Water Rights and Reservoirs in the Brazos River Basin	3-12
Table 3.2	Interbasin Transfers Associated with the Brazos River Basin(1)	3-16
Table 3.3	Water Supply Contracts and Other Current Demands Supplied by WUGs and WWPs (acre-feet/year)	3-18
Table 3.4	Return Flows included in the Brazos G WAM (mgd)	3-35
Table 3.5	Summary of Current and Future Sediment Estimates for Reservoirs with Recent Surveys (available as of December 1, 2023)	3-39
Table 3.6	Summary of Current and Future Sediment Estimates for Reservoirs without Recent Surveys	3-39
Table 3.7	Yields for Reservoirs in the Brazos G Area (acre-feet/year)	3-40
Table 3.8	Summary of BRA Reservoir Firm Yields and System Operations Reliable Supply	3-43
Table 3.9	Summary of Unappropriated Flow at Selected Brazos G WAM Locations	3-45
Table 3.10	Local Surface Water Supply Methodology (ac-ft/yr)	3-52
Table 3.11	2024 Draft Texas 303(d) List (June 26, 2024) Brazos G Regional Planning Area	3-56
Table 3.12	Groundwater Availability Methodology for Non-MAG Aquifers in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan	3-63
Table 3.13	Groundwater Availability Used in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan	3-67
Table 3.14	Groundwater Availability from the Brazos G Area Aquifers	3-71
Table 3.15	Water Supplies from Other Regions	3-82
Table 4.1	Municipal WUGs with Projected Water Needs	4-2
Table 4.2	Counties with Projected Water Needs for Manufacturing Use	4-7
Table 4.3	Counties with Projected Water Needs for Steam-Electric Use	4-7
Table 4.4	Counties with Projected Water Needs for Mining Use	4-8
Table 4.5	Counties with Projected Water Needs for Irrigation Use	4-8
Table 4.6	Counties with Projected Water Needs for Livestock Use	4-9
Table 4.7	Water Needs Projected for WWPs	4-9
Table 5.1-1	Bell County Surplus (Shortage)	5.1-1
Table 5.1-2	Bell County Surplus (Shortage)	5.1-3
Table 5.1-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Armstrong WSC	5.1-4
Table 5.1-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County WCID No. 2	5.1-5
Table 5.1-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County WCID No. 3	5.1-6
Table 5.1-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell-Milam-Falls WSC	5.1-7
Table 5.1-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Belton	5.1-8
Table 5.1-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Dog Ridge WSC	5.1-9
Table 5.1-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for East Bell WSC	5.1-10

Table 5.1-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Elm Creek WSC	5.1-11
Table 5.1-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fort Hood	5.1-12
Table 5.1-12	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Harker Heights	5.1-14
Table 5.1-13	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Killeen	5.1-15
Table 5.1-14	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Little Elm Valley WSC	5.1-16
Table 5.1-15	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Moffat WSC	5.1-17
Table 5.1-16	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Pendleton WSC	5.1-18
Table 5.1-17	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Rogers	5.1-19
Table 5.1-18	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Salado WSC	5.1-19
Table 5.1-19	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Temple	5.1-21
Table 5.1-20	Projected Surplus/Shortage by Decade for The Grove WSC	5.1-22
Table 5.1-21	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for West Bell County WSC	5.1-23
Table 5.1-22	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County - Other	5.1-24
Table 5.1-23	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County - Manufacturing	5.1-25
Table 5.1-24	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County - Irrigation	5.1-26
Table 5.2-1	Bosque County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.2-1
Table 5.2-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Childress Creek WSC	5.2-2
Table 5.2-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Clifton	5.2-3
Table 5.2-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Highland Park WSC	5.2-4
Table 5.2-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Meridian	5.2-5
Table 5.2-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Mustang Valley WSC	5.2-6
Table 5.2-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Valley Mills	5.2-7
Table 5.2-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other	5.2-8
Table 5.2-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bosque County – Mining	5.2-9
Table 5.2-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bosque County – Irrigation	5.2-10
Table 5.3-1	Brazos County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.3-1
Table 5.3-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bryan	5.3-3
Table 5.3-3	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bryan	5.3-4
Table 5.3-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of College Station	5.3-5
Table 5.3-5	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of College Station	5.3-6
Table 5.3-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Texas A&M University	5.3-7
Table 5.3-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD	5.3-9
Table 5.3-8	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD	5.3-9
Table 5.3-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD	5.3-10
Table 5.3-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD	5.3-11
Table 5.3-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Brazos County – Steam-Electric	5.3-12
Table 5.3-12	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD	5.3-13
Table 5.5-1	Burleson County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.4-1
Table 5.5-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Cade Lakes WSC	5.4-2
Table 5.5-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Caldwell	5.4-3
Table 5.5-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Deanville WSC	5.4-3
Table 5.5-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Snook	5.4-4
Table 5.5-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Somerville	5.4-5
Table 5.5-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Burleson County – Manufacturing	5.4-6
Table 5.5-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Burleson County – Mining	5.4-7

Table 5.5-1	Callahan County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.5-1
Table 5.5-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Baird	5.5-2
Table 5.5-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Clyde	5.5-3
Table 5.5-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Cross Plains	5.5-4
Table 5.5-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Eula WSC	5.5-4
Table 5.6-1	Comanche County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.6-1
Table 5.6-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Comanche	5.6-2
Table 5.6-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Comanche County-Other	5.6-3
Table 5.6-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Comanche County – Mining	5.6-4
Table 5.6-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Comanche County – Irrigation	5.6-5
Table 5.6-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Comanche County – Livestock	5.6-5
Table 5.7-1	Coryell County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.7-1
Table 5.7-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the Central Texas College District	5.7-2
Table 5.7-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Copperas Cove	5.7-3
Table 5.7-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Coryell City WSD	5.7-4
Table 5.7-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Flat Creek WSC	5.7-5
Table 5.7-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fort Gates WSC	5.7-6
Table 5.7-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Gatesville	5.7-8
Table 5.7-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Mountain WSC	5.7-9
Table 5.7-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Multi-County WSC	5.7-10
Table 5.7-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Coryell County – Other	5.7-11
Table 5.7-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Coryell County – Mining	5.7-12
Table 5.8-1	Eastland County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.8-1
Table 5.8-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Cisco	5.8-2
Table 5.8-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Eastland	5.8-2
Table 5.8-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Ranger	5.8-3
Table 5.8-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Rising Star	5.8-4
Table 5.8-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Staff WSC	5.8-5
Table 5.8-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other, Eastland	5.8-6
Table 5.8-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Eastland County – Mining	5.8-7
Table 5.9-1	Erath County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.9-1
Table 5.9-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Stephenville	5.9-2
Table 5.9-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Erath County – Other	5.9-3
Table 5.9-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Erath County – Manufacturing	5.9-4
Table 5.10-1	Falls County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.10-1
Table 5.10-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Cego-Durango WSC	5.10-2
Table 5.10-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Marlin	5.10-3
Table 5.10-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Rosebud	5.10-4
Table 5.10-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for West Brazos WSC	5.10-5
Table 5.10-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the Falls County – Other	5.10-6
Table 5.11-1	Fisher County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.11-1
Table 5.11-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Roby	5.11-2
Table 5.11-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Rotan	5.11-3
Table 5.11-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other Fisher	5.11-3
Table 5.11-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fisher County – Mining	5.11-5

Table 5.12-1	Grimes County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.12-1
Table 5.12-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Navasota	5.12-2
Table 5.12-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for TDCJ – Luther Units	5.12-3
Table 5.12-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for TDCJ – W. Pack Unit	5.12-4
Table 5.12-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Grimes County – Other	5.12-4
Table 5.12-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Grimes County – Mining	5.12-6
Table 5.12-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Grimes County – Irrigation	5.12-7
Table 5.13–1	Hamilton County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.13-1
Table 5.13–2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hamilton	5.13-2
Table 5.13–3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hico	5.13-3
Table 5.13–4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Hamilton County – Manufacturing	5.13-3
Table 5.13–5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Hamilton County – Manufacturing	5.13-4
Table 5.14-1	Haskell County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.14-1
Table 5.14-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Haskell	5.14-2
Table 5.14-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other Haskell	5.14-2
Table 5.14-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Haskell County – Mining	5.14-3
Table 5.14-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Haskell County – Irrigation	5.14-4
Table 5.15-1	Hill County Surplus (Shortage)	5.15-1
Table 5.15-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Brandon-Irene WSC	5.15-2
Table 5.15-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Brandon-Irene WSC	5.15-3
Table 5.15-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Chatt WSC	5.15-4
Table 5.15-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Double Diamond Utilities	5.15-5
Table 5.15-6	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for Double Diamond Utilities	5.15-6
Table 5.15-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Files Valley WSC	5.15-7
Table 5.15-8	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for Files Valley WSC	5.15-7
Table 5.15-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for HILCO United Services	5.15-8
Table 5.15-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Hillsboro	5.15-9
Table 5.15-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Itasca	5.15-10
Table 5.15-12	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Post Oak SUD	5.15-12
Table 5.15-13	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Whitney	5.15-13
Table 5.15-14	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Woodrow-Osceola WSC	5.15-14
Table 5.15-15	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Hill County - Other	5.15-15
Table 5.16-1	Hood County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.16-1
Table 5.16-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Acton MUD	5.16-2
Table 5.16-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Granbury	5.16-3
Table 5.16-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Lipan	5.16-4
Table 5.16-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Tolar	5.16-5
Table 5.16-6	Plan Costs by Decade for Hood County – Other	5.16-6
Table 5.16-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Hood County – Mining	5.16-7
Table 5.17-1	Johnson County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.17-1
Table 5.17-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bethesda WSC	5.17-3
Table 5.17-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Burleson	5.17-4
Table 5.17-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Cleburne	5.17-6
Table 5.17-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Godley	5.17-7
Table 5.17-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Grandview	5.17-8

Table 5.17-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Johnson County SUD	5.17-10
Table 5.17-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Parker WSC	5.17-12
Table 5.17-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Rio Vista	5.17-13
Table 5.17-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Venus	5.17-14
Table 5.17-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Johnson County – Steam-Electric	5.17-15
Table 5.17-12	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Johnson County – Irrigation	5.17-16
Table 5.18-1	Johnson County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.18-1
Table 5.18-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hamlin	5.18-2
Table 5.18-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Stamford	5.18-3
Table 5.18-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Jones County-Other	5.18-4
Table 5.18-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Jones County – Irrigation	5.18-5
Table 5.19-1	Kent County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.19-1
Table 5.19-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Jayton	5.19-2
Table 5.19-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Kent County-Other	5.19-2
Table 5.20-1	Knox County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.20-1
Table 5.20–2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Benjamin	5.20-2
Table 5.20–3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Knox City	5.20-3
Table 5.20–4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Munday	5.20-5
Table 5.20-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Knox County – Irrigation	5.20-7
Table 5.21-1	Lampasas County Surplus (Shortage)	5.21-1
Table 5.21-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Kempner WSC	5.21-2
Table 5.21-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Lampasas	5.21-4
Table 5.21-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Lampasas County-Manufacturing	5.21-5
Table 5.21-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Lampasas County - Minning	5.21-6
Table 5.21-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Lampasas County - Irrigation	5.21-7
Table 5.22-1	Lee County Surplus (Shortage)	5.22-1
Table 5.22-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Giddings	5.22-2
Table 5.22-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Lexington	5.22-3
Table 5.22-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Lee County-Other	5.22-4
Table 5.23-1	Limestone County Surplus (Shortage)	5.23-1
Table 5.23-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bistone Municipal Water Supply District	5.23-2
Table 5.23-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Coolidge	5.23-3
Table 5.23-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Groesbeck	5.23-4
Table 5.23-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Mexia	5.23-6
Table 5.23-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Prairie Hill WSC	5.23-7
Table 5.23-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Tri-County SUD	5.23-8
Table 5.23-8	Unmet Needs for White Rock Water SUD	5.23-8
Table 5.23-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the Limestone County - Manufacturing	5.23-10
Table 5.23-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Limestone County - Steam-Electric	5.23-11
Table 5.23-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Limestone County - Mining	5.23-12
Table 5.24-1	McLennan County Surplus (Shortage)	5.24-1
Table 5.24-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Axtell WSC	5.24-3
Table 5.24-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bellmead	5.24-4

Table 5.24-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bruceville-Eddy	5.24-5
Table 5.24-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Central Bosque WSC	5.24-5
Table 5.24-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Central Bosque WSC	5.24-6
Table 5.24-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Crawford	5.24-7
Table 5.24-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Cross County WSC	5.24-8
Table 5.24-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for East Crawford WSC	5.24-9
Table 5.24-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for EOL WSC	5.24-10
Table 5.24-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Gholson WSC	5.24-11
Table 5.24-12	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hewitt	5.24-12
Table 5.24-13	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the Hog Creek WSC	5.24-13
Table 5.24-14	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Lacy-Lakeview	5.24-14
Table 5.24-15	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Leroy Tours Gerald WSC	5.24-15
Table 5.24-16	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Levi WSC	5.24-16
Table 5.24-17	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Lorena	5.24-17
Table 5.24-18	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Mart	5.24-18
Table 5.24-19	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of McGregor	5.24-19
Table 5.24–20	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the McLennan County WCID No. 2	5.24-20
Table 5.24–21	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Moody	5.24-20
Table 5.24–22	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for North Bosque WSC	5.24-21
Table 5.24–23	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Riesel	5.24-22
Table 5.24–24	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Robinson	5.24-23
Table 5.24–25	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Spring Valley WSC	5.24-24
Table 5.24–26	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Texas State Technical College	5.24-25
Table 5.24–27	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Waco	5.24-26
Table 5.24–28	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of West	5.24-28
Table 5.24–29	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Windsor Water	5.24-29
Table 5.24–30	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Woodway	5.24-30
Table 5.24–31	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the McLennan County - Other	5.24-31
Table 5.24–32	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for McLennan County - Manufacturing	5.24-32
Table 5.24–33	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for McLennan County Irrigation	5.24-33
Table 5.25-1	Milam County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.25-1
Table 5.25-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Cameron	5.25-2
Table 5.25-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Milano WSC	5.25-3
Table 5.25-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for North Milam WSC	5.25-3
Table 5.25-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Rockdale	5.25-5
Table 5.25-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Salem Elm Ridge WSC	5.25-6
Table 5.25-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Southwest Milam WSC	5.25-7
Table 5.25-8	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for Southwest Milam WSC	5.25-8
Table 5.25-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Thorndale	5.25-9
Table 5.25-10	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of Thorndale	5.25-9
Table 5.25-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Milam County-Other	5.25-10
Table 5.25-12	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Milam County – Mining	5.25-11
Table 5.26-1	Nolan County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.26-1
Table 5.26-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bitter Creek WSC	5.26-2
Table 5.26-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Roscoe	5.26-3

Table 5.26-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Sweetwater	5.26-4
Table 5.26-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Nolan County - Manufacturing	5.26-5
Table 5.26-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Nolan County – Mining	5.26-6
Table 5.26-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Nolan County – Irrigation	5.26-8
Table 5.27-1	Palo Pinto County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.27-1
Table 5.27-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Gordon	5.27-2
Table 5.27-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Mineral Wells	5.27-4
Table 5.27-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Possum Kingdom WSC	5.27-5
Table 5.27-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Sportsmans World MUD	5.27-6
Table 5.27-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Strawn	5.27-7
Table 5.27-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – County-Other	5.27-8
Table 5.27-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – Manufacturing	5.27-9
Table 5.27-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – Mining	5.27-10
Table 5.27-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – Irrigation	5.27-11
Table 5.27-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – Livestock	5.27-12
Table 5.28-1	Robertson County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.28-1
Table 5.28-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bremond	5.28-2
Table 5.28-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Calvert	5.28-2
Table 5.28-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hearne	5.28-3
Table 5.28-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Robertson County WSC	5.28-4
Table 5.28-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Twin Creek WSC	5.28-5
Table 5.28-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other Robertson	5.28-5
Table 5.28-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Robertson County Steam-Electric	5.28-6
Table 5.28-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Robertson County – Irrigation	5.28-7
Table 5.29-1	Shackelford County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.29-1
Table 5.29-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Albany	5.29-2
Table 5.30-1	Somervell County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.30-1
Table 5.30-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Glen Rose	5.30-2
Table 5.30-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Somervell County Water District	5.30-3
Table 5.30-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Somervell County – Steam-Electric	5.30-5
Table 5.30-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Somervell County – Mining	5.30-5
Table 5.30-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Somervell County – Livestock	5.30-6
Table 5.31-1	Stephens County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.31-1
Table 5.31-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Breckenridge	5.31-2
Table 5.31-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fort Griffin SUD	5.31-2
Table 5.31-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Stephens Regional SUD	5.31-3
Table 5.31-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Stephens County – Irrigation	5.31-5
Table 5.32-1	Stonewall County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.32-1
Table 5.32-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Aspermont	5.32-2
Table 5.32-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Stonewall County – Mining	5.32-3
Table 5.33-1	Taylor County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.33-1
Table 5.33-2	City of Abilene Demands and Supplies	5.33-3
Table 5.33-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Abilene	5.33-5
Table 5.33-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Lawn	5.33-6
Table 5.33-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Potosi WSC	5.33-7

Table 5.33-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for S U N WSC	5.33-7
Table 5.33-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Steamboat Mountain WSC	5.33-8
Table 5.33-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Taylor County-Other	5.33-10
Table 5.33-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Taylor County-Manufacturing	5.33-10
Table 5.33-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Taylor County – Mining	5.33-11
Table 5.33-12	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Taylor County – Irrigation	5.33-12
Table 5.34-1	Throckmorton County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.34-1
Table 5.34-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Throckmorton	5.34-2
Table 5.34-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Throckmorton County – Mining	5.34-3
Table 5.34-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Throckmorton County – Irrigation	5.34-4
Table 5.35-1	Washington County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.35-1
Table 5.35-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Brenham	5.35-2
Table 5.35-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Central Washington County WSC	5.35-3
Table 5.35-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Chappell Hill WSC	5.35-3
Table 5.35-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Corix Utilities	5.35-4
Table 5.35-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Washington County – Manufacturing	5.35-5
Table 5.35-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Washington County – Mining	5.35-6
Table 5.36-1	Williamson County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.36-1
Table 5.36-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bartlett	5.36-3
Table 5.36-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Blockhouse MUD	5.36-4
Table 5.36-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Brushy Creek MUD	5.36-5
Table 5.36-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Cedar Park	5.36-6
Table 5.36-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fern Bluff MUD	5.36-7
Table 5.36-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Florence	5.36-8
Table 5.36-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Georgetown	5.36-10
Table 5.36-9	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of Georgetown	5.36-11
Table 5.36-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Granger	5.36-12
Table 5.36-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hutto	5.36-13
Table 5.36-12	Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hutto	5.36-13
Table 5.36-13	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Jarrell-Schwertner WSC	5.36-14
Table 5.36-14	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Jarrell-Schwertner WSC	5.36-15
Table 5.36-15	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Leander	5.36-16
Table 5.36-16	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Liberty Hill	5.36-18
Table 5.36-17	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Noack WSC	5.36-19
Table 5.36-18	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Paloma Lake MUD 1	5.36-19
Table 5.36-19	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Paloma Lake MUD 2	5.36-20
Table 5.36-20	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Round Rock	5.36-22
Table 5.36-21	Alternative WMS Costs by Decade for City of Round Rock	5.36-22
Table 5.36-22	Projected Surplus/Shortage by Decade for Sonterra MUD	5.36-23
Table 5.36-23	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Taylor	5.36-24
Table 5.36-24	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Vista Oaks MUD	5.36-25
Table 5.36-25	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Walsh Ranch MUD	5.36-25
Table 5.36-26	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County MUD 10	5.36-26
Table 5.36-27	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County MUD 11	5.36-27

Table 5.36-28	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County WSID 3	5.36-28
Table 5.36-29	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson-Travis Counties MUD 1	5.36-28
Table 5.36-30	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County–Other	5.36-30
Table 5.36-31	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County – Manufacturing	5.36-32
Table 5.36-32	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County – Irrigation	5.36-33
Table 5.37-1	Young County Surplus/(Shortage)	5.37-1
Table 5.37-2	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fort Belknap WSC	5.37-2
Table 5.37-3	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Graham	5.37-3
Table 5.37-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County-Other	5.37-4
Table 5.37-5	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County Manufacturing	5.37-5
Table 5.37-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County Steam-Electric	5.37-6
Table 5.37-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County – Irrigation	5.37-7
Table 5.38-1	WWP Surplus/(Shortage)	5.38-1
Table 5.38-2	Supplies and Demands for the BRA Lake Aquilla System	5.38-2
Table 5.38-3	WWP Surplus/(Shortage)	5.38-3
Table 5.38-4	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the BRA Little River System	5.38-4
Table 5.38-5	Supplies and Demands for the BRA Main Stem/Lower Basin System	5.38-6
Table 5.38-6	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the BRA Main Stem System	5.38-7
Table 5.38-7	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Aquilla WSD	5.38-7
Table 5.38-8	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County WCID No.	5.38-9
Table 5.38-9	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bluebonnet WSC	5.38-11
Table 5.38-10	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Central Texas WSC	5.38-12
Table 5.38-11	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for FHLM WSC	5.38-13
Table 5.38-12	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for North Central Texas MWA	5.38-14
Table 5.38-13	Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No.1	5.38-14
Table 5.38-14	Supplies and Demands for the West Central Texas Municipal Water District	5.38-15
Table 5.40-1	Implementation Status of Certain WMS Projects Reference Information (volumes in ac-ft/yr)	5.40-3
Table 5.41-1	Brushy Creek Reservoir	5-2
Table 5.41-2	Bryan Aquifer Storage & Recovery (Carrizo-Wilcox)	5-2
Table 5.41-3	Cedar Ridge Reservoir	5-3
Table 5.41-4	Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir	5-3
Table 5.41-5	Georgetown Reclamation	5-3
Table 5.41-6	Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir	5-4
Table 5.41-7	NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir	5-4
Table 5.41-8	New Throckmorton Reservoir	5-5
Table 5.41-9	Turkey Peak Reservoir	5-5
Table 5.41-10	Implementation Status Chart for Major Water Management Strategies	5-7
Table 6.1	Recommended WMS Included in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis	6-4
Table 6.2	Locations for Evaluating the Effects of Recommended Strategies on Streamflow and Inflows to the Brazos River Estuary	6-5
Table 6.3	Summary of WMS, Potential Water Quality Concerns, and WUGs Potentially Affected	6-19
Table 6.4	Needs Left Unmet for Brazos G Primary WUGs by Use Category	6-27

Table 6.5	Needs for WUGs Left Unmet in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan	6-28
Table 7.1	PDSI Value Ranges	7-4
Table 7.2	DOR Based on Reservoir Firm Yield Analysis	7-7
Table 7.3	Percent of Days the Brazos River is Below Mean Annual Flow for Three Drought Periods	7-10
Table 7.4	Drought Sensitivity of Brazos G Aquifers	7-13
Table 7.5	Summary of DCPs for WUGs in the Brazos G Area	7-21
Table 7.6	Summary of DCPs for WWPs in the Brazos G Area	7-45
Table 7.7	Summary of Groundwater Conservation District DCPs in the Brazos G Area	7-51
Table 7.8	Summary of Emergency Interconnects in the Brazos G Area	7-57
Table 7.9	Alternative Water Supply Initiatives for WUG/WWPs in the Brazos G Area	7-65
Table 7.10	Potential Emergency Water Supplies for Small and County-Other WUGs Facing Loss of Supply	7-67
Table 7.11	Waco Surface Water Drought Contingency Response	7-85
Table 7.12	Thrall Groundwater Drought Contingency Response	7-89
Table 9.1	New WUGs in the 2026 Plan	9-3
Table 9.2	Assumptions for Determining Water Available to Current Supplies and WMS	9-7
Table 10.1	Comments Received from WUGs, WWPs and MWPs	10-5
Table 10.2	Comments Received from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	10-7
Table 10.3	Comments Received from Public	10-8
Table 10.4	Level 1 Comments Received from TWDB	10-15
Table 10.5	Level 2 Comments Received from TWDB	10-45

Figures

Figure ES-1	Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area	ES-2
Figure ES-2	Historical and Projected Brazos G Area Population	ES-5
Figure ES-3	Historical and Projected Population by Subregion	ES-6
Figure ES-4	Projected Total Water Demand	ES-7
Figure ES-5	Total Water Demand by Type of Use in 2030 and 2080	ES-8
Figure ES-6	Distribution of Water Rights in the Region G Portion of the Brazos River Basin	ES-10
Figure ES-7	GCDs and GMAs Located Wholly or Partially in the Brazos G Area	ES-12
Figure 1.1	Location Map	1-2
Figure 1.2	Major Features of the Brazos G Area	1-3
Figure 1.3	Historical and Projected BGWRPA Population	1-5
Figure 1.4	Historical and Projected Population by Subregion	1-6
Figure 1.5	2030 Population Distribution by County	1-7
Figure 1.6	2080 Population Distribution by County	1-8
Figure 1.7	Average Annual Precipitation (1981 to 2022)	1-11
Figure 1.8	BGRWPA Historical Water Use by Source (1981 to 2021)	1-12
Figure 1.9	Major Aquifers	1-14
Figure 1.10	Minor Aquifers	1-15
Figure 1.11	Brazos G Area Historical Water Pumpage by Aquifer	1-16
Figure 1.12	2021 Total Water Use by County	1-27
Figure 1.13	Historical Water Use by Type	1-28

Figure 1.14	2021 Municipal Water Use	1-29
Figure 1.15	2021 Industrial Water Use (Manufacturing, Steam-Electric Cooling, and Mining)	1-30
Figure 1.16	2021 Agricultural Water Use (Livestock and Irrigation)	1-31
Figure 1.17	Vegetational Areas of the Brazos G Area	1-33
Figure 1.18	Geology of the Brazos G Area	1-35
Figure 1.19	Soils of the Brazos G Area	1-36
Figure 1.20	Water Resources of the Brazos G Area	1-39
Figure 1.21	Biotic Provinces of the Brazos G Area	1-40
Figure 1.22	PGMAs	1-54
Figure 1.23	GCDs and Groundwater Management Areas Located Wholly or Partially within the Brazos G Area	1-55
Figure 2.1	Population Projections	2-2
Figure 2.2	Projected Annual County Growth Rates in the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area	2-18
Figure 2.3	Projected Total Water Demand	2-21
Figure 2.4	Total Water Demand by Type of Use in 2030 and 2080	2-22
Figure 2.5	Municipal Water Demand Projections	2-35
Figure 2.6	Manufacturing Water Demand Projections	2-48
Figure 2.7	Steam-Electric Water Demand Projections	2-50
Figure 2.8	Mining Water Demand Projections	2-52
Figure 2.9	Irrigation Water Demand Projections	2-54
Figure 2.10	Livestock Water Demand Projections	2-56
Figure 3.1	Distribution of Water Rights in the Brazos River Basin	3-3
Figure 3.2	Comparison of Number of Water Rights in the Brazos River Basin by Planning Area	3-4
Figure 3.3	Comparison of Authorized Diversion Volume (acre-feet/year) in the Brazos River Basin by Planning Area	3-5
Figure 3.4	Comparison of Cumulative Diversion Volume and Priority Date for the Brazos G Area and Region H	3-6
Figure 3.5	Comparison of Storage and Diversion Volumes for Brazos G and Region H	3-7
Figure 3.6	Major Water Rights and Reservoirs in the Brazos River Basin	3-9
Figure 3.7	Comparison of Cumulative Streamflows for Two Drought Periods for the Clear Fork at Nugent, TX Streamgage (08084000)	3-38
Figure 3.8	Comparison of modeled BRA System Yield from BRA Water Conservation Plan and from Brazos G WAM Projections	3-44
Figure 3.9	Comparison of Simulated Median Annual Unappropriated Flow to 2026 Brazos G Plan	3-46
Figure 3.10	Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River at South Bend (BRSB23)	3-47
Figure 3.11	Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Glen Rose (BRGR30)	3-47
Figure 3.12	Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Aquilla (BRAQ33)	3-48
Figure 3.13	Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Waco (BOWA40)	3-48
Figure 3.14	Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Little River at Cameron (LRCA58)	3-49

Figure 3.15	Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Bryan (BRBR59)	3-49
Figure 3.16	Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Hempstead (BRHE68)	3-50
Figure 3.17	Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River at Richmond (BRRI70)	3-50
Figure 3.18	Groundwater Management Areas in Brazos G	3-67
Figure 3.19	Distribution of Groundwater by Area within Brazos G	3-72
Figure 3.20	Major Aquifers in the Western Area	3-73
Figure 3.21	Minor Aquifers in the Western Area	3-74
Figure 3.22	Groundwater Availability in the Western Area	3-75
Figure 3.23	Major Aquifers in the Central Area	3-76
Figure 3.24	Minor Aquifers in the Central Area	3-77
Figure 3.25	Groundwater Availability in the Central Area	3-78
Figure 3.26	Major Aquifers in the Eastern Area	3-80
Figure 3.27	Minor Aquifers in the Eastern Area	3-81
Figure 3.28	Groundwater Availability in the Southeastern Area	3-82
Figure 5.25-1	City of Rockdale Projected Population Growth	5.25-5
Figure 6.1	Cumulative Gaged Flows at Clear Fork of the Brazos near Nugent	6-2
Figure 6.2	Location of Recommended WMS Included in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis	6-4
Figure 6.3	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River at South Bend	6-8
Figure 6.4	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River near Glen Rose	6-9
Figure 6.5	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River near Aquilla	6-10
Figure 6.6	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Bosque River near Waco	6-11
Figure 6.7	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Little River near Cameron	6-12
Figure 6.8	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River near Bryan	6-13
Figure 6.9	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River near Hempstead	6-14
Figure 6.10	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River at Richmond	6-15
Figure 6.11	Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River at Gulf of Mexico	6-16
Figure 7.1	Map of Brazos G Sub-Areas	7-2
Figure 7.2	Map of Brazos G Climate Divisions	7-3
Figure 7.3	Historical Palmer Drought Severity Indices: Division 3	7-5
Figure 7.4	Historical Palmer Drought Severity Indices: Division 2	7-5
Figure 7.5	Historical Weighted Average Palmer Drought Severity Indices: Upper Brazos G	7-6
Figure 7.6	Historical Weighted Average PDSI: Mid Brazos G	7-6
Figure 7.7	Historical Weighted Average PDSI: Lower Brazos G	7-6
Figure 7.8	Sites Selected for Naturalized Streamflow Analysis	7-9
Figure 7.9	Annual Naturalized Flows at Three Sites on the Main Stem of the Brazos River	7-10
Figure 7.10	Cumulative Naturalized Streamflow for Three Drought Periods for Upper, Mid, & Lower Brazos G	7-11
Figure 7.11	Comparison of Low-Flow Periods for Six Selected Locations	7-12
Figure 7.12	Drought Sensitivity of Brazos G Aquifers	7-14
Figure 7.13	Drought Sensitivity of Brazos G Aquifers	7-16

Figure 9.1	Water Demand Projections in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans	9-5
Figure 9.2	Groundwater Availability in Brazos G Region	9-6
Figure 9.3	GMAs in the Brazos G Region	9-6
Figure 9.4	Groundwater Supplies Available to WUGs in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans	9-8
Figure 9.5	Surface Water Supplies Available to WUGs in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans	9-9
Figure 9.6	Total Water Supplies Available to WUGs in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans	9-9
Figure 9.7	Municipal Surpluses and Needs (Shortages) in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans	9-10
Figure 9.8	Total Surpluses and Needs (Shortages) in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans	9-11

Abbreviations

°F	degrees Fahrenheit
AAC	average annual capacity
ac-ft	acre-feet
ac-ft/yr	acre-feet per year
ARP	aquifer recharge project
ASR	aquifer storage and recovery
BFZ	Balcones Fault Zone
BGRWPA	Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area
BRA	Brazos River Authority
Carollo	Carollo Engineers
cfs	cubic foot per second
CRMWD	Colorado River Municipal Water District
CRP	Clean Rivers Program
DCP	drought contingency plan
DFC	desired future condition
DOR	drought of record
DPR	direct potable reuse
DWDOR	droughts worse than the drought of record
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EWCWTP	East Williamson County Water Treatment Plant
FHLM	Falls, Hill, Limestone, and McLennan counties
ft	foot or feet
GAM	groundwater availability model
GCD	groundwater conservation district
GMA	groundwater management area
gpcd	gallons per capita per day
GWA	Groundwater Management Areas
IBT	Interbasin Transfer
IPR	indirect potable reuse
IPP	Initially Prepared Plan
LCRA	Lower Colorado River Authority
MAG	modeled available groundwater
MCL	maximum contaminant level
mg/L	milligrams per liter
mgd	million gallons per day
MUD	municipal utility district
MWD	municipal water district
MWP	major water provider

MWSD	municipal water supply district
NCTMWA	North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRD	normal-rated design
OCR	off-channel reservoir
PDI	precipitation deficit index
PDSI	Palmer Drought Severity Index
PGMA	priority groundwater management areas
PWS	public water system
RUA	Regional Utility Authority
RWPG	Regional Water Planning Group
SB1	Senate Bill 1
SB2	Senate Bill 2
SDWA	Safe Water Drinking Act
SFWQC	Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation
SLR	Sandow Lakes Ranch
SUD	special utility district
SWAP	Source Water Assessment and Protection
TAC	Texas Administrative Code
TAWWA	Texas Section of the American Water Works Association
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TDS	total dissolved solids
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TPWD	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
TRWD	Tarrant Regional Water District
TWC	Texas Water Code
TWDB	Texas Water Development Board
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WAM	water availability models
WCP	water conservation plan
WCID	water control and improvement district
WMARSS	Waco Metropolitan Area Regional Sewerage System
WMS	water management strategies
WRAP	Water Rights Analysis Package
WSC	water supply corporation
WSD	water supply district
WSID	water, sewage, irrigation, and drainage
WTP	water treatment plant

WTP	water treatment plant
WUG	water user group
WWP	wholesale water provider
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 Background

Since 1957, the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) has been charged with preparing a comprehensive and flexible long-term plan for the development, conservation, and management of the State's water resources. The current State Water Plan, Water for Texas, January 2022, was produced by the TWDB and based on approved regional water plans pursuant to requirements of Senate Bill 1 (SB1), enacted in 1997 by the 75th Legislature, and further modified by subsequent legislation. As stated in SB1, the purpose of the regional water planning effort is to:

> *"Provide for the orderly development, management, and conservation of water resources and preparation for and response to drought conditions in order that sufficient water will be available at a reasonable cost to ensure public health, safety, and welfare; further economic development; and protect the agricultural and natural resources of that particular region."*

SB1 also provides that future regulatory and financing decisions of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) and the TWDB be consistent with approved regional plans.

The TWDB is the State agency designated to coordinate the overall Statewide planning effort. The Brazos G Area, which is comprised of all or portions of 37 counties (Figure ES-1), is one of the State's 16 regional water planning areas established by the TWDB. The Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (BGRWPG) was originally appointed by the TWDB to represent a wide range of legislatively defined stakeholder interests and acts as the steering and decision-making body of the regional planning effort. As members (who serve without pay) leave the planning group, new members are appointed by the BGRWPG through solicitation of nominations. The BGRWPG adopted bylaws to govern its operations and, in accordance with its bylaws, designated the Brazos River Authority (BRA) as the administrative agency and principal contractor to receive grants from the TWDB to develop the water plan. Ms. Pamela Hanneman currently serves as the Regional Planning Project Manager for the BRA. The BGRWPG selected Carollo Engineers (Carollo) as the prime consultant for the planning and engineering tasks necessary for plan development. The firms of Plummer, Inc., and Advanced Groundwater Solutions, LLC.have contributed as subconsultants to Carollo.



Figure ES-1 Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area

The BGRWPG consists of 23 voting members who represent the following 12 interest groups:

- The public.
- Counties.
- Municipalities.
- Industries.
- Agriculture.
- The environment.
- Small businesses.
- Electric-generating utilities.
- River authorities.
- Water districts.
- Water utilities.
- Groundwater management areas (GMAs).

The BGRWPG also includes several non-voting members who participate in the deliberations of the BGRWPG and contribute excellent knowledge and insight to the Group. Table ES-1 lists the voting and non-voting members and interest groups represented on the BGRWPG who contributed to the development of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan (both current and recently resigned).

The regional water plans are developed on a five-year cycle, with previous plans developed in 2001, 2006, 2011, 2016, and 2021. In accordance with legislative and rule requirements, all the regional water plans must be completed and adopted by October 20, 2025. The TWDB will then compile the 16 plans into the 2027 State Water Plan. The regional water plans will continue to be updated every five years.

Table ES-1 Current and Recent Brazos G RWPG Members

Interest Group	Name
Voting Members	
Agricultural	Judge Dale Spurgin Wayne Wilson (Chairman)
Counties	Judge David Blackburn Judge Scott M. Felton Commissioner Gary Myers
Electric Generating Utilities	Ryan Bayle
Environmental	Luci Dunn
Industry	Alan Gardenhire
Municipalities	Jim Briggs Jennifer Nations Lisa Tyer Jerry K. “Kenny” Weldon
Public	Gary Newman
River Authorities	David Collinsworth
Small Business	Gail L. Peek
Water Districts	Patrick Wagner Kathy Turner
GMAs	Dirk Aaron Dale Adams Zach Holland Lynn Smith Gary Westbrook
Water Utilities	Charles Beseda
Non-Voting Members	
Texas Water Development Board	John Maurer Jean Devlin (former)
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Jennifer Bronson-Warren Lindsey Elkins
Texas Department of Agriculture	Lauren Moore
Texas Sate Soil and Water Conservation Board	Allen Nash

The planning horizon to be used is the 50-year period from 2030 to 2080. This planning period allows for long-term forecasting of future water demands and supplies sufficiently in advance of needs to allow for appropriate water management measures to be implemented. As required by statute, the TWDB has promulgated planning rules and guidelines to focus the efforts and to provide for general consistency among the planning areas so that the regional plans can then be aggregated into the overall State Water Plan.

The 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan is organized in accordance with TWDB guidelines by chapter as follows:

ES	Executive Summary
Chapter 1	Description of the Brazos G Area
Chapter 2	Projected Population and Water Demands
Chapter 3	Evaluation of Current Water Supplies
Chapter 4	Comparison of Water Demands with Water Supplies to Determine Needs
Chapter 5	County and Wholesale Water Provider Plans (Volume I)
Chapter 5	Evaluation of Water Management Strategies (Volume II)
Chapter 6	Consistency with Long Term Protection of the State's Water, Agricultural and Natural Resources
Chapter 7	Drought Response Information, Activities and Recommendations
Chapter 8	Recommendations for Unique Stream Segments, Unique Reservoir Sites and Other Legislative Policy Recommendations
Chapter 9	Implementation and Comparison to the 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan
Chapter 10	Public Participation and Adoption of Plan
Appendices	Various appendices containing supporting information

ES.2 Description of the Brazos G Area

The Brazos G Area can be described by a single word - diverse. From the piney woods of Brazos and Grimes Counties to the rolling plains of Nolan County; from sparsely populated Stonewall County to rapidly-growing Williamson County, often listed as the fastest growing county in the Nation; from the prodigious Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in the southeast to the meager dribbles from windmills in Shackelford County; from up to 50 inches of annual rainfall in the east to as low as 22 inches annually in the west; from the Chisholm Trail through Stephens County to the NAFTA trail known as Interstate Highway 35 (IH-35); these diverse characteristics make for a wide variation in water supplies, demands, and availability of affordable options to meet needs.

ES.3 Population and Water Demand Projections

The TWDB publishes draft population and water demand projections for each county in the State for use by the regional water planning groups. Population projections were developed for municipal water user groups (WUGs), which are defined as private or publicly owned water systems that provide more than 100 acre-feet per year (ac-ft/yr) for municipal use, and "County-Other" to aggregate those people living outside the WUG-sized utilities. In the Brazos G Area, population projections were completed for 289 municipal WUGs, including 37 County-Other WUGs. Multiple municipal WUGs are located in more than one county, resulting in 389 individual municipal WUG projections when the portions of WUGs located in different counties are separated. Water demand projections were also developed for other

types of non-municipal use on a county-wide basis, including manufacturing, steam-electric, mining, irrigation, and livestock uses.

Figure ES-2 illustrates population growth in the entire Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area (BGRWPA) for 1900 to 2020 and projected growth for 2030 to 2080.

Population trends may be further understood by dividing the planning Region into three subregions: the northwestern Rolling Plains, the central IH-35 Corridor, and the southeastern Lower Basin. Figure ES-3 illustrates historical population growth in the three sub-regions from 1900 to 2020 and projected growth from 2030 to 2080. Projected growth is greatest in the IH-35 Corridor.

Water demand projections have been compiled for six categories of water use: (1) municipal, (2) manufacturing, (3) steam-electric cooling, (4) mining, (5) irrigation, and (6) livestock. Each of the non-municipal uses is aggregated on a county basis and is defined as a separate WUG within each county. The TWDB has developed and provided water demand projections for each of the five non-municipal WUGs in each of the 37 counties in the Brazos G Area.



Figure ES-2 Historical and Projected Brazos G Area Population



Figure ES-3 Historical and Projected Population by Subregion

Annual total water use for the Region is projected to increase from 1,119,518 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 1,571,453 ac-ft/yr in 2080, a 40 percent increase, as shown in Table ES-2. The six types of water use as percentages of total water use are shown for 2030 and 2080 in Figure ES-5. The projections indicate that municipal water use as percentages of the total water use will increase from 2030 to 2080, while steam electric, irrigation, manufacturing, and livestock water use are projected to decrease as percentages of the total. Water use for mining is projected to be constant between 2030 and 2080.

Table ES-2 Brazos G Area Total Water Demand by Type of Use (acre-feet/year)

Water Use	Historical (1)		Projections (1)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Municipal	326,414	383,011	552,334	654,908	746,902	832,014	915,785	1,002,767
Manufacturing	46,131	9,718	16,847	17,474	18,124	18,800	19,498	20,223
Steam-Electric	76,545	204,266	158,660	158,660	158,660	158,660	158,660	158,660
Mining	53,383	16,454	27,389	28,139	25,835	26,406	25,893	26,283
Irrigation	298,754	310,817	320,150	320,150	319,772	319,536	319,382	319,382
Livestock	51,943	44,064	44,138	44,138	44,138	44,138	44,138	44,138
Brazos G Total	**853,170**	**968,330**	**1,119,518**	**1,223,469**	**1,313,431**	**1,399,554**	**1,483,356**	**1,571,453**

Notes:
(1) 2010 demand was obtained from the 2021 Plan, and the 2020 demand was obtained from the TWDB Water Use Survey. Projections from Texas Water Development Board.



Figure ES-4 Projected Total Water Demand



Figure ES-5 Total Water Demand by Type of Use in 2030 and 2080

ES.4 Water Supply

ES.1.1 Surface Water Supplies

Streamflow in the Brazos River and its tributaries, along with reservoirs in the Brazos River Basin, comprise a vast supply of surface water in the Brazos G Area. Diversion and use of this surface water occurs throughout the entire Region with over 1,000 water rights currently issued. These water rights provide authorization for an owner to divert, store, and use the water; however, they do not guarantee that a dependable supply will be available from the water source. The availability of water to a water right is dependent on several factors, including hydrologic conditions (i.e., rainfall, runoff, spring flow), priority date of the water right, quantity of authorized storage, and any special conditions associated with the water right (i.e., instream flow requirements, maximum diversion rate). The principal tributaries to the Brazos River in the planning area are the Clear Fork, the Double Mountain Fork, the Salt Fork, Bosque River, Little River, Navasota River, and Yegua Creek. Major water supply reservoirs are owned by the BRA (three in the planning area), US Army Corps of Engineers (nine in the area), West Central Texas MWD, the City of Abilene, and Texas Utilities. The western part of the area is heavily dependent on surface water sources, largely due to limited quantities of groundwater.

ES.1.1.1 Surface Water Rights

The State of Texas owns the surface water resources of the State, and issues water rights to utilize surface water. The TCEQ maintains a database of all active water rights referred to as "WRactive", which is available for download from the TCEQ website. The July 2024 version of this database indicates that TCEQ has issued 1,134 active water rights totaling 3,854,018 ac-ft/yr of authorized diversions for the Brazos River Basin. Since 2020, three permanent water rights totaling 52,976 ac-ft/yr have been issued. The summary statistics referenced herein are based on the information reflected in this July 2024 version of the database.

The Brazos G Area includes many of the water rights in the Brazos River Basin. A total of 987 water rights exists in the Brazos G portion of the Brazos River Basin, with a total authorized diversion of 1,457,202 ac-ft/yr. In the Brazos G portion of the Brazos River Basin, 31 water rights (3.1 percent) make up 1,225,975 ac-ft/yr (84.1 percent) of the authorized diversion volume. The remaining 956 water rights primarily consist of small irrigation rights distributed throughout the area. It is important to note that a small percentage of the water rights represent a large percentage of the total authorized diversion volume in the Brazos River Basin. The BRA System Operation Permit alone comprises 11 percent of the total authorized diversion volume. Forty-six other major water rights comprise 3,148,642 ac-ft/yr (82 percent) of the authorized diversion volume. The BRA, Gulf Coast Water Authority, and Dow Chemical Company are the three largest water right holders and own approximately 71 percent of the total authorized diversion amount in the Basin. The remaining 1,090 water rights primarily consist of the small irrigation rights distributed throughout the river basin. Figure ES-6 shows a comparison of significant water rights in the Brazos River Basin by number of rights and diversion volume.

The Brazos River Basin Water Availability Model (Brazos WAM) Run 3 maintained by the TCEQ for surface water permitting was used as the basis to determine surface water supply available to WUGs and Wholesale Water Providers (WWPs) in the Brazos G Area. The latest official WAM utilized for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan now has an extended period of naturalized flow data from 1949 through 2018, reflecting the effects of more recent drought conditions than what was represented in the previous official model. The model input data has been modified by the BGRWPG to conservatively

account for expected future return flows (discharge of wastewater effluent), future sedimentation conditions for major reservoirs, and existing subordination agreements. This resulting modified WAM is termed the "Brazos G WAM."

The firm yield - the 100 percent reliable amount that can be withdrawn annually through the drought of record - was computed for each major reservoir (greater than 5,000 ac-ft authorized storage capacity), and smaller reservoirs that serve as water sources. Source availabilities for run-of-river water rights are based on the minimum annual supply (computed on a monthly basis). Surface water supplies were allocated to individual WUGs and WWPs from sources based upon a listing of water right ownership as maintained by TCEQ, and contractual agreements between water rights holders and wholesale customers. Supplies were constrained based upon facility limitations to access the raw water supply, such as intake capacity and water treatment plant capacity.



Figure ES-6 Distribution of Water Rights in the Region G Portion of the Brazos River Basin

ES.1.1.2 New Drought of Record

The drought of record has historically been considered the drought of the 1950's drought, which forms the basis for water supply determinations for most of the State. In some parts of the upper Brazos Basin, the drought of the 1990s has continued past the turn of the century, and in many places streamflow data indicate that its severity is greater than that of the drought that occurred in the 1950s. The region of Texas near Abilene has experienced drought conditions in almost all years from the early 1990s until 2016. An analysis of updated critical periods for reservoir yield analysis using the extended period for the Brazos G WAM, naturalized streamflows, and the Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI) indicates that a new drought of record has occurred in the upper Brazos Basin (above Possum Kingdom Reservoir), but that the 1950's drought should continue to be considered the drought of record for the mid and lower Brazos G Area.

ES.1.2 Groundwater Supplies

Groundwater supplies in 21 counties in the Brazos G Area are regulated by 13 groundwater conservation districts (GCDs). These GCDs are part of GMAs 6, 7, 8, 12, and 14, which are tasked with determining Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) and the Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) for the jointly regulated aquifers in their areas. The GCDs and GMAs affecting the Brazos G Area are shown in Figure ES-7.

In general terms, the MAG represents the annual volume of groundwater available which may be developed and, according to modeling, will still maintain aquifer parameters within the criteria established in the aquifer DFCs. When evaluating proposed pumping for regulatory approval, the MAG serves as a guideline and may be one of multiple guidelines referenced. However, for planning purposes, the MAGs are considered hard caps of which annual groundwater production cannot exceed.

Seventeen aquifers underlie parts of the Brazos G Area, including six of the major and eleven of the minor aquifers in Texas. If developed fully, these sources can provide a combined reliable supply of about 574,366 ac-ft/yr, (2080 decade) based on the most recent MAGs and other availability estimates for aquifers without a MAG estimate. The Seymour Aquifer supplies significant quantities of water in the western part of the Region. Other aquifers that are depended on in the western part of the Region are the Blaine, Dockum, Cross Timbers, Edwards-Trinity (Plateau). The Trinity and Edwards-BFZ (Northern Segment) are heavily relied upon in the IH-35 corridor and to the west. In the eastern part of the Region, the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and Brazos River Alluvium have a prolific water supply with lesser amounts pumped from the Gulf Coast, Queen City, Sparta, Trinity, Navasota River Alluvium and Yegua-Jackson Aquifers.

MAG was allocated to each existing user based upon currently installed well capacity for municipal WUGs and WWPs, and recent pumping estimates for county-aggregated WUGs. When the existing capacities exceeded the MAG, supplies were adjusted proportionally so that the MAG would not be exceeded, consistent with requirements for regional water planning.



Figure ES-7 GCDs and GMAs Located Wholly or Partially in the Brazos G Area

ES.1.3 Water Quality

Natural salt pollution has been recognized as a serious and widespread water quality problem in the Brazos River Basin. No other pollution source, man-made or natural, has had the impact of the natural salt sources located in the Upper Basin. A substantial part of the salt load in the Brazos River is contributed by Croton Creek and Salt Croton Creek. The natural salt pollution producing area is a semi-arid region of salt and gypsum encrusted hills and canyon-like stream valleys. Numerous stream segments within the Brazos G Area are listed on the State's 303(d) list for bacteria levels that exceed the standards for contact recreation; however, bacteria, unlike salts, are easily managed through required conventional water treatment to meet drinking water standards. There are several special water quality studies that are on-going in the Brazos River Basin as described in the BRA's 2022 Basin Summary Report. A list of special studies by basin is provided in Chapter 3. As the Brazos River flows to the Gulf, inflows from tributaries dilute the concentration of dissolved minerals, improving the quality of water.

ES.1.4 Supply and Demand Comparison

Supplies are compared with projected demands, and shortages (needs) or surpluses are computed for each WUG and WWP. Detailed tabulations of water needs from various database reports are presented in the Executive Summary Appendix. A comparison of total supplies available (developed groundwater supplies and firm surface water) with demand for all use categories in the planning area shows a surplus in the 2030 planning decade, but an overall shortage past 2040. These mask surpluses that are projected to occur in individual water supply entities and WUGs. However, all 37 counties in the Brazos G Region are projected to have at least one municipal WUG shortage. A list of the reports available and incorporated herein is provided at the end of this Executive Summary.

ES.1.5 Water Supply Strategies to Meet Needs

The water management strategies in Table ES-3 were identified by the BGRWPG as potentially feasible to meet shortages. These strategies were evaluated by the consultant team and compared to criteria utilizing a formal process adopted by the BGRWPG. The methods by which the strategies were evaluated, and the technical evaluations of the potentially feasible water management strategies are presented in Volume II.

Table ES-3 Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies Evaluated for the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

Chapter (Volume II)	Water Management Strategy and Description
2	**Water Conservation** (implement accelerated use of various water conservation techniques to achieve water savings above what is already included in the TWDB water demand projections)
3	**Wastewater Reuse** (use highly treated wastewater treatment plant effluent to meet non-potable and potable water needs)
4	**New Reservoirs** (new or updated evaluations of the following proposed new reservoirs) ▪ Brushy Creek Reservoir ▪ Cedar Ridge Reservoir ▪ Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir ▪ City of Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir ▪ NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir ▪ New Throckmorton Reservoir ▪ Turkey Peak Dam
5	**Groundwater** ▪ City of Bryan Groundwater Strategies ▪ City of College Station Groundwater Strategies ▪ City of Georgetown Groundwater Strategies ▪ City of Temple Groundwater Strategies
6	**Conjunctive Use** (conjunctively use surface water supplies with available groundwater supplies) ▪ Lake Granger Augmentation ▪ Oak Creek Reservoir Conjunctive Operation

Chapter (Volume II)	Water Management Strategy and Description
7	**Aquifer Storage and Recovery** (Inject or percolate excess surface water into groundwater aquifers, storing for future use) ▪ City of Bryan ASR ▪ City of College Station ASR ▪ Lake Georgetown ASR ▪ Lake Granger ASR ▪ Fort Cavazos ASR ▪ City of Temple ASR
8	**Regional Water Supply Projects** ▪ Bosque County Regional Project ▪ Brushy Creek RUA Water Supply Project ▪ East Williamson County Water Supply Project ▪ Belhouse Drought Preparedness Project ▪ Lake Whitney Water Supply Project (Cleburne) ▪ Rolling Plains Groundwater Conservation District Managed Aquifer Recharge Project ▪ Somervell County Water Supply Project ▪ West Texas Water Partnership Supply to Abilene (Region F evaluation) ▪ Central Texas Water Alliance Strategy
9	**Augmentation of Existing Reservoir Supplies** ▪ Lake Aquilla Storage Reallocation ▪ Lake Granger Storage Reallocation ▪ Lake Whitney Reallocation ▪ Lake Waco Reallocation
10	**Brush Control** (increase deep percolation and discharge to streams by removing unwanted brush
11	**Miscellaneous Strategies** (various pipelines, treatment plants and groundwater wells to meet projected needs of WUGs and wholesale water providers)

ES.5 Water Plan Findings

Conservation is considered first as a water management strategy for all WUGs with identified needs before any other water management strategies. Second-Tier water needs are those water needs remaining after implementation of conservation and direct reuse strategies. A presentation of Second-Tier water needs for each WUG is included in Reports 7 and 8 in the Executive Summary Appendix. The individual plans for each WUG in Chapter 5 also include a presentation of water needs remaining after advanced conservation.

The 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan includes recommendations for 171,419 ac-ft/yr of municipal conservation and water loss reduction savings and another 65,517 ac-ft/yr for both direct and indirect wastewater reuse by 2080. The conservation savings are more than those already included in the TWDB demand projections. Conservation savings for municipal users reflect a 1 percent annual reduction in per capita consumption until a target of 140 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) is reached. Conservation recommendations for several entities in Williamson County go beyond this and call for a reduction to a target of 120 gpcd by 2080.

Water management strategies and projects recommended to meet water needs are presented for WUGs and WWPs in Chapter 5. Table ES-4 includes a summary of recommended strategies and projects.

Table ES-4 Summary of Strategies and Projects Recommended for WUGs and/or WWPs

Recommended Strategies and Projects	WUGs Receiving Supply	Supply Developed						Total Project Cost
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Irrigation Conservation	18	7,035	11,727	16,260	16,271	16,348	16,348	$0
Manufacturing Conservation	9	312	546	792	818	847	879	$0
Mining Conservation	16	617	1,070	1,455	1,435	1,348	1,344	$0
Municipal Conservation	141	25,326	61,080	88,280	115,117	137,384	162,885	$0
Municipal Water Loss Reduction	44	6,588	6,980	7,391	7,798	8,144	8,534	$46,047,450
Reuse	21	31,498	42,447	51,727	53,407	65,517	65,517	$494,826,000
ASR	9	24,929	35,928	40,593	43,093	45,093	49,219	$460,083,000
Increased or New WTP Capacity	11	10,381	15,102	15,836	16,909	16,554	15,520	$43,500,000
Purchase of Water/Voluntary Redistribution	36	38,939	39,205	40,769	41,279	40,191	43,238	$116,217,000
Blaine Groundwater	4	971	923	880	843	810	810	$4,622,000
Brazos River Alluvium Groundwater	1	325	325	325	325	325	325	$323,000
Carrizo-Wilcox Groundwater	11	26,121	36,454	51,853	67,742	83,747	82,547	$1,559,063,000
Cross Timbers Groundwater	5	799	799	799	799	799	799	$1,830,000
Edwards-BFZ Groundwater	2	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,335	$1,878,000
Edwards-Trinity-Plateau, Pecos Valley, and Trinity Groundwater	3	133	133	133	133	133	133	$1,878,000
Ellenburger-San Saba Groundwater	1	73	83	97	115	133	133	$8,775,000
Gulf Coast Groundwater	7	1,729	1,809	1,809	1,809	2,059	2,059	$17,664,000
Marble Falls Groundwater	1	203	195	198	201	204	204	$3,772,000
Other Groundwater	1	30	30	30	30	30	30	$277,000
Queen City Groundwater	3	949	949	949	949	949	949	$7,336,000

Recommended Strategies and Projects	WUGs Receiving Supply	Supply Developed						Total Project Cost
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Seymour Groundwater	6	445	10,447	15,947	15,950	15,953	15,956	$7,052,000
Sparta Groundwater	5	35	958	1,236	2,236	2,986	4,186	$17,950,000
Trinity Groundwater	44	17,539	16,605	17,029	18,339	19,536	19,439	$186,820,000
Woodbine Groundwater	5	225	224	225	449	1,287	1,287	$17,788,000
Yegua-Jackson Groundwater	3	1,325	1,325	1,325	1,325	2,325	3,361	$26,367,000
Belhouse Drought Preparedness Project	1	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	$101,598,000
Bosque County Regional Project	5	0	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	$72,283,000
BRA Highland Lake to County-Other	1	300	300	300	300	300	300	$115,654,000
Brushy Creek Reservoir	1	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	$59,720,000
Cedar Ridge Reservoir	8	0	25,547	25,541	25,536	25,531	25,531	$708,741,000
Central Texas WSC System Expansion	1	600	600	600	600	600	600	$85,080,000
City of Cameron Little River Intake	3	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	$14,785,000
Coryell County OCR	4	0	0	3,190	3,190	3,190	3,190	$132,206,000
Granbury North Water Treatment Plant	1	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	$59,504,000
Groesbeck OCR	1	0	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	$35,278,000
Lake Aquilla Pool Reallocation	2	0	0	0	1,950	1,950	1,950	$29,173,000
Lake Waco Reallocation	1	0	0	1,860	1,860	1,860	1,860	$31,219,000
NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir	5	0	0	6,090	6,090	6,090	6,090	$236,072,000
New Throckmorton Reservoir	2	0	0	1,280	1,280	1,280	1,280	$89,139,000
Oak Creek Reservoir-Conjunctive Use	1	475	512	549	586	623	660	$0
Reallocation of Supply from Moffat WSC	1	0	0	14	84	154	154	$0
Somervell County WSP Surplus	2	783	783	783	783	783	783	$19,575,000

Recommended Strategies and Projects	WUGs Receiving Supply	Supply Developed						Total Project Cost
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Storage Reallocation of Lake Whitney	9	93,355	93,355	93,355	93,355	93,355	93,355	$723,433,000
Turkey Peak Reservoir	3	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730	$241,789,000

New supplies of water in the Brazos G Area total 650,918 ac-ft/yr by 2080, comprised of newly developed groundwater, supply transferred from other regions, newly developed surface water supplies, and reuse, as well as supplies made available through conservation, water loss reduction, and augmentation of existing facilities, including water treatment plant expansions. These totals do not reflect water trades between users of existing supplies in Brazos G but represent entirely new supplies to the Brazos G Area. Total project costs for these new supplies exceed $5.7 billion.

Overdrafting of Lakes Georgetown and Granger when the reservoirs are nearly full and injecting part of this supply into the Trinity Aquifer through Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) projects can yield an additional 17,975 ac-ft/yr of supply when the ASR well field is operated in conjunction with the reservoirs. Similar ASR strategies for the Simsboro, Sparta, Queen City, and Trinity (McLennan County) aquifers add an additional 31,244 ac-ft/yr of supply.

Williamson County is projected to experience substantial growth in County-Other, which is specifically outside of areas that will be served by existing WUGs. The 2026 Plan includes multiple strategies to meet the needs of Williamson County-Other users, but successful development of these projects will require considerable cooperation amongst current WUGs and WWPs, and possibly formation of - or collaboration with - a regional provider to develop the large projects needed to meet these needs. Similar plans are presently being considered in Bell County.

Existing supplies combined with recommended water management strategies do not exceed the Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) from any aquifer in any county. This is a planning requirement that limits the number of available water management strategies in some cases. Nevertheless, GCDs are not required to utilize the applicable MAG for permitting and regulation of their jurisdiction; thus, the permitting of supplies may exceed amounts of source availability shown herein. Future utilization of existing supplies and new water management strategies will increase use from the water supply sources available to users in the Brazos G Region.

Alternative water management strategies are also presented in the Executive Summary Appendix. An alternative strategy can replace a recommended strategy by action of the regional water planning group, avoiding the need for new availability analyses and costing of the alternative strategy. Such a change would still necessitate a formal process by the RWPG as well as review and approval from the TWDB as part of the regional planning process.

The BGRWPG has recommended that irrigation, manufacturing, mining and steam-electric needs in some counties remain unmet, because there are no feasible water management strategies identified that can economically meet those needs. In addition, municipal needs remain unmet due to required infrastructure not being available or feasible, or other information exists indicating a strategy would not be feasibly implemented by the WUG or WWP. This has been a particular focus area of the BGRWPG, as there are cases where existing groundwater permit amounts exceed the MAGs for a given area, and thus recommending a different strategy would be infeasible. In such cases, the BGRWPG elected to avoid recommending an infeasible strategy. It should be noted, however, that these needs are typically only

unmet should a drought of severity equivalent to the drought of record occur prior to strategies scheduled to be in place. A summary of unmet needs is presented in Table ES-5.

Implementation of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan provides for the development of new water supplies that will be reliable in the event of a repeat of the most severe drought on record. Implementation of all recommended water management strategies would often provide supplies sufficient to meet more than the projected needs with which the strategies are associated.

Table ES-5 Needs for WUGs Left Unmet in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

Counties	WUG Name	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Municipal WUGs							
Bell	Bell County WCID 3	252	548	1,083	1,619	1,750	1,880
Bell	Belton	0	0	0	0	294	817
Bell	Central Texas College District	145	128	111	93	75	75
Bell	County-Other, Bell	473	564	598	536	427	275
Bell	Dog Ridge WSC	0	1	73	122	178	240
Bell	Elm Creek WSC	73	93	106	90	74	97
Bell	Georgetown	0	0	227	294	245	278
Bell	Jarrell-Schwertner	95	126	147	165	188	210
Bell	Killeen	0	0	0	0	322	3,901
Bell	The Grove WSC	0	0	4	11	16	49
Bosque	Cross Country WSC	0	0	0	0	0	5
Bosque	Hilco United Services	51	35	28	38	51	65
Bosque	Hog Creek WSC	18	10	2	0	0	0
Brazos	Texas A&M University	3,392	1,086	0	0	0	0
Brazos	Wickson Creek SUD	0	0	0	0	0	39
Comanche	County-Other, Comanche	1	0	0	0	0	0
Coryell	Copperas Cove	0	991	2,286	3,119	3,424	1,924
Coryell	Elm Creek WSC	22	22	23	17	11	9
Coryell	Fort Gates WSC	154	118	96	94	94	92
Coryell	Gatesville	482	585	0	0	0	0
Coryell	The Grove WSC	0	0	1	2	2	7
Erath	Stephenville	0	0	0	0	102	865
Falls	Cego-Durango WSC	0	6	34	58	89	133
Falls	Levi WSC	89	104	112	105	118	130
Grimes	County-Other, Grimes	199	229	255	265	268	261
Haskell	Haskell	538	473	0	0	0	0
Hill	Brandon Irene WSC	52	40	13	0	0	13
Hill	Chatt WSC	0	0	2	3	4	10
Hill	County-Other, Hill	127	128	144	161	167	151
Hill	Double Diamond Utilities	35	0	0	0	0	0
Hill	Files Valley WSC	0	0	0	0	0	8
Hill	Hilco United Services	181	121	92	117	149	181

Counties	WUG Name	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Hill	Itasca	1	1	1	1	0	1
Hill	Navarro Mills WSC	0	0	0	1	1	1
Hill	Rio Vista	1	1	1	1	1	1
Hood	County-Other, Hood	618	1,100	1,954	2,791	3,192	3,463
Johnson	County-Other, Johnson	14	0	0	0	0	0
Johnson	Crowley	1	0	0	0	0	2
Johnson	Godley	0	0	0	0	27	55
Johnson	Rio Vista	0	0	0	0	6	46
Knox	Benjamin	21	19	0	0	0	0
Knox	Knox City	182	183	0	0	0	0
Knox	Munday	202	183	0	0	0	0
Lampasas	Copperas Cove	0	35	88	134	154	88
Lee	County-Other, Lee	5	2	0	0	0	0
Limestone	Bistone Municipal Water Supply District	0	58	143	147	127	197
Limestone	Groesbeck	542	0	0	0	0	0
Limestone	Mexia	767	729	685	657	636	603
Limestone	Prairie Hill WSC	97	79	69	64	60	59
McLennan	County-Other, McLennan	0	169	214	232	124	250
McLennan	Cross Country WSC	0	0	0	0	0	131
McLennan	Elm Creek WSC	0	0	3	0	0	11
McLennan	Gholson WSC	0	0	49	0	0	79
McLennan	Hog Creek WSC	73	42	10	0	0	0
McLennan	Mart	66	0	0	0	0	0
McLennan	McGregor	39	0	0	0	0	0
McLennan	Prairie Hill WSC	97	94	96	105	116	135
McLennan	Texas State Technical College	139	0	0	0	0	0
McLennan	Waco	0	0	0	0	0	32
Milam	Thorndale	53	68	86	103	116	137
Palo Pinto	Double Diamond Utilities	346	311	274	230	160	93
Palo Pinto	Gordon	41	22	1	0	0	0
Robertson	County-Other, Robertson	44	15	0	0	0	0
Somervell	Somervell County Water District	461	260	11	0	0	0
Stephens	Fort Belknap WSC	0	0	0	0	2	4
Stonewall	Aspermont	16	0	0	0	0	0
Taylor	North Runnels WSC	68	77	85	93	103	114
Throckmorton	Fort Griffin SUD	9	5	5	4	2	0
Throckmorton	Throckmorton	84	71	0	0	0	0
Williamson	Brushy Creek MUD	481	108	0	0	8	28
Williamson	County-Other, Williamson	2,336	0	0	7,110	0	5,245
Williamson	Florence	18	18	20	21	23	25

Counties	WUG Name	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Williamson	Georgetown	0	5,215	30,332	44,419	46,139	60,216
Williamson	Hutto	620	982	1,751	3,067	5,164	9,041
Williamson	Jarrell-Schwertner	2,256	2,946	3,380	3,827	4,298	4,779
Williamson	Jonah Water SUD	1,690	3,273	4,690	6,149	8,668	11,502
Williamson	Leander	0	419	1,482	1,500	1,512	1,520
Williamson	Paloma Lake MUD 1	128	134	137	138	138	138
Williamson	Paloma Lake MUD 2	103	108	110	111	111	111
Williamson	Round Rock	0	0	4,451	0	0	1,295
Williamson	Sonterra MUD	936	2,267	3,843	5,551	7,474	9,638
Williamson	Taylor	1,801	3,238	4,870	6,391	8,094	9,995
Williamson	Williamson County WSID 3	40	155	359	643	966	1,333
Young	County-Other, Young	41	56	66	94	88	103
Young	Fort Belknap WSC	0	0	0	17	21	64
Young	Graham	1,451	1,189	317	127	9	0
Non-Municipal WUGs							
Bell	Irrigation, Bell	31	0	0	0	0	0
Comanche	Irrigation, Comanche	8,288	7,673	7,074	7,101	7,144	7,178
Grimes	Irrigation, Grimes	8	4	1	1	1	1
Hamilton	Irrigation, Hamilton	0	0	0	3	6	7
Haskell	Irrigation, Haskell	6,562	0	0	0	0	0
Johnson	Irrigation, Johnson	229	217	207	207	207	207
Knox	Irrigation, Knox	8,837	8,513	6,466	3,831	6,024	6,237
McLennan	Irrigation, McLennan	111	9	0	0	0	0
Nolan	Irrigation, Nolan	9,287	9,056	8,441	8,199	8,038	8,038
Robertson	Irrigation, Robertson	11,219	9,741	8,536	8,652	8,757	8,757
Stephens	Irrigation, Stephens	87	84	81	81	81	81
Taylor	Irrigation, Taylor	498	261	261	261	261	261
Williamson	Irrigation, Williamson	212	206	198	198	198	198
Young	Irrigation, Young	194	184	174	174	174	174
Comanche	Livestock, Comanche	784	784	784	784	784	784
Palo Pinto	Livestock, Palo Pinto	95	103	110	117	124	131
Somervell	Livestock, Somervell	21	21	21	21	21	21
Eastland	Manufacturing, Eastland	0	0	0	0	0	15
Lampasas	Manufacturing, Lampasas	37	45	49	58	61	53
Limestone	Manufacturing, Limestone	220	223	226	234	241	251
Taylor	Manufacturing, Taylor	0	0	0	402	526	0
Burleson	Mining, Burleson	3,384	3,273	3,161	3,161	3,161	3,161
Eastland	Mining, Eastland	213	221	199	214	200	200
Haskell	Mining, Haskell	4	4	4	4	4	4
Limestone	Mining, Limestone	2,923	2,892	2,858	2,878	1,953	2,019

Counties	WUG Name	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Somervell	Mining, Somervell	833	898	957	1,027	1,085	1,130
Taylor	Mining, Taylor	368	172	199	228	250	256
Limestone	Steam-Electric Power, Limestone	3,054	3,171	3,287	3,403	3,517	3,648
Robertson	Steam-Electric Power, Robertson	7,967	8,194	0	0	0	101
Somervell	Steam-Electric Power, Somervell	14,193	14,579	14,965	15,351	15,737	16,055
Young	Steam-Electric Power, Young	610	633	659	633	596	628
	Total Municipal	**22,267**	**29,040**	**65,020**	**90,637**	**95,588**	**132,250**
	Total Irrigation	**45,563**	**35,948**	**31,439**	**28,708**	**30,891**	**31,139**
	Total Livestock	**900**	**908**	**915**	**922**	**929**	**936**
	Total Manufacturing	**257**	**268**	**275**	**694**	**828**	**319**
	Total Mining	**7,725**	**7,460**	**7,378**	**7,512**	**6,653**	**6,770**
	Total Steam Electric Power	**25,824**	**26,577**	**18,911**	**19,387**	**19,850**	**20,432**
	Total Brazos G	**102,536**	**100,201**	**123,938**	**147,860**	**154,739**	**191,846**

ES.6 Other Aspects of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

In addition to providing a roadmap for development of supplies to meet future water needs in the Basin, the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan includes other elements of value and interest to water supply managers and others in the Brazos G Area.

- The Plan provides a concise summary of physiographic, hydrologic and natural resources in the Brazos G Area.
- The Plan provides a comprehensive understanding of how water supplies have been developed and are managed in the Brazos G Area.
- The Plan provides information on appropriate droughts of record in the Brazos G Area.
- The Plan provides recommendations for drought management and emergency supply measures that may assist water managers with developing plans for their systems.
- The Plan includes information on how the BGRWPG conducted outreach specifically to rural entities in the planning area to collect and evaluate information to support plan development, including keeping track of which rural entities were contacted by the BGRWPG's technical consultant, which entities were not responsive to RWPG contact efforts, and including a summary of the rural outreach efforts. Particular focus was given to those rural public water systems that had self-reported water restrictions to TCEQ due to water supply issues during this planning cycle, reported to TCEQ that they had less than 180 days of water supply remaining during this planning cycle, have not previously engaged in the regional planning process, and have already been identified as facing significant near-term shortages under drought conditions in previous regional water planning.
- The Plan includes recommendations to the TWDB and the Texas Legislature regarding key water policy issues and the direction of water supply management in Texas.
- The Plan includes those WUGs identified as not having engaged with the BGRWPG towards development of the 2026 Plan to date.

ES.7 Executive Summary Appendix – Required Reports from DB27 (reflecting database entries as of September 22, 2025)

The database utilized for this round of planning is referred to as DB27, as it serves as the technical repository of regional water planning data that will ultimately be used for the purposes of the 2027 State Water Plan. These standard TWDB DB27 Database Reports are hereby incorporated as part of the regional water plan, and may be accessed by the following steps:

1. Navigate to the TWDB Database Reports application at https://www3.twdb.texas.gov/apps/SARA/reports/list
2. Enter '2026 Regional Water Plan' into the "Report Name" field to filter to all DB27 reports associated with the 2026 Regional Water Plans.
3. Click on the report name hyperlink to load the desired report.
4. Enter planning region letter parameter, click view report.

The following table lists the DB27 reports included in the Executive Summary Appendix:

Report	Description
1	WUG Population
2	WUG Demand
3	Source Availability
4	WUG Existing Water Supply
5	WUG Needs/Surplus
6	WUG Second-Tier Identified Water Need
7	WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP
8	Source Data Comparison to 2021 RWP
9	WUG Unmet Needs
10a	Recommended WUG Water Management Strategies
11	Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies
12	Alternative WUG Water Management Strategies
13	Alternative Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies
14	WUG Management Supply Factor
15	Recommended Water Management Strategy Supply Associated with a new or amended IBT Permit
16	WUG Recommended WMS Supply Associated with a new or amended IBT Permit and Total Recommended Conservation WMS Supply
17	Sponsored Recommended WMS Supplies Unallocated to WUGs
18	MWP Existing Sales and Transfers
19	MWP WMS Summary

CHAPTER 1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING AREA

1.1 Background

Senate Bill 1 (SB1), which was passed into law in June 1997 and enacted by the 75th Texas Legislature, stemmed from increased awareness of Texas' vulnerability to drought and of the limitations of existing water supplies to meet the needs of the State's growing population. Senate Bill 2 (SB2), enacted in September 2001, expanded on the regional water planning process as created by SB1, and provided for further analysis and planning for water resources in the State. With rapidly growing populations, the need to adequately plan for existing and future water needs is vital to the economic health of the Region and State. Some areas of the State are already facing near-term water shortages, and the projected population is expected to double by 2060. The purpose of SB1 and SB2 is to ensure that the water needs of all Texans are met in the 21st century.

The SB1/SB2 legislation calls for a "bottom up" water planning process wherein Regional Water Planning Groups (RWPGs) are formed with members representing a minimum of 11 different interests, including the environment, industry, municipalities, water authorities, and the public. The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) has established 16 regional water planning areas: each with its own RWPG. Each RWPG is tasked with preparing a regional water plan for its area that assesses the available water supplies, the projected demands on these supplies and identifies a means to meet future water needs while maintaining long-term protection of the State's resources.

In accordance with SB2 (as amended), all the regional water plans must be completed, adopted and submitted to the TWDB by October 20, 2025. The TWDB will approve and compile the 16 regional plans into the 2027 State Water Plan. The regional and State Water Plans will continue to be updated every five years.

1.1.1 Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area

The Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area (BGRWPA), shown in Figure 1.1, comprises all or portions of 37 central Texas counties. The Brazos G Area is about 31,600 square miles in area, or 12 percent of the State's total area. About 90 percent of the Region lies in the Brazos River Basin. Figure 1.2 shows the major features of the BGRWPA, such as major cities, reservoirs, and highways. This figure also shows that parts of several counties extend into the Red, Trinity, Colorado, and San Jacinto River Basins. Cities in the Region with current populations greater than 50,000 are Abilene, Bryan, Cedar Park, College Station, Georgetown, Killeen, Leander, Round Rock, Temple, and Waco.[1]

The Region's geography varies from the rugged, uneven terrain and sandy soils of Kent and Knox Counties in the northwest to the hilly, forested areas and rich soils in Grimes and Washington Counties in the southeast. In the central part of the Region are the Blackland Prairies in Hill and McLennan Counties.[2]

[1] US Census Bureau, *2020 Census*, https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade/2020/2020-census-results.html.

[2] The Dallas Morning News, *1997-1998 Texas Almanac*, 1998.

Members of the Brazos G RWPG who contributed to the development of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan are listed in Table 1.1. These members represent 12 interests: the public, counties, municipalities, industries, agriculture, the environment, small businesses, electric-generating utilities, river authorities, water districts, groundwater districts and water utilities. The Brazos G RWPG has retained the services of engineering firms and other specialists to assist the RWPG with the preparation of the regional plan, and it has designated the Brazos River Authority (BRA) as its administrative contracting agency.



Figure 1.1 Location Map



Figure 1.2 Major Features of the Brazos G Area

Table 1.1 Current and Recent Brazos G RWPG Members

Interest Group	Name
Voting Members	
Agricultural	Judge Dale Spurgin Wayne Wilson (Chairman)
Counties	Judge David Blackburn Judge Scott M. Felton Commissioner Gary Myers
Electric Generating Utilities	Ryan Bayle
Environmental	Luci Dunn
Industry	Alan Gardenhire
Municipalities	Jim Briggs Jennifer Nations Lisa Tyer Jerry K. “Kenny” Weldon
Public	Gary Newman
River Authorities	David Collinsworth
Small Business	Gail L. Peek
Water Districts	Patrick Wagner Kathy Turner
Groundwater Management Areas	Dirk Aaron Dale Adams Zach Holland Lynn Smith Gary Westbrook
Water Utilities	Charles Beseda
Non-Voting Members	
TWDB	John Maurer Jean Devlin (former)
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)	Jennifer Bronson-Wilson
Texas Department of Agriculture	Lauren Moore
Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board	Allen Nash

1.2 Population

1.2.1 Regional Trends

Figure 1.3 illustrates population growth in the entire BGRWPA for 1900 to 2020 and projected growth for 2030 to 2080. Table A.1 in Appendix A gives historical population data for each county in the BGRWPA, as well as regional and State population totals, for 1990 to 2020.

From 1900 to 1970, the population in the Brazos G Area grew slowly at an average rate of 0.4 percent per year from 680,093 people to 895,682. During the same period, the total population of Texas grew at an average rate of 1.9 percent annually, from 3,048,710 to 11,196,730. Beginning in the 1970s, however, both the State's and the Region's population began to increase at faster rates. Growth in the Region was about two percent annually, which approximates the State's total growth rate of two percent. Population in the BGRWPA is expected to increase by an average of 1.6 percent annually, reaching 5.66 million by 2080. This is roughly double the census population in 2020.

Population trends may be further understood by dividing the BGRWPA into three subregions: the northwestern Rolling Plains, the central IH-35 Corridor, and the southeastern Lower Basin. Table A.2 in Appendix A provides historical population data for all counties in each subregion from 1900 to 2020.



Figure 1.3 Historical and Projected BGWRPA Population

Figure 1.4 illustrates historical population growth in the three subregions from 1900 to 2020 and projected growth from 2030 to 2080. Figure 1.5 and Figure 1.6 illustrate population distribution by county for years 2030 and 2080, respectively. The greatest growth is projected to occur along the IH-35 corridor, which connects some of the larger cities in the Region and the State. Table 1.2 presents 2020 populations and projected populations for 2030 and 2080 for the major cities in each subregion. Major cities are defined as having at least 10,000 people in 2020. This table also presents the percentage change in populations from 2030 to 2080 in each city. The overall division of the population between large cities and rural areas is expected to increase from 61.0 percent in 2020 to 65.0 percent by 2080.



Figure 1.4 Historical and Projected Population by Subregion

1.2.2 Rolling Plains

The counties in the Rolling Plains subregion are Knox, Kent, Stonewall, Haskell, Throckmorton, Young, Fisher, Jones, Shackelford, Stephens, Palo Pinto, Nolan, Taylor, Callahan, Eastland, Erath, Hood, Somervell, Comanche, Hamilton, Bosque, Coryell, and Lampasas. These counties, with about 23 percent of the BGRWPA's population in 2020, have grown moderately since 1970 at an average rate of 1.0 percent per year. Major cities in this subregion include Abilene, Copperas Cove, Gatesville, Granbury, Mineral Wells, Stephenville, and Sweetwater.

1.2.3 IH-35 Corridor

The counties in the IH-35 Corridor are Johnson, Hill, McLennan, Bell, and Williamson. Population growth in these counties has been rapid since 1970, averaging three percent annually. In this subregion, cities with a current population greater than 10,000 include Bellmead, Belton, Burleson, Cedar Park, Cleburne, Fort Hood, Georgetown, Harker Heights, Hewitt, Hutto, Killeen, Leander, Robinson, Round Rock, Taylor, Temple, and Waco.[3] Total population in the IH-35 Corridor was about 59 percent of the Region's total in year 2020, and it is expected to keep growing rapidly.

1.2.4 Lower Basin

Counties in the Lower Basin are Limestone, Falls, Milam, Robertson, Lee, Burleson, Brazos, Washington, and Grimes. This subregion also has seen a relatively high growth rate averaging 1.9 percent annually since 1970. Major cities include Brenham, Bryan, and College Station. The Lower Basin had 18 percent of the population of the BGRWPA in 2020.



Figure 1.5 2030 Population Distribution by County

[3] US Census Bureau, *2020 Census*, https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade/2020/2020-census-results.html



Figure 1.6 2080 Population Distribution by County

Table 1.2 Population of Major Cities in the BGRWPA (Greater than 10,000 People in 2020)

City	County	Population Data[1]			% Change
		2020	2030	2080	(2030 to 2080)
Rolling Plains					
Abilene	Jones, Taylor	120,609	134,466	184,001	36.8
Copperas Cove	Coryell	33,519	48,375	78,916	63.1
Gatesville	Coryell	14,984	15,649	16,353	4.5
Granbury	Hood	14,124	16,684	29,871	79.0
Mineral Wells[2]	Palo Pinto	14,626	16,926	19,737	16.6
Stephenville	Erath	20,372	26,797	46,758	74.5
Sweetwater	Nolan	11,457	11,590	10,768	-7.1

City	County	Population Data[1]			% Change
		2020	2030	2080	(2030 to 2080)
IH-35 Corridor					
Bellmead	McLennan	10,471	11,152	12,735	14.2
Belton	Bell	23,310	28,600	53,719	87.8
Burleson[2]	Johnson	43,515	42,810	81,047	89.3
Cedar Park	Williamson	83,703	92,024	92,024	0.0
Cleburne	Johnson	27,492	36,047	59,118	64.0
Fort Hood	Bell, Coryell	27,811	36,200	43,451	20.0
Georgetown	Williamson	123,177	247,802	1,041,920	320.5
Harker Heights	Bell	33,013	36,879	50,000	35.6
Hewitt	McLennan	15,779	17,127	17,127	0.0
Hutto	Williamson	16,813	23,452	120,937	415.7
Killeen	Bell	152,631	173,431	297,387	71.5
Leander	Williamson	66,009	137,045	190,010	38.6
Robinson	McLennan	11,340	13,570	26,268	93.6
Round Rock[2]	Williamson	123,672	145,880	233,092	59.8
Taylor	Williamson	15,767	27,500	95,847	248.5
Temple	Bell	85,214	115,562	164,252	42.1
Waco	McLennan	137,862	156,758	230,264	46.9
Lower Basin					
Brenham	Washington	16,490	17,003	17,232	1.3
Bryan	Brazos	81,200	103,527	273,294	164.0
College Station	Brazos	96,208	124,105	187,998	51.5
Total, Major Cities		**1,410,697**	**1,845,809**	**3,661,391**	**98.4**
% of Region Total		**60.5%**	**60.9%**	**64.7%**	
Total, Rural Areas		**920,202**	**1,186,350**	**1,999,147**	**68.5**
% of Region Total		**39.5%**	**39.1%**	**35.3%**	
Region Total		**2,330,899**	**3,032,159**	**5,660,538**	**86.7**

Notes:
(1) 2020 population data obtained from US Census. 2030 and 2080 projections are based on TWDB.
(2) Represents only the portion of the city located in Region G.

1.3 Economic Activities

The BGRWPA includes all or part of the following metropolitan statistical areas as defined by the Texas State Data Center: Abilene, Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, College Station-Bryan, Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, Killeen-Temple, and Waco. The economy of the Region can be divided into the following general sectors: agriculture, agribusiness, mineral production, wholesale and retail trade, and varied manufacturing. Table 1.3 lists 2022 payrolls and employment in the BGRWPA by subregion and economic sector.[4,5] As of this writing, 2022 was the most recent year for which such data was available. Payroll and employment in the Brazos G Area were concentrated along the IH-35 Corridor, which in 2022 had a total payroll of about $25.2 billion and employment of approximately 530,300 people. Primary economic activities were construction, manufacturing, retail trade, and services, accounting for about 73 percent of the Region's total payroll in 2022.

Table 1.3 2022 Economic Data (x$1,000)

Economic Sector(1)	Rolling Plains	IH-35 Corridor	Lower Basin	Region Total
Agricultural, Forestry, Fishing	$6,732	$2,930	$73,074	$82,736
Mining	$280,491	$220,331	$153,932	$654,754
Construction	$586,283	$2,585,079	$548,780	$3,720,142
Manufacturing	$751,526	$2,477,716	$699,968	$3,929,210
Transportation, Public Utilities	$537,303	$946,998	$344,450	$1,828,751
Wholesale Trade	$280,970	$1,240,687	$317,328	$1,838,985
Retail Trade	$784,638	$3,018,253	$563,707	$4,366,598
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	$453,674	$2,010,410	$386,872	$2,850,956
Services	$2,581,100	$11,651,487	$2,019,241	$16,251,828
Unclassified	$316	$1,902	$0	$2,218
Not Categorized	$119,826	$1,079,767	$237,045	$1,436,638
Total Payroll	**$6,453,831**	**$25,239,930**	**$5,347,562**	**$37,041,323**
Total Employed(2)	**178,837**	**530,301**	**161,390**	**870,528**

Notes:
(1) Data from US Census Bureau.
(2) Data from Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[4] US Census Bureau, "2022 Economic Data," Online, https://data.census.gov/.
[5] US Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages: 2022 Annual Averages," Online

1.4 Climate

Average temperatures from 1981 to 2023[6] in the Brazos G area range from lows of 28 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) to 40°F to highs of 55°F to 62°F in January. For July, average temperatures across the planning area range from lows of 70°F to 75°F to highs of 94°F to 97°F. Average annual precipitation[7] ranges from 22 to 26 inches in in the northwestern most counties of the Region to 38 to 50 inches in the southeastern most counties. Figure 1.7 depicts average annual precipitation for the entire Region.



Figure 1.7 Average Annual Precipitation (1981 to 2022)

[6] PRISM Climate Group - Northwest Alliance for Computation Science and Engineering, 2024, Historical Past and Recent Years Datasets for Precipitation and Temperature, http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu/
[7] TWDB, Water Data for Texas – Lake Evaporation and Precipitation Dataset. Accessed at: https://waterdatafortexas.org/lake-evaporation-rainfall

1.5 Sources of Water

Table A.3 in Appendix A provides historical data on use of groundwater and surface water within the BGRWPA from 1980 to 2021. These data suggest that the planning area depended slightly more on surface water than on groundwater. Figure 1.8 shows the proportion of surface water use to groundwater use in 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, 2017 and 2021. While the proportions were equal in 1980, surface water use was greater by two percent in 1990, and three percent in 2000. In 2010, surface water use was slightly less than groundwater, or one percent. In 2017, surface water use was four percent more than groundwater and in 2021 surface water was six percent greater.



Figure 1.8 BGRWPA Historical Water Use by Source (1981 to 2021)

1.5.1 Groundwater

1.5.1.1 Aquifers

Portions of six major and 11 minor aquifers extend into the Brazos G Area (Figure 1.9 and Figure 1.10).[8] Major aquifers are defined generally as those aquifers that supply large amounts of water to large areas of the State.[9] Minor aquifers are defined as those that supply large amounts of water to small areas of the State or provide small supplies to wide areas. Figure 1.11 shows historical water pumpage for each aquifer in the BGRWPA in 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, 2017, and 2021. In 2021, about 78 percent of the groundwater pumped came from four aquifers: Brazos Valley Alluvium, Carrizo-Wilcox, Seymour, and Trinity.[10] Table 1.4 presents historical pumpage in 2020 and projected availability in 2080 of groundwater in each aquifer in the BGRWPA.

Fewer than half of the aquifers in the BGRWPA have potential for further development. Seven of them extend only slightly into the planning area. The aquifers that do offer potential for further development are all in the southeastern part of the Region.

In the western part of the Region, the Seymour Aquifer is the most significant in terms of usage and yield. The Seymour Aquifer has an uneven distribution, is highly developed, and most of its water is used for irrigation. The Seymour Aquifer is prone to depletion if subjected to a combination of prolonged drought and heavy use, but groundwater supply in the Aquifer has remained mostly constant. Along with the Seymour, the fringes of three aquifers, the Dockum, Blaine, and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), extend into the west end of the planning area, but these offer little room for further development. In the northeastern part of the Region, there is a wide area with no major or minor aquifers, including Throckmorton, Young, Shackelford, Stephens, and Palo Pinto Counties. In these areas, locally occurring groundwater is not associated with a defined major or minor aquifer system and is primarily used for domestic and livestock purposes.

[8] TWDB, *Water for Texas*, 1997.
[9] Texas Water Commission, *Groundwater Quality in Texas - An Overview of Natural and Man-Affected Conditions*, TWC Report No. 89-01, 1989.
[10] TWDB, *Estimated Groundwater Pumpage by County and Aquifer*, 2021.



Figure 1.9 Major Aquifers



Figure 1.10 Minor Aquifers



Figure 1.11 Brazos G Area Historical Water Pumpage by Aquifer

Table 1.4 Historical Pumpage and Future Availability in Brazos G Area Aquifer

Aquifer	2021 Pumpage (ac-ft)	2080 Availability (ac-ft/yr)	Remarks
Western Area			
Seymour	67,199	79,828	Fully developed
Dockum	15,700	12,079	Limited extent within region
Edwards-Trinity-Plateau	670	1,182	Limited extent within region
Blaine	385	22,320	Limited extent within region
Cross Timbers	66	3,414	Recently named minor aquifer
Subtotal:	84,020	118,823	
Central Area			
Trinity	75,366	125,343	Overdeveloped in some areas
Edwards-Bfz	16,958	9,931	Overdeveloped in drought
Woodbine	385	2,567	Limited extent within region
Ellenburger-San Saba	22	2,595	Limited extent within region
Marble Falls	13	2,839	Limited extent within region
Hickory	ND(1)	113	Limited extent within region
Subtotal:	92,744	143,388	
Southeastern Area			
Brazos River Alluvium	115,112	238,272	Added potential, water quality variable
Carrizo-Wilcox	65,780	299,958	Large added potential
Gulf Coast	4,619	93,073	Added potential
Sparta	4,487	19,016	Added potential
Yegua-Jackson	2,931	14,755	
Queen City	2,362	10,108	
Navasota River Alluvium	ND(1)	2,216	
Subtotal:	**195,291**	**677,398**	
Other and Undifferentiated	63,314	847	Many widely-scattered sources
Total	**435,369**	**940,456**	

Notes:
ac-ft – acre-feet; acfy/yr – acre-feet per year
(1) ND indicates no data available.

The Trinity Aquifer is the most significant groundwater source in the central part of the BGRWPA. It is widespread and furnishes small to moderate amounts of groundwater in 17 counties. In the confined portions of the Aquifer, however, development has resulted in significant declines in water levels.

In the southeastern part of the area, groundwater supplies are dominated by the Carrizo-Wilcox System and the Gulf Coast Aquifer. The Carrizo-Wilcox has significant potential for further development, but the Gulf Coast Aquifer in this area has low to moderate potential. Several minor aquifers also have potential for further development over wide areas in this sector. The Brazos Alluvium, which lies along the Brazos River, also extends into the central portion of the area and has some potential for additional development, but most of the BGRWPA's undeveloped groundwater lies in the southeastern sector.

The Trinity Aquifer and all other aquifers to the southeast have outcrop areas under water-table conditions and downdip areas with overlying confining layers where artesian conditions may occur. Most of these aquifers contain fresh water to considerable depths, and all contain slightly saline water just downdip (commonly to the southeast) of the fresh water.

Maps in Appendix B show the locations of fresh water, defined as containing less than 1,000 milligrams per liter (mg/L) total dissolved solids (TDS), and slightly saline water, defined as having 1,000 to 3,000 mg/L TDS, within various aquifers. Maps are included for all aquifers within the BGRWPA that have availability estimated to exceed 5,000 ac-ft/yr. The use of aquifers with groundwater containing more than 1,000 mg/L TDS is an option only where consumers can use the saline water or where special treatment (desalination or blending) is available. More detailed descriptions and availability of water from each aquifer in the BGRWPA are in Appendix B.

1.5.1.2 Major Springs

The BGRWPA contains few major springs, defined as springs with discharges commonly greater than one cubic foot per second (cfs). The majority of these springs issue from the Edwards-Balcones Fault Zone (BFZ) Aquifer in Bell and Williamson Counties and from the Marble Falls Aquifer in Lampasas County. Of the Edwards Aquifer springs, all but one are intermittent. The three largest Edwards springs are:

1. Salado Springs at Salado in Bell County along the Lampasas River with discharges ranging from 5 to 60 cfs.
2. Berry Springs, which is located five miles north of Georgetown in Williamson County, with discharges ranging from 0 to 50 cfs.
3. San Gabriel Springs at Georgetown in Williamson Co. with discharges ranging from 0 to 25 cfs.

Springs from the Marble Falls Aquifer include Hancock Park Springs along the Sulfur River, which is a tributary to the Lampasas River, with discharges reportedly ranging from 6 to 12 cfs, and Swimming Pool Springs at Hancock Park with a reported discharge of 1.3 to 1.6 cfs. Both springs are in the City of Lampasas in Lampasas County.

Some springs in the Region significantly affect the quality of the water in the Brazos River. These are primarily the salt springs and seeps, such as those along Salt Croton and Croton Creeks, in the upper Brazos River Basin in Dickens, Kent, and Stonewall Counties. These natural saltwater sources cause the water in the main stem of the Brazos River above Possum Kingdom Lake to be too saline for most uses during low flow periods. For example, from 1963 to 1986, TDS and chloride concentrations in Croton Creek near Jayton averaged 7,933 mg/L and 3,169 mg/L, respectively. The mean values for TDS and chlorides in the Salt Croton Creek near Aspermont from 1969 to 1977 were 71,237 mg/L and 41,516 mg/L, respectively. Water in Possum Kingdom Lake usually contains more than 400 mg/L chloride and 1,200 mg/L TDS. The natural chloride pollution in the upper Brazos River affects water quality in the lower basin. In the Brazos River at Richmond, it has been estimated that 85 percent (or about 95 mg/L for the years 1946 to 1986)[11] of the chloride is from the upper basin.

[11] Ganze, C. Keith and Ralph A. Wurbs, "Compilation and Analysis of Monthly Salt Loads and Concentrations in the Brazos River Basin," US Army Corps of Engineers, Contract No. DACW63-88-M-0793, January 1989.

There are many smaller springs in the Brazos G Area, but cataloging is inconsistent and incomplete. Only a few small springs have been cataloged in just nine of the 37 counties in the BGRWPA.[12] These springs flow substantially less than one cfs, and most flow only a few gallons per minute (gpm) (1 cfs = 448.8 gpm).

1.5.2 Surface Water

The BGWRPA lies within the Brazos River Basin, the boundaries of which are the Red River Basin to the north, the Colorado River Basin to the west, the Trinity and San Jacinto River Basins to the east, and the counties of Fayette, Austin, Waller, and Montgomery to the south. The total drainage area for the Brazos River Basin is about 45,400 square miles, and of this about 28,400 square miles are in the BGRWPA.

The Brazos River is the third-largest river in Texas and the largest river between the Rio Grande River and the Red River in terms of total watershed area[13]. The Brazos River rises in three upper forks: the Double Mountain Fork, Salt Fork, and Clear Fork. Twenty-nine major reservoirs provide surface water to the BGRWPA. Major reservoirs, listed in Table 1.5, are defined as having an authorized conservation capacity greater than 10,000 ac-ft. This table shows amounts of storage and annual use that the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) authorizes for each reservoir. Figure 1.2 shows locations of some of the reservoirs in the BGRWPA, and Table A.5 in Appendix A provides more detailed information about all reservoirs in the BGRWPA with a permitted capacity greater than or equal to 2,500 ac-ft. Diversions permitted for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and mining uses for each BGRWPA subregion are listed in Table 1.6. Total diversions permitted by use in each BGWRPA county are given in Table A.6 in Appendix A.

Table 1.5 Major Reservoirs in BGRWPA (Authorized Capacity Greater than 10,000 ac-ft)

Reservoir	Stream	County	Authorized Storage (ac-ft)	Authorized Use (ac-ft/yr)	Owner
Abilene	Elm Creek	Taylor	11,868	1,675	City of Abilene
Alcoa Lake	Sandy Creek	Milam	15,650	14,000	Aluminum Co. of America
Aquilla	Aquilla Creek	Hill	52,400	13,896	USACE(1)
Belton	Leon River	Bell	469,600	130,257	USACE(2)
Brushy Creek		Falls	45,000	2,027	Cisco
Cisco	Sandy Creek	Eastland	45,000	2,027	City of Cisco
Cleburne	Nolan Creek	Johnson	25,600	6,000	City of Cleburne
Daniel	Gonzales Creek	Stephens	11,400	2100	City of Breckenridge
Dansby Power Plant	Unnamed Trib. Brazos River	Brazos	15,227	850	City of Bryan
Fort Phantom Hill	Elm Creek	Jones	73,960	38,662	City of Abilene
Georgetown	North Fork San Gabriel River	Williamson	37,100	13,610	USACE(1)
Gibbons Creek	Gibbons Creek	Grimes	32,084	9,740	Texas Municipal Power Agency

[12] Brune, Gunnar, *Major and Historical Springs of Texas: TWDB Report 189*, 1970.
[13] The Dallas Morning News, *2004-2005 Texas Almanac*, 2004.

Reservoir	Stream	County	Authorized Storage (ac-ft)	Authorized Use (ac-ft/yr)	Owner
Graham/Eddleman	Flint Creek	Young	52,386	11,000	City of Graham
Granbury	Brazos River	Hood	155,000	64,712	BRA
Granger	San Gabriel River	Williamson	65,500	19,840	USACE(1)
Hubbard Creek	Hubbard Creek	Stephens	317,750	56,000	West Central Texas MWD
Leon	Leon River	Eastland	28,000	6,300	Eastland Co. WSD
Limestone	Navasota River	Robertson	225,400	65,074	BRA
Millers Creek Lake	Millers Creek	Baylor	30,696	5,000	North Central Texas MWA
Palo Pinto	Palo Pinto Creek	Palo Pinto	44,100	13,480	Palo Pinto MWD
Possum Kingdom	Brazos River	Palo Pinto	724,739	230,750	BRA
Proctor	Leon River	Comanche	59,400	19,658	USACE(1)
Somerville	Yegua Creek	Washington	160,110	48,000	USACE(1)
Squaw Creek	Squaw Creek	Somervell	151,500	23,180	Texas Utilities Electric Co.
Stamford	Paint Creek	Haskell	60,000	10,000	City of Stamford
Stillhouse Hollow	Lampasas River	Bell	235,700	67,768	USACE(1)
Tradinghouse	Tradinghouse Creek	McLennan	37,800	27,000	Texas Utilities Electric Co.
Truscott Brine	Bluff Creek	Knox	107,000	N/A	Red River Authority of Texas
Twin Oak	Duck Creek	Robertson	30,319	13,200	Texas Utilities Electric Co.
Waco	Bosque River	McLennan	176,124	79,870	USACE(5)
Whitney	Brazos River	Hill	50,000	18,336	USACE(1)
Totals			**3,546,413**	**1,014,012**	

Notes:
USACE – US Army Corps of Engineers; WSD – water supply district
(1) Water rights held by the BRA.
(2) Water rights held by the BRA and the Department of the Army (Fort Hood).
(3) Millers Creek Lake is listed in Baylor County in Region B, but is used exclusively in the Brazos G Area.
(4) Storage authorization includes both Lake Stamford and College Lake.
(5) Water rights held by the City of Waco.

Table 1.6 Permitted Surface Water Diversions by Subregion

Subregion	Permitted Diversion (ac-ft/yr)[1]					
	Municipal	Industrial	Irrigation	Mining	Other[2]	Total
Rolling Plains	583,087	41,678	59,792	9,064	640	694,261
IH-35 Corridor	833,875	45,963	22,368	1,248	3,625	907,079
Lower Basin	131,606	48,998	34,960	53	1,884	217,501
Region Total	**1,548,568**	**136,639**	**117,120**	**10,365**	**6,149**	**1,818,841**

Notes:
(1) Available supply may be less than the permitted diversion based on hydrologic conditions and priority of individual water rights.
(2) Category includes consumptive amounts for recreation and other uses as classified by the TCEQ.

1.5.3 Reuse

Region G demonstrates a well-established and diversified portfolio of water reuse sources, providing a reliable supply of more than 41,900 ac-ft/yr that remains consistent through 2080. This reuse portfolio includes both direct and indirect reuse sources that collectively support municipal, industrial, and agricultural demands, each with varying levels of treatment and long-term reliability.

Indirect potable reuse plays a significant role in municipal supply, particularly in locations like Abilene and Johnson County, where conventional treatment processes are in place. These supplies are projected to remain stable through 2080, with Abilene alone contributing approximately 7,840 ac-ft/yr.

In contrast, direct potable reuse is limited in scope, currently implemented only in Rotan. Although conventionally treated, this supply is relatively small, declining slightly from nine ac-ft/yr to six ac-ft/yr by 2080.

The most prominent category of reuse in Region G is direct non-potable reuse, which supports a wide range of applications including irrigation, municipal non-potable needs, and steam-electric power generation. Key contributors in this category include the Round Rock Wastewater Treatment Plant, providing over 4,320 ac-ft/yr with advanced treatment, and several steam-electric power operations in Bell, Johnson, and McLennan counties, collectively using more than 26,424 ac-ft/yr. Additionally, the City of Abilene supplies reuse water for irrigation in Taylor, Jones, and Shackelford counties, contributing over 1,016 ac-ft/yr across the planning period.

Altogether, Region G's reuse strategy reflects a robust and adaptive approach to water resource management, balancing various treatment levels and end uses to meet growing demand across multiple sectors.

1.6 Wholesale Water Providers

Wholesale water providers (WWPs) are defined in 31 Texas Administrative Code §357 as any person or entity that sells wholesale water to water user groups or other WWPs, or that the RWPG expects or recommends to deliver or sell water to water user groups or other WWPs during the period covered by the regional water plan. It is the responsibility of the RWPG to identify WWPs within the Region to be evaluated for plan development. There are 12 identified WWPs located primarily in the BGRWPA. These providers are listed in Table 1.7 and described below.

1.6.1 BRA

The largest provider of water in the BGRWPA is the BRA. The BRA also operates water and wastewater treatment systems, has programs to assess and protect water quality, does water supply planning, and supports water conservation efforts in the Brazos River Basin. The BRA provides water from three wholly owned and operated reservoirs: Lake Granbury, Possum Kingdom Lake, and Lake Limestone. The BRA also owns water rights for the proposed Allens Creek Reservoir in Region H. In addition to these sources, the BRA contracts for conservation storage space in the eight USACE reservoirs in the Region: Lakes Proctor, Belton, Stillhouse Hollow, Georgetown, Granger, Somerville, Whitney, and Aquilla. The total permitted capacity of the 12 constructed reservoirs in the BRA system is approximately 2.3 million ac-ft. The BRA holds rights for diversion in the Region totaling 661,901 ac-ft, and contracts to supply water to municipal, industrial, and agricultural water customers in the BGRWPA and other regions. The BRA's largest current municipal customers, based on contracted supply, include Bell County Water Control and Improvement District (WCID) No. 1, the City of Georgetown, and the City of Temple.

In 2016 the BRA obtained Water Use Permit No. 5851 (System Operations Permit) from the TCEQ for the diversion, impoundment, and use of (1) previously unappropriated State water in the Brazos River Basin, and (2) BRA owned return flows discharged into State watercourses not already authorized for use by other entities. The water right currently authorizes a maximum combined diversion of up to 434,703 ac-ft/yr. Diversions are authorized in 40 individual stream segments basin-wide, with each stream segment assigned a specific maximum annual diversion amount.

Table 1.7 WWPs in the Brazos G Area

Entity	Current Contracts (ac-ft/yr)	Water Source
Brazos G WWPs		
Aquilla WSD	5,392	Lake Aquilla
Bell County WCID 1	62,259	Lake Belton, Reuse
Bluebonnet WSC	7,125	Lake Belton
BRA	729,707[1][2]	Lakes Aquilla, Belton, Georgetown, Granbury, Granger, Limestone, Possum Kingdom, Proctor, Somerville, Stillhouse Hollow, Whitney, and BRA System Operations Permit
BRA	25,000[3]	Highland Lakes Supply, Colorado Basin
Central Texas WSC	18,013	Lake Stillhouse Hollow, Trinity Aquifer
Eastland County WSD	5,395	Eastland Lake, Lake Leon
FHLM WSC		Lake Waco
North Central Texas MWA	1,682[2]	Millers Creek Lake
Palo Pinto County MWD 1	9,906	Lake Palo Pinto
Upper Leon MWD	4,572	Lake Proctor

Entity	Current Contracts (ac-ft/yr)	Water Source
Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation		Local saline groundwater
West Central Texas MWD	15,620	Hubbard Creek Reservoir

Notes:
FHLM - Falls, Hill, Limestone, and McLennan counties; WSC – water supply corporation
(1) Includes 11,403 ac-ft/yr in the Lake Aquilla System, 254,663 ac-ft/yr in the Little River System, 326,715 ac-ft/yr in the Main Stem/Lower Basin System, and 136,927 of System Operations Permit supply contracts (based on contractual commitment list provided by BRA, dated 11/20/2023).
(2) Includes contracts in other regions.
(3) House Bill 1437 supplies from the Lower Colorado River Authority (based on contractual commitment list provided by BRA, dated 11/20/2023).

1.6.2 Aquilla WSD

Aquilla WSD is located in Hill County and obtains raw water from Lake Aquilla through a contract with the BRA. The district supplies treated water to five wholesale customers. The City of Hillsboro is the District's largest customer with a contract for 3,640 ac-ft/yr. Total existing contracted sales for Aquilla WSD are in the amount of 5,392 ac-ft/yr.

1.6.3 Bell County WCID No. 1

Bell County WCID No. 1 currently obtains raw water from Lake Belton for distribution to its customers and will soon also obtain water through new facilities at Lake Stillhouse Hollow. Major customers include 439 WSC and the Cities of Belton, Copperas Cove, Harker Heights, and Killeen. Bell County WCID No. 1 is currently contracted for a total treated water supply volume of 62,259 ac-ft/yr, plus an additional supply to meet demands for Bell County WCID No. 3.

1.6.4 Bluebonnet WSC

The Bluebonnet WSC is located in Bell County. The WSC obtains raw water from Lake Belton and sells treated water to eight entities in the BGRWPA. The largest customer is the City of McGregor, which holds a contract for 2,139 ac-ft/yr. The total annual contracted supply to be provided by Bluebonnet WSC is 7,125 ac-ft.

1.6.5 Central Texas WSC

Central Texas WSC contracts with the BRA to obtain raw water from Lake Stillhouse Hollow and pumps groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer. The corporation sells treated water under contract to 17 municipal water user groups, the largest with the Bell Milam Falls WSC for 2,327 ac-ft/yr. Supply contracts by the Central Texas WSC total 18,013 ac-ft/yr.

1.6.6 Eastland County WSD

The Eastland County WSD owns and operates Lake Leon and has a water right to divert 5,800 ac-ft for municipal and industrial purposes and 500 ac-ft for irrigation. The District also receives supply from the Eastland Lake. The District currently provides treated water to entities in Eastland County through the

Cities of Eastland and Ranger. Current supply contracts by the Eastland County WSD total 5,395 ac-ft/yr plus an additional treated supply volume to meet demands for Eastland County-Manufacturing.

1.6.7 FHLM WSC

Several Public Water Supply entities in Falls, Hill, Limestone, and McLennan Counties formed the FHLM WSC to address the elevated arsenic levels, groundwater compliance issues, Trinity Aquifer depletion, and exchange information concerning treatment technologies and operations and maintenance considerations among the member entities. The main purpose of creating the FHLM WSC was to serve as the financing vehicle to obtain funding to support regional water projects for the area. The FHLM WSC has contracted 336 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the City of Waco to be used by member utilities for blending and/or replacing existing groundwater supply.

1.6.8 North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority

North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority supplies treated water to seven entities across Knox, Haskell and Stonewall Counties. The District has water rights to divert 5,000 ac-ft/yr of raw water from Millers Creek Reservoir for municipal, industrial, and mining purposes. Current supply contracts from the North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority, including contracts for out of Region sales, total 1,682 ac-ft/yr.

1.6.9 Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No. 1

Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No. 1 owns and operates Lake Palo Pinto, which is used to supply water to entities in Palo Pinto and Parker Counties. The District has rights to 18,500 ac-ft a year for municipal and steam electric power uses. Treated water is supplied to the City of Mineral Wells (and its customers), Lake Palo Pinto WSC, and steam-electric entities in Palo Pinto County. Current supply contracts form the Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1 total 9,906 ac-ft/yr, including the additional treated water volume to meet demands for the City of Mineral Wells.

1.6.10 Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation

The Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation (SFWQC) was formed to develop a project for reducing surface water salinity in the Brazos River Basin. The project concept involves constructing a series of wells to be used for intercepting highly saline water currently being discharged to waterways from a series of seeps and springs in the Upper Brazos Basin. Captured water would be treated and processed to remove the salt which could then be used for commercial application, while the resulting freshwater would be available for use by local municipal utilities. This project has yet to be developed, and the SFWQC does not currently hold any supply contracts.

1.6.11 Upper Leon Municipal Water District

The Upper Leon Municipal Water District obtains water from Lake Proctor through contracts with the BRA. The MWD provides treated water to the Cities of Comanche, De Leon, Dublin, Gorman, Hamilton, and Stephenville, as well as other entities throughout Comanche County. Current supply contracts from the Upper Leon MWD total 4,572 ac-ft/yr.

1.6.12 West Central Texas Municipal Water District

The West Central Texas Municipal Water District diverts raw water from Hubbard Creek Reservoir, which it owns and operates, for distribution to the Cities of Abilene, Albany, Anson, and Breckenridge. This District has rights to 56,000 ac-ft/yr of water for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and mining uses. Current supply contracts from the West Central Texas MWD total 15,620 ac-ft/yr.

1.7 Major Water Providers

The Brazos G RWPG defines major water providers (MWPs) to be:

1. Any WWP that is not also a municipal WUG, or
2. Any WUG with a total municipal demand in the Brazos G Area of at least 1,000 ac-ft/yr, including contractual sales to other municipal utilities.

Based on the above definition, the Brazos G RWPG has identified 105 WUGs and WWPs as MWPs for the 2026 Brazos G Plan, listed in Table 1.8. This 2026 Brazos G Plan includes data summaries specific to these MWPs.

Table 1.8 MWPs in the Brazos G Area

Major Water Providers					
439 WSC	Brushy Creek MUD	Eastland County WSD	Hutto	Morgans Point Resort	Sweetwater
Abilene	Bryan	Fern Bluff MUD	Jarrell-Schwertner	Mountain Peak SUD	TRWD - via other WWPs
Acton MUD	Burleson	FHLM WSC	Johnson County SUD	Navasota	Taylor
Alvarado	Cameron	Files Valley WSC	Jonah Water SUD	North Bosque WSC	Temple
Anson	Cedar Park	Fort Cavazos(1)	Keene	North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority	Texas A and M University
Aquilla WSD	Central Texas WSC	Fort Worth	Kempner WSC	Palo Pinto County MUD No.1	Texas State Technical College
Arlington	Cisco	Gatesville	Killeen	Potosi WSC	Upper Leon Municipal Water District
Bell County WCID 1	Cleburne	Georgetown	Lacy Lakeview	Robinson	Venus
Bell County WCID 3	Clifton	Gholson WSC	Lampasas	Rockdale	Waco
Bellmead	College Station	Giddings	Leander	Round Rock	Wellborn SUD
Belton	Colorado River Municipal Water District	Gordon	Liberty Hill	Salado WSC	West Central Texas MWD
Bethesda WSC	Copperas Cove	Graham	Lower Colorado River Authority	SFWQC	Wickson Creek SUD
Bistone Municipal WSD	Corix Utilities Texas Inc	Granbury	Mansfield	Somervell County Water District	Williamson County MUD 11

Major Water Providers					
Bluebonnet WSC	Coryell City WSD	Harker Heights	Manville WSC	Sonterra MUD	Williamson County WSID 3
BRA	Cross Country WSC	Hewitt	Marlin	Southwest Milam WSC	Woodway
Brandon Irene WSC	Dog Ridge WSC	Hilco United Services	McGregor	Stamford	
Brenham	Double Diamond Utilities	Hillsboro	Mexia	Steamboat Mountain WSC	
Bruceville Eddy	Dublin	Huntsville	Mineral Wells	Stephenville	

Notes:
TRWD – Tarrant Regional Water District
(1) Fort Cavazos formerly Fort Hood, all references herein should be assumed to be same.

1.8 Current Water Users and Demand Centers

1.8.1 Regional Water Use

Total water use by each county in the BGRWPA is summarized in Figure 1.12 for 2021 Water use can be classified into four general types of use: municipal, industrial, agricultural, and non-consumptive. Figure 1.13 shows historical water use by municipalities, industries, and agriculture in the BGRWPA. Industrial use can be further broken down into three sub-categories: manufacturing, steam-electric cooling, and mining. Agricultural use consists of the subcategories of water used for irrigation and livestock. Historical water use in the planning area for six categories is summarized in Table 1.9.

In Appendix A, Table A.7 gives historical water-use data for all counties in the BGRWPA, and Table A.8 gives historical water-use data by category of use. Historical surface water use greater than or equal to 1,000 ac-ft is given in Appendix D by each water-right holder.

1.8.2 Municipal Use

Municipal water use includes water consumed for residential and commercial enterprises and institutions. Residential and commercial uses are categorized together because they are similar types of uses (i.e., they both use water primarily for drinking, cleaning, sanitation, air-conditioning, and landscape watering). Generally, municipal use does not include water use by large industries. Projections for future municipal use account for population growth and anticipated efforts at water conservation. Municipal use of 387,752 ac-ft accounted for about 41 percent of the Region's total water use in 2021. Figure 1.14 shows municipal water use in each BGRWPA county in2021.



Figure 1.12 2021 Total Water Use by County



Figure 1.13 Historical Water Use by Type

Table 1.9 Historical Water Use[1] (in ac-ft/yr)

Category	1980	1990	2000	2010	2017	2021
Municipal Use	216,782	238,260	312,169	333,404	362,937	387,752
Manufacturing Use	21,124	32,240	60,522	9,006	10,582	10,081
Steam-Electric Use	28,686	57,657	97,921	113,553	205,181	199,296
Mining Use	11,413	6,944	4,382	57,644	13,730	9,246
Irrigation Use	229,387	200,954	232,911	298,754	315,648	284,769
Livestock Use	38,916	46,771	53,222	55,208	41,987	43,303
Total Use	546,308	582,826	761,127	867,569	950,065	934,447
Percent of State Total	3.06%	3.71%	4.69%	6.28%	6.79%	6.50%

Notes:
(1) Historical data obtained from TWDB.



Figure 1.14 2021 Municipal Water Use

1.8.3 Industrial Use

Industrial use consists of water used for manufacturing, for steam-electric cooling during power generation, and for mining operations. Projections for industrial use account for expected growth of industries, population changes, available mineral reserves, and production rates. In 2021, industrial use was 218,623 ac-ft, or about 23 percent of the total water used in the BGRWPA. Refer to Figure 1.15 for 2021 industrial water use by county.



Figure 1.15 2021 Industrial Water Use (Manufacturing, Steam-Electric Cooling, and Mining)

1.8.3.1 Manufacturing

Manufacturing use is water used for producing finished goods. Manufacturing use was 10,081 ac-ft in 2021, or five percent of total industrial water usage that year.

1.8.3.2 Steam-Electric Cooling

This category is water used during the power-generation process and is typically losses due to forced evaporation during cooling. Water that is diverted and not consumed (i.e., return flow) is not included in the power-generation total. Water use for steam-electric cooling in 2021 was 199,296 ac-ft, or 91 percent of total industrial water use.

1.8.3.3 Mining

Mining use is water consumed for exploration and production of oil and gas, and for mining of lignite, sand, gravel, and such. Mining use in 2021 was 9,246 ac-ft, or four percent of the total industrial water use.

1.8.4 Agricultural Use

Agricultural use is water used for irrigation and for watering livestock. Agricultural use was 328,072 ac-ft in 2021 or 35 percent of the BGRWPA's total water use. Agricultural water use by each county in the planning area in 2021 is summarized in Figure 1.16.

1.8.4.1 Irrigation

Irrigation use in 2021 totaled 284,769 ac-ft, or about 87 percent of the total agricultural water use. Refer to Appendix F for more detailed information about irrigation use in the BGRWPA.

1.8.4.2 Livestock Watering

The estimate of use for livestock watering is based on a determination of the total number of livestock in the Region. A uniform water-consumption rate for each type of animal is applied to this total number. The categories of livestock considered are cattle and calves, poultry, sheep and lambs, and hogs and pigs. Livestock watering totaled 43,303 ac-ft, or 13 percent of agricultural use in 2021. Refer to Appendix F for more detailed information on water used for livestock.



Figure 1.16 2021 Agricultural Water Use (Livestock and Irrigation)

1.8.5 Non-Consumptive Use

Non-consumptive use is water that is diverted and then returned to the river basin with minimal change in volume and temperature or is used but never leaves the river system. Most of the non-consumptive water use in the BGRWPA is associated with recreational use and the return flow from power generation. Water-related recreational activities include boating, camping, fishing, and swimming. Recreational use in the BGRWPA is supported by numerous State parks and by public facilities for boating and camping at various lakes and reservoirs.

Navigation is another form of non-consumptive use. Other than small watercraft used primarily for recreation on lakes and rivers, the BGRWPA includes no use of water for navigation. No water management strategy considered by the BGRWPG will affect navigation, either in the BGRWPA or in adjacent regions.

Power generation demands large amounts of water for cooling equipment. Fifteen steam-electric power-generating facilities were operating in the BGRWPA in 2019 (TWDB Water Use Survey), although the number of facilities has declined within the Region. Most of the diverted water was returned to the Brazos River Basin. Water that is lost to evaporation during the cooling process is considered industrial use and is discussed in Section 1.5.3.

1.9 Natural Resources

1.9.1 Regional Vegetation

The BGRWPA lies within several different vegetational areas, or ecoregions.[14]

Figure 1.17 shows the locations of these ecoregions, which are relatively homogenous areas in terms of geography, hydrology, and land use. The five ecoregions in the BGRWPA are the Rolling Plains, Blackland Prairies, Post Oak Savannah, Cross Timbers and Prairies, and Edwards Plateau. A general description for each ecoregion is provided below. More detailed information is provided in Appendix E.

1.9.1.1 Rolling Plains

The Rolling Plains are part of the Great Plains of the central United States. The Rolling Plains region covers about 24 million acres of gently rolling to moderately rough terrain. The region is bordered on the west by the Caprock Escarpment, on the south by the Edwards Plateau, and on the east by the Cross Timbers and Prairies region. Annual precipitation averages about 22 to 30 inches, and elevations range from 800 to 3,000 feet above sea level. The eastern part of the Rolling Plains is called the Reddish Prairie. Soils vary from coarse sands in outwash terraces near streams to tight clays or red-bed clays and shales.

1.9.1.2 Blackland Prairies

The Blackland Prairies region consists of nearly level to gently rolling topography. It covers about 11.5 million acres from Grayson and Red River Counties in northeast Texas to Bexar County in the south-central part of the State where it merges with the brush land of the Rio Grande Plains. Annual precipitation is 30 to 45 inches, and elevations range from 300 to 800 feet above sea level.

[14] Gould, F.W., *The Grasses of Texas*, Texas A&M University Press, College Station, Texas, 1975.

The term Blackland comes from the uniformly dark-colored, calcareous clays in the Alfisols (fertile mineral soils). Soils in the Blackland Prairies are interspersed with gray-colored, acidic sandy loams. This highly fertile region has widely been used for agriculture, but it is increasingly used for ranching.[15] Experts estimate that less than one percent of the Blackland Prairies remain in a near-natural condition.[16]



Figure 1.17 Vegetational Areas of the Brazos G Area

1.9.1.3 Post Oak Savannah

The Post Oak Savannah covers about 8.5 million acres in east-central Texas and consists of closely associated and intermingled prairies and woodlands on slightly acidic sandy or clay loams. Topography in this region is gently rolling to hilly, with moderate to deeply dissected drainage paths. Soils in uplands are generally light-colored, acidic sandy loams or sands, and soils in bottomlands are light brown to dark gray acidic sandy loams or clays. Much of this vegetational area is used for crops and grazing.

[15] Gould, F.W. and Schuster, J.L. and Hatch, S.L., *Texas Plants B, An Ecological Summary*, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1990.
[16] Smeins and Diamond, 1986.

1.9.1.4 Cross Timbers and Prairies

The Cross Timbers and Prairies vegetational area covers about 17 million acres in north- central Texas. Geology in this area is diverse, and the topography varies from gently rolling to hilly to deeply dissected. Rapid surface drainage is typical throughout the region. Soils are typically brown, neutral-to-slightly acidic, sandy or clay loams.

1.9.1.5 Edwards Plateau

The Edwards Plateau area covers about 24 million acres. This includes a large portion of the Hill Country in west-central Texas, the Llano Uplift, and the Stockton Plateau. Average annual precipitation increases from west to east across this region. Limestone or caliche typically underlie the shallow, variably textured soils, although granitic rock underlies soil in the Llano Uplift. Land use in this vegetational area is dominated by the ranching of cattle, sheep, and goats. This region reportedly once was dominated by grassland or an open savannah climax community, except in steep canyons and slopes where junipers and oaks were dominant. The widespread disturbance associated with grazing livestock eventually allowed brush and tree species to spread widely throughout the original grasslands and savannahs.

1.9.2 Regional Geology

Figure 1.18 shows the varied geology of the planning area. Generally, the formations in the northwest part of the planning area are the older Blaine and San Angelo Formations of the Paleozoic era. The central part of the planning area is typically dominated by younger formations from the Cretaceous era, such as the Trinity Group; the Navarro and Taylor Groups; and the Austin, Eagle Ford, Woodbine, and U. Washita Groups. The youngest formations are in the southern part of the planning area. These formations include the Cook Mountain, Weches, Sparta, and Yegua, among others. Many areas near streams and rivers are dominated by alluvial deposits.

1.9.3 Soils

The soils of the upper Brazos River Basin are agriculturally and ecologically important. Throughout the Brazos G Area, soils are varied and are influenced by both geology and surface drainage. Figure 1.19 shows the locations of different orders of soil in the BGRWPA. These soil types are briefly described in the following subsections.



Figure 1.18 Geology of the Brazos G Area



Figure 1.19 Soils of the Brazos G Area

1.9.3.1 Alfisols

Alfisols are mineral soils with a gray-to-brown surface horizon. These soils form under humid, cool-to-hot areas of native grasslands. They are productive and favor good crop yields.

1.9.3.2 Entisols

Entisols are typical of rangeland in west and southwest Texas. In this order, soils range from infertile sands and bedrock to highly productive soils on recent alluvium. A characteristic common to all Entisols is the lack of significant profile development.

1.9.3.3 Inceptisols

Inceptisols are thought to form relatively quickly from the alteration of parent material. Productivity varies among soils in this order, and it is affected by factors such as levels of organic matter and drainage. Typically, Inceptisols have slightly higher profile development than Entisols.

1.9.3.4 Mollisols

Mollisols are considered important agriculturally and are characterized by a thick, dark surface horizon. These soils develop under grassland-prairie vegetation typical of the central United States. Mollisols cover more land area in the United States than any other soil order.

1.9.3.5 Vertisols

Vertisols have a high clay content and therefore may develop deep cracks from shrinking during dry periods. The fine texture of Vertisols and their tendency to shrink excessively makes them generally unstable for building foundations and even for some agricultural uses.

1.9.4 Wetlands

Wetlands are defined by the USACE as areas that, due to a combination of hydrologic and soil conditions, are capable of supporting hydrophytic vegetation. In the Brazos G Area, wetlands are found primarily in narrow strips along rivers and streams.

As a natural resource, wetlands are especially valued because of their location on the landscape, the wide variety of ecological functions they perform, and the uniqueness of their plant and animal communities. Many wetlands are also valued for their aesthetic qualities, as sites for educational research, as sites of historic and archaeological importance, and as locations for storing or conveying floodwaters. Wetlands provide high-quality habitats for wildlife, including foraging and nesting areas for birds and spawning and nursery areas for fish.

1.9.5 Water Resources

Rivers and reservoirs are important ecological resources for the Brazos G Area. These support diverse aquatic plants and animals as well as terrestrial wildlife living along the banks. Important rivers and creeks in the planning area include the Brazos, Leon, Bosque, Lampasas, San Gabriel, South Wichita, Little, Clear

Fork of the Brazos, and Yegua Creek. These rivers contribute to unique vegetational communities that provide habitat for wildlife.

There are more than 40 species of aquatic amphibians, reptiles, and mammals in the planning area. Waterfowl heavily use the mature, hardwood, bottomland forests and forested wetlands often associated with rivers. Aquatic habitats include riffles and pools, which support both invertebrates and fish.

Reservoirs (Figure 1.20) provide habitat for inland fish stocks and waterfowl. Many reservoirs in the planning area provide habitat for fish stocks and waterfowl including Lake Stamford, Hubbard Creek Reservoir, Possum Kingdom Lake, Lake Leon, Lake Proctor, Lake Whitney, Lake Stillhouse Hollow, Lake Belton, Lake Waco, and Lake Somerville.

Although few in number, the major springs and seeps in the planning area that produce frequent flows are often rich in wildlife habitat and ecological diversity. Springs represent a transition from groundwater to surface water. Where frequent springflow occurs, an abundance of moisture is provided, resulting in diverse vegetational communities unique to such areas. Typical vegetation includes willows, cottonwoods, hackberry, elms, rushes, sedges, and smartweed. These vegetational communities often provide optimal habitat for native wildlife.

1.9.6 Wildlife Resources

1.9.6.1 Biotic Provinces

Just as Texas has been divided into major plant zones[17], the State has also been classified into biotic provinces based on the distribution of topographic features, climate, vegetation types, and terrestrial vertebrates[18] (Figure 1.21). The BGRWPA includes the Kansan, Austroriparian, Balconian, and Texan biotic provinces.

[17] Gould, Op. Cit., 1975.
[18] Blair, 1950.



Figure 1.20 Water Resources of the Brazos G Area



Figure 1.21 Biotic Provinces of the Brazos G Area

1.9.6.2 Kansan

The Kansan province runs southward from the Texas panhandle and across the Rolling Plains area of the Brazos G Area. It meets the Texan biotic province at the western boundary of the Cross Timbers and Prairies vegetational area. There is little available moisture in the province, and moisture that is available decreases from east to west. The plant associations vary. However, they fall into three general categories of associations: the mixed-grass plains, the mesquite-grass association, and the short-grass plains.

1.9.6.3 Austroriparian

The western fringe of the Austroriparian province extends into the southeastern rim of the Brazos G Area. This province comprises the pine and hardwood forests of the eastern Gulf Coastal plain. The province is limited to the west due to low moisture. However, vegetational communities found in the westward extensions of the province occur along drainageways where environmental conditions allow.

1.9.6.4 Balconian

The Balconian province includes most of the Edwards Plateau excluding the region west of the Pecos River. The Edwards Plateau is a physio-graphically discrete unit. It has a variety of wildlife, and its vegetation is different from that found in adjacent provinces. The abundant vertebrate species are a mixture of Austroriparian, Tamaulipan, Chihuahuan, and Kansan.

Most of the Balconian province lies on Cretaceous limestone, but igneous intrusives and sediments of Precambrian age are exposed in the Llano Uplift. Limestone caverns and springs are common features of this province. Massive outcrops of limestone are characteristic of the stream canyons, and limestone fragments occur at the surface over almost the entire area.

Rainfall amounts typically decrease from east to west. The most characteristic plant association is the juniper-oak scrub. Mesquite is also distributed throughout the province.

1.9.6.5 Texan

The Texan biotic province has no true endemic species of vertebrates. In this area, western species tend to encroach into open habitats, and eastern species encroach along the many wooded drainageways extending through the landscape. The Texan province has supported 49 species of mammals, 39 species of snakes, 16 species of lizards, 2 types of land turtles, 18 types of toads and frogs (anurans), and 5 species of salamander (urodeles).

1.9.6.6 Threatened and Endangered Species

In planning water-management strategies, one major consideration is the potential impact on threatened and endangered species. Table E-1 in Appendix E gives a complete list of threatened and endangered species in each county in the BGRWPA. Some of the more widely seen of these are the golden-cheeked warbler (Dendroica chrysoparia), the black-capped vireo (Vireo atricapillus), and the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus).

1.9.7 Agricultural Resources

Agriculture is a mainstay of the BGRWPA rural economy. Among livestock, cattle were the most significant component, approaching 1.86 million head with an additional 110,659 dairy cows in 2022. Almost 17 million acres, or about 84 percent of BGRWPA's total area, were classified as farmland in 2022. Of the 17 million acres of farmland, about 4.3 million acres were classified as cropland, of which about 2.1 million acres were harvested. Refer to Appendix E for detailed listings of agricultural information for the BGRWPA.

The Texas Department of Agriculture has specified several Agricultural Statistics Districts for the purpose of keeping records. The districts within the BGRWPA the Blacklands (District No. 40), Cross Timbers (District No. 30), East Texas South (District No. 52), Edwards Plateau (District No. 70), Northern Low Plains (District No. 21), South Central (District No. 81), and Southern Low Plains (District No. 22). Note, these Agricultural Statistics Districts have changed slightly in names, numbering, and boundaries since the 2021 RWP.

1.9.7.1 Blacklands

The Blacklands counties (District No. 40) are Bell, Bosque, Coryell, Falls, Hamilton, Hill, Johnson, Limestone, McLennan, Milam, and Williamson. Edwards Plateau (District No. 70), which contains Lampasas County, is included for the purposes of this analysis. The Blacklands is noted for dryland production of corn for grain, grain sorghum, wheat for grazing and grain, cotton, and hay. Irrigation in the Blacklands is limited by lack of sufficient groundwater supply.

1.9.7.2 Cross Timbers

The Cross Timbers counties (District No. 30) are Callahan, Comanche, Eastland, Erath, Hood, Palo Pinto, Shackelford, Somervell, Stephens, Throckmorton, and Young. Combined, these counties lead the State in dairy production. This is due to several factors such as available groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer, soils suitable for forage production, topography conducive to dairy operation, and an existing infrastructure. The major crops produced in the Cross Timbers are hay and silage, with smaller amounts of peanuts, pecans, and vegetables irrigated from the Trinity Aquifer.

1.9.7.3 East Texas South and South Central

East Texas South (District No. 52) and South Central (District No. 81) counties are Brazos, Burleson, Grimes, Lee, Robertson, and Washington. This subregion has limited row-crop agriculture because suitable topography and soils are limited. Hay and silage are the major agricultural products. The Brazos River Bottoms counties (Brazos, Burleson, and Robertson) produce most of the crops in the subregion, including corn for grain, grain sorghum, and cotton. The Brazos River Alluvium is the major source of groundwater for the Brazos River Bottoms.

1.9.7.4 Southern Low Plains

Counties in the Southern Low Plains (District No. 22) are Fisher, Haskell, Jones, Knox, Nolan, Stonewall, and Taylor. The Northern Low Plains (District No. 21), which contains Kent County, is included for the purpose of this analysis. The major dryland products are extensive row-crops, such as cotton, and wheat. Irrigation comes from the Seymour Aquifer where available. Major crops include wheat and cotton. Hay and silage are also produced, but because of low rainfall, their acreage is much less than in other districts in the BGRWPA.

1.9.7.5 Threats and Constraints to Water Supply

Projected population growth in the Region, particularly along the IH-35 Corridor, will strain existing municipal supplies. The population of Williamson County within Region G, for example, is projected to increase more than 450 percent between 2020 and 2080 to about 2,426,093 people. Water will become even more valuable, especially in the western and central parts of the BGRWPA, due to limited options for new reservoirs and because the aquifers in these areas have limited potential for further development.

Other concerns include the high content of chloride in surface-water runoff from the upper Brazos River Basin. Water with high chloride content is more expensive to treat and therefore places capital constraints on suppliers who obtain surface water from affected streams and reservoirs.

Zebra mussels are an invasive species impacting water quality in reservoirs and impairing the operation of water supply infrastructure. The TPWD maintains an up-to-date list of the occurrences of zebra mussels at the following web site:

https://tpwd.texas.gov/huntwild/wild/species/exotic/zebramusselmap.phtml

According to the website, as of July 2023, the following reservoirs in the Brazos G Area are either "infested", i.e., established reproducing populations, or "positive", i.e., zebra mussels or their larvae have been detected: Lake Belton, Lake Georgetown, Lake Granger, and Lake Stillhouse Hollow. The Little River, downstream of Lakes Belton, Stillhouse Hollow, Georgetown and Granger is also positive for zebra mussels. Several reservoirs in the adjacent Trinity and Colorado River Basins are also infested or positive.

1.9.8 Susceptibility of Water Supplies to Drought

1.9.8.1 Groundwater

The 16 aquifers within the BGRWPA vary in drought resistance, but all tend to have more resistance than most surface-water reservoirs. Most of the thick, deep, and extensive sand aquifers with moderate to high transmissivity react very slowly to droughts. Their supplies are virtually drought-proof even during long droughts. These aquifers, such as the Carrizo-Wilcox and Gulf Coast Aquifers, store enormous amounts of water. Somewhat thinner, yet still extensive, sand aquifers with low to moderate transmissivity commonly are only slightly less drought resistant. These aquifers include the Trinity, Woodbine, Queen City, Sparta, and Hickory. The geological characteristics of the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, classified as a confined aquifer, exacerbate the challenges associated with groundwater management. Confined aquifers are characterized by layers of impermeable rock that confine the groundwater, maintaining it under pressure and causing water levels to rise when accessed via wells. However, the extensive groundwater extraction can disturb this delicate balance. Large-scale pumping activities can significantly alter water pressure dynamics, resulting in a decline in water levels within wells. Consequently, accessing water becomes more difficult and costly for communities reliant on this resource.

During long droughts, shallow alluvial aquifers from which large withdrawals are made experience water level declines that are relatively large in comparison to total saturated thickness. Supplies from these aquifers, such as the Seymour and Brazos River Alluvium Aquifers, can be affected by drought but generally only by extended droughts. In extended droughts, available well yields are typically reduced, and pumps must run longer for a given level of supply.

In thin aquifers with shallow supplies, drought resistance may not be adequate. Such aquifers in the BGRWPA include the Dockum, Blaine, and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau). Also, shallow supplies in or near outcrop areas of aquifers, even of major aquifers, may have limited drought resistance.

Aquifers composed of limestone and/or dolomite are commonly the least drought- resistant. This is because these aquifers typically have only about one-tenth as much storage per cubic foot as sand aquifers. For limestone aquifers, the amount of well development is also an important factor in drought resistance. Thus, the Edwards (BFZ) Aquifer, with more developed well capacity than is available in extended droughts, is the least drought-resistant of all the aquifers in the BGRWPA.

Depending on location and exact local conditions, spring flows and some Edwards (BFZ) well supplies are substantially reduced in only moderate droughts. In contrast, the Marble Falls and Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifers, which are relatively undeveloped by wells, can more slowly discharge a part of their stored water during long droughts.

In the Brazos G Area, for supplies drawing from the Edwards (BFZ) Aquifer, drought planning is critical. All of the other aquifers in the Region are drought resistant due to their inherent characteristics.

1.9.8.2 Surface Water

Surface water supplies in the Region vary greatly, as annual rainfall ranges from 20 to 24 inches in Kent County in the northwest, to 40 to 48 inches in Grimes County in the southeast. Evaporation rates show a similarly wide variation, with the highest rates occurring in the northwestern part of the Region.

Drought originates from a deficiency of precipitation over an extended period of time, usually a season or more. This deficiency results in a water shortage for some activity, group, or environmental sector. Drought should be considered relative to some long-term average condition of balance between precipitation and evapotranspiration (i.e., evaporation + transpiration). It is also related to the timing (i.e., principal season of occurrence, delays in the start of the rainy season, occurrence of rains in relation to principal crop growth stages) and the effectiveness of the rains. Other climatic factors such as high temperature, high wind, and low relative humidity are often associated with drought and can significantly aggravate its severity.

Hydrological drought is associated with the effects of periods of precipitation shortfalls on surface water supply. The frequency and severity of hydrological drought is often defined on a watershed or river basin scale. Although all droughts originate with a deficiency of precipitation, hydrologists are more concerned with how this deficiency affects the water supply. Firm yields of reservoirs are estimated based on water that would be available through a repeat of the historic drought of record, which includes the effects of reduced runoff and high evaporation rates during the drought period. Water supply from run-of-the-river diversions are estimated based on water that would be available[19] through a repeat of the drought of record as well, but without the benefit of using stored water. The water supply estimates throughout this water plan are reliable through a repeat of the drought of record and are therefore not particularly susceptible to drought-induced shortages. However, the northwestern counties of the Brazos G Area are currently suffering through a particularly dry spell and data indicate new record drought conditions.

In 2009, 2011, 2012, and 2013 priority calls were made in the Brazos Basin. In July 2013 TCEQ issued an Order for the Brazos Basin including Possum Kingdom Lake and below Possum Kingdom Lake. The Order suspended or modified approximately 900 water rights in the Brazos Basin in 21 counties. The Order required the owners of larger reservoirs affected by the Order to submit pass-through plans, detailing their response to the priority call. The priority call was rescinded on October 10, 2013.

On April 9, 2014, the TCEQ directed that a new Watermaster be appointed for the Brazos River Basin including Possum Kingdom Lake and the watershed below the lake. The purpose of the Watermaster is to maintain compliance with water rights by monitoring stream flows, reservoir levels and water use. It is also the responsibility of the Watermaster to mediate the curtailment of water use if a priority call is initiated.

[19] Estimates of municipal and industrial run-of-river diversions are for 100 percent reliability. For irrigation uses, run-of-river reliability less than 100 percent is often acceptable.

1.9.9 Identified Water Quality Problems

Water quality varies throughout the upper, middle and lower portions of the BGRWPA. Water quality is generally good in aquifers and in the tributaries of the Brazos River. However, high concentrations of chloride are found in the main stem of the Brazos River. Three factors affecting water quality in the Brazos G Area are wastewater disposal, high-density agricultural activities, and natural saline contamination.[20] Except for the third factor, these threats are associated with the growth of both population and the economy, which are expected to continue in the future.

Water quality data collection and assessment studies have been conducted since 1991 through the Texas Clean Rivers Program (CRP). Through collaborative efforts with other agencies and basin residents, the BRA identifies and evaluates water quality and watershed management issues, establishes priorities for corrective actions, and implements activities to improve and protect the Brazos River basin. Identified surface water quality problems within the BGRWPA are summarized according to specific regions in the basin and are based on information from the Texas CRP 2022 Basin Summary Report.[21]

1.9.9.1 Upper Basin Region

The Upper Basin Region includes the Salt and Double Mountain Forks and the Clear Fork of the Brazos River. Water quality data reveal water quality impacts represented by high conductivity levels, along with high TDS and chloride concentrations. Impairments have been identified in the Salt Fork and Double Mountain Forks of the Brazos River for chloride, bacteria, and mercury in edible tissue (Lake Alan Henry). Concerns have been identified for bacteria, chlorophyll a/nutrients, dissolved oxygen, and selenium.

Within the Clear Fork watershed, land use is predominantly agricultural, with Abilene representing the only urban area. All but one classified segment meet water quality standards to support their designated uses. The Clear Fork Brazos River segment was listed in 2018 as impaired for bacteria. In addition, the Clear Fork of the Brazos has concerns for nitrate and chlorophyll a, along with an increasing trend in chloride concentrations. Chloride concentrations in this region are noted to be a natural feature and dependent upon weather conditions. There are also reported increasing concerns for nutrient levels in this segment.

While this area contributes only 14 to 18 percent of the total Brazos River flow, the area contributes 45 to 55 percent of the total dissolved minerals and about 75 to 85 percent of the dissolved salts. Special studies in the area include:

- Biological Assessments of California Creek.

[20] Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC), *Summary Report: Regional Assessments of Water Quality Pursuant to the Texas Clean Rivers Act (Senate Bill 818)*, 1992.

[21] Brazos River Authority, Texas Clean Rivers Program 2022 Basin Summary Report, available online at https://brazos.org/Portals/0/Documents/CRP/Brazos-River-Basin-Summary-Report-2022.pdf

1.9.9.2 Upper Central Basin Activity Region

The Upper Central Basin of the Brazos River includes eight lakes, five watersheds, and a variety of land uses interconnected throughout the watersheds. The Upper Central Basin Region generally covers from Bell County north to Hood County. Numerous watershed protection and management projects are being conducted in this region to address declining water quality due to impacts from industrial, agricultural, municipal, and natural causes.

Impairments have been identified in the Upper Watershed of the Brazos River for bacteria and sulfate/TDS. Concerns have been identified for nutrient/Chlorophyll a. Salt Fork and Double Mountain Forks of the Brazos River for chloride, bacteria, and mercury in edible tissue (Lake Alan Henry). Concerns have been identified for bacteria, chlorophyll a/nutrients, dissolved oxygen, and selenium.

Concerns in the Aquilla Watershed have been identified for nutrient/Chlorophyll a, dissolved oxygen, and arsenic in sediment, each within Hackberry Creek.

The Bosque River Watershed drains approximately 1,652 square miles and discharges into Lake Waco. Impairments have been identified for depressed dissolved oxygen and bacteria. Concerns have been identified for chlorophyll a/nutrients, bacteria, dissolved oxygen, and the microbenthic community in the North Bosque River.

Impairments identified in the Leon River Watershed include bacteria and dissolved oxygen. Concerns have been identified for specific segments in the watershed for dissolved oxygen, bacteria, and chlorophyll a/nutrients.

The Lampasas Watershed includes Stillhouse Hollow Lake and Salado Creek. Water quality issues include identified impairments for dissolved oxygen, and concerns for chlorophyll a/nutrients, dissolved oxygen, and bacteria.

Numerous activities and special studies have been performed in this area to study and improve water quality conditions, including:

- Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Improvement Project, a partnership initiated in 2016 between BRA and the TPWD to perform habitat improvement projects on Possum Kingdom Lake, Lake Granbury, Lake Proctor, Lake Aquilla, Lake Whitney, Lake Belton, Stillhouse Hollow Lake, Lake Georgetown, Lake Granger, Lake Limestone, and Lake Somerville.
- Brazos Basin Instream Flow Monitoring Program to Inform on Environmental Flow Standards, initiated by the BRA in 2012 to perform extensive environmental studies at select locations in the Brazos River basin to gather data related to the TCEQ's adopted Senate Bill 3 environmental flow baseline.
- A Total Maximum Daily Load for Atrazine in Aquilla Reservoir.
- Two Total Maximum Daily Loads for Phosphorus in the North Bosque River.
- Biological Assessments initiated by BRA for long-term aquatic life monitoring on the North Bosque River at Cooper's Crossing in 2008.
- A Watershed Protection Plan for the Leon River developed by stakeholders and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in early 2015 and presently in the implementation phase.
- A Watershed Protection Plan for Nolan Creek/South Nolan Creek developed by the Nolan Creek Watershed Partnership and accepted by the EPA in February 2019.
- Belton Lake, Proctor Lake, and Stillhouse Hollow Lake are part of a Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Improvement project.

- Biological Assessments in Resley Creek (an unclassified tributary of the Leon River) and the Leon River above Belton Lake.
- The Lampasas River Watershed Protection Plan to address bacteria issues in the watershed was approved by the EPA in May 2013 and by a Steering Committee in September 2013 and is in the implementation phase.

1.9.9.3 Lower Central Basin Activity Region

The Lower Central Basin includes the Little River Watershed (Lake Georgetown and Lake Granger), the Central Watershed (Lake Brazos Dam), and the Navasota River Watershed (Lake Mexia, Lake Springfield, and Lake Limestone). Portions of the area are subject to non-point source discharges and nutrient loading from agricultural activities.

The western portion of the Little River watershed is rapidly developing while the eastern portion of the watershed remains rural. It is reported that recent major industrial manufacturing movements will see urbanization spread even more rapidly eastward, potentially leading to additional land application of fertilizers, pesticides, pet waste, septic systems, and new sewage outfalls which can result in increased concentrations of nutrients, bacteria, and organic constituents. Data collected recently show that current water quality in the watershed overall is good and that most segments support their designated use classifications. Impairments have been identified for bacteria in the watershed, while concerns have been identified for chlorophyll a/nutrients, dissolved oxygen, and bacteria.

The Central Watershed of the Brazos River has primarily agricultural land usage, with two rapidly growing urban areas (Waco and Bryan/College Station). Impairments in portions of the watershed have been identified for bacteria and dissolved oxygen, and concerns have been identified for bacteria, dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll a/nutrients, microbenthic and fish communities, and fish kills in Tradinghouse Reservoir and Tehuacana Creek.

The Navasota Watershed covers approximately 2,235 square miles, with primarily agricultural land uses and one growing urban area (Bryan/College Station). Most of the water quality in the area is good, although there are segments of the watershed that are reported to exceed state standards for *Escherichia coli* and dissolved oxygen. Impairments have been identified within the watershed for bacteria, dissolved oxygen, and pH, while concerns have been identified for chlorophyll a/nutrients, dissolved oxygen, bacteria, and toxic substances in sediment.

Special studies in the area include:

- Big Elm Watershed Protection Plan.
- Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances for the Balcones Spike and Texas Fawnsfoot in the Brazos River Basin.
- The USACE Sustainable Rivers Program presently underway to bring projects to the Little River System which will evaluate reservoir release strategies using the lower fraction of the USACE controlled reservoir flood pools, including Lake Georgetown, Lake Granger, Stillhouse Hollow Lake, and Lake Belton.
- Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Improvement Project.
- Characterization of Middle Yegua, Davidson, and Deer Creeks project.
- Watershed Characterization of the Thompsons Creek Watershed.
- TPWD Tehuacana Creek water quality reporting.

- Navasota River Below Lake Limestone Watershed Protection Plan.
- Three Total Maximum Daily Loads for Indicator Bacteria in the Carters Creek Watershed.
- Brazos Basin Instream Flow Monitoring Program to Inform on Environmental Flow Standards.
- Biological Assessments on Duck Creek.

Additionally, elevated naturally occurring arsenic levels have been experienced in Trinity Aquifer groundwater produced from certain areas of Falls, Hill, Limestone, and Milam Counties which has created compliance issues with EPA drinking water standards.

1.9.9.4 Lower Basin Activity Region

The Lower Basin area includes the Yegua Creek Watershed, including Lake Somerville. Land use is mainly rural and cattle production with small urban areas and limited crop production areas. Water quality issues in portions of the area include identified impairments to bacteria, depressed dissolved oxygen, and pH, while concerns have been identified for bacteria, chlorophyll a, and dissolved oxygen.

Special studies in the area include:

- Characterization of Middle Yegua, Davidson, and Deer Creeks.
- Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Improvement.

1.9.10 Identified Threats to Agricultural and Natural Resources

Drought and water quality are the two primary threats to agricultural and natural resources in the Brazos G Area.

1.9.10.1 Threats to Agricultural Resources

Drought is the primary threat to agricultural resources in the Brazos G Area. During extended droughts, surface water sources crucial for unconfined livestock become severely depleted. Grazing lands and watering holes, essential for sustaining cattle and other free-roaming livestock, are significantly affected. With dwindling water sources, ranchers face the difficult task of providing adequate hydration and nutrition to their herds. Reduced access to water not only jeopardizes the health and well-being of livestock but also impairs their ability to graze effectively, leading to diminished forage availability and quality. Extended drought conditions not only diminish surface water supplies but also disrupt forage production cycles.

The scarcity of precipitation during critical growing seasons hampers the growth of essential forage crops, further exacerbating the challenges faced by livestock producers. Insufficient forage availability translates to reduced feed options for livestock, compelling ranchers to seek alternative feeding strategies or incur additional expenses to procure feed from external sources. Consequently, the overall productivity and profitability of livestock operations in the Brazos G Area are significantly compromised.

The reliance on groundwater for crop irrigation further magnifies the impact of drought on agricultural sustainability in the Brazos G Area. Limited groundwater availability during dry periods constrains farmers' ability to irrigate crops adequately, compromising yield potential and economic viability. As water becomes scarcer, farmers are forced to prioritize irrigation, often at the expense of other agricultural activities or face significant reductions in crop yields. Rural water systems, particularly in the northwest part of the region, face heightened vulnerability during drought periods. These systems, often reliant on

groundwater sources, experience reduced water availability, leading to challenges in meeting the needs of both human populations and confined livestock operations.

Water quality can also pose a threat to agricultural resources. Increased levels of salts and TDS may damage certain crops and require additional water for irrigation. High levels of salts can accumulate on the surface soils, creating a hardpan effect that impedes percolation of irrigated water. As water quality degrades, crop selection and production may be limited. An additional threat to crop production is the migration into agricultural land of municipal well fields to supply groundwater to growing cities. Groundwater Conservation Districts (GCDs) and Underground Water Conservation Districts have been created in part to manage groundwater supplies that may have competing interests.

1.9.10.2 Threats to Natural Resources

The Brazos River Basin within the BGRWPA is a freshwater eco-region that is defined as primarily temperate coastal rivers and lakes habitat, with high-ranking habitats for fish, reptiles and amphibian species.[22] The identified threats to biological resources within the Brazos River Basin are multifaceted, with their origins rooted in various human activities and environmental changes. Land use disturbance, such as urbanization, agriculture, and deforestation, can lead to habitat loss, fragmentation, and degradation, directly impacting the flora and fauna dependent on these ecosystems. Moreover, reduced stream flow resulting from prolonged droughts amplifies the stress on aquatic habitats, leading to diminished water availability and altered hydrological regimes. These changes can disrupt the reproductive cycles, migration patterns, and overall health of aquatic species, further exacerbating biodiversity loss within the basin.

In addition to natural phenomena like drought, current and future water diversions from water supply projects pose a significant threat to the ecological integrity of the Brazos River Basin. These diversions can alter the flow regimes of rivers and streams, disrupting the natural balance of aquatic ecosystems and exacerbating habitat fragmentation. Lower lake levels resulting from water diversions and climate variability can impact not only the aquatic habitats within the lakes but also the surrounding riparian zones. Decreased water levels lead to the loss of critical habitat for aquatic species and riparian vegetation, exacerbating the decline in species richness and biodiversity. The impacted quality of surface and groundwater due to pollution from agricultural runoff, industrial discharge, and urban wastewater further compounds these challenges, threatening the health and viability of both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems within the basin. Declining flows can affect the availability and quality of aquatic habitats and streamside vegetation and also contribute to changes in water temperature and chemistry.

As discussed in Section 1.7.2, water quality in the Brazos River Basin has been degraded by increased concentrations of chlorides, dissolved metals, ammonia, nitrates, and phosphates, pesticides, algae, and fecal coliform bacteria. Under lower flow conditions, greater effects from pesticide contamination could occur through higher concentrations of chlorinated hydrocarbons and organic phosphates. A summary of potential effects that identified threats would have on biological resources is presented in Table 1.10. The water resources impacted by water quality concerns identified in Section 1.7.2 within the Brazos River Basin are presented in Table 1.11.

[22] Abell, R.A, D.M. Olson, E. Dinerstein, P.T. Hurley, J.T. Diggs, W. Eichbaum, S. Walters, W. Wettengel, T. Allnutt, C.J. Loucks, and P. Hedao. 2000. Freshwater Eco-regions of North America – A Conservation Assessment. World Wildlife Fund. Island Press. Washington D.C. 320 pp.

Reduced stream flows and reservoir levels, which are brought on by drought and increases in water use, pose the greatest potential threat to aquatic species in the region. Lower stream flows would alter the proportion of stream runs, riffles, pools, and backwater sloughs and decrease the wetted perimeter (total available habitat). These changes in habitat may benefit some species, primarily hardy, generalist species, but would negatively impact most species and result in reduced species richness. Riparian vegetation is also threatened by less over bank flooding and a shift to more mesic (drier) conditions with a decline in those species that are dependent on flooding processes (cottonwood, willow, and pecan) and an increase in species tolerating drier conditions (hackberry and mesquite).

Lower reservoir levels can have varying effects on habitat and biodiversity, depending on their duration and timing. When reservoir levels remain low for extended periods, the available habitat for aquatic species diminishes. This reduction in habitat availability can lead to lower species diversity and decreased species abundance. Aquatic organisms dependent on specific water depths and shoreline habitats may struggle to find suitable areas for breeding, foraging, and refuge. Consequently, the overall ecosystem health may decline, affecting the ecological balance within the reservoir. In contrast, if lower reservoir levels occur seasonally and are followed by subsequent rising lake levels, there can be potential positive effects, particularly on fishery production.

Seasonal fluctuations in water levels can stimulate productivity within the reservoir ecosystem. For example, during periods of low water levels, exposed shoreline areas may experience increased nutrient availability and sunlight exposure, promoting the growth of aquatic vegetation and phytoplankton. These conditions can enhance food availability and habitat complexity, ultimately benefiting fish populations. However, the extent of these positive effects depends on the timing and duration of both the low and rising water levels. If the low water levels coincide with critical periods in the life cycles of fish species, such as spawning or nursery habitat requirements, the benefits to fishery production may be limited. Additionally, rapid fluctuations in water levels can disrupt fish spawning behaviors and nesting sites, potentially offsetting any gains in fishery productivity.

Table 1.10 Summary of Regional Threats to Biological Resources in the Brazos River Basin

Threat	Potential Effects to Aquatic Organisms	Potential Effect to Riparian Vegetation
Rivers & Streams		
Lower Streamflows	Decreased stream runs, riffles, pools, and backwater sloughs resulting in lower habitat diversity and species richness.	Less overbank flooding and shift to more mesic (drier) conditions with decline in species dependent on flooding processes and increase in species tolerating drier conditions.
Lower Water Quality	Lower habitat suitability; lower habitat diversity, species richness, and abundance; possible direct and indirect adverse effects from point and non-point source contaminants.	Potentially enhanced growth from higher concentrations of phosphorus, nitrates, and other nutrients; but increased growth could be suppressed by lower water tables from declining flows, increased salinities or exposure to contaminants.

Threat	Potential Effects to Aquatic Organisms	Potential Effect to Riparian Vegetation
Reservoirs		
Lower Reservoir Levels	If prolonged, less available habitat resulting in lower species diversity & species abundance. If seasonal, potential positive effects through enhanced fishery production, depending on timing and duration of subsequent rising lake levels.	Increase in growth of shoreline herbaceous and woody vegetation during lower lake levels, but growth suppressed or reversed by rising lake levels and seasonal inundation.
Bays & Estuaries		
Reduced freshwater inflows	Possible change in hydrological dynamics of estuary. Projected effects would be minimal due to limited coastal marsh habitats associated with the Brazos River Estuary.	Effects considered minimal due to limited coverage resulting from previous levee construction and river channelization.

Table 1.11 Location of Threats to Biological Resources Related to Water Quality in the Brazos River

Identified Threats	Upper Basin	Upper Central Basin	Lower Central Basin	Lower Basin
Increased Chlorides	Salt and Double Mountain Forks, Clear Fork Brazos River segment, White River Lake	Upper Brazos River		
Bacteria	Salt Fork and Double Mountain Forks, Clear Fork Brazos River segment. Miller's Creek Reservoir	Upper Brazos River, Aquilla Watershed, Lake Waco, Leon River, Bosque River, Stillhouse Hollow Lake and Salado Creek	Lake Georgetown, Lake Granger, Lake Brazos Dam, Lake Mexia, Lake Springfield, and Lake Limestone	Yegua Creek Watershed, Lower Brazos River Watershed, Upper and Middle Oyster Creek Watersheds
Dissolved Oxygen	Salt Fork and Double Mountain Forks	Upper Brazos River. Aquilla Watershed, Bosque River, Lake Waco, Leon River, Stillhouse Hollow Lake and Salado Creek	Lake Georgetown, Lake Granger, Lake Brazos Dam, Lake Mexia, Lake Springfield, and Lake Limestone	Yegua Creek Watershed, Lower Brazos River Watershed

Identified Threats	Upper Basin	Upper Central Basin	Lower Central Basin	Lower Basin
Increased Nutrients(1)	Salt and Double Mountain Forks, Clear Fork Brazos River segment, California Creek	Upper Brazos River, Aquilla Watershed, Bosque River, Lake Waco, Leon River, Stillhouse Hollow Lake and Salado Creek	Lake Georgetown, Lake Granger, Lake Mexia, Lake Springfield, and Lake Limestone, Lake Brazos Dam	Yegua Creek Watershed, Lower Brazos River Watershed, Upper and Middle Oyster Creek Watersheds
Algae		North Bosque River, Lake Waco	Lake Brazos Dam	
Pesticides & Heavy Metals	Salt Fork and Double Mountain Forks	Aquilla Watershed, Upper Brazos River	Trinity Aquifer groundwater, Lake Brazos Dam	

Notes:
(1) Includes: ammonia, phosphorus, nitrogen, nitrate-nitrogen.

1.10 Drought Preparations

With significant historical growth across the State and considering the current projections for future growth in the Brazos G area, the demand for water is expected to continue increasing. Preparation and planning for potential future drought(s) is critical to ensuring a sufficient water supply is available to meet user demands.

In drought preparation efforts, the droughts of record, or the worst droughts during the available period of hydrologic data, can be a useful metric. In the Brazos G area, the most significant drought of record occurred in the 1950s. This drought lasted almost a decade, including the second, third, and eighth driest years on record at the time. By 1956, 244 of the 245 counties in the State were considered disaster areas. Two other notable droughts occurred in 2006 and 2011, with the 2011 drought declared as the most severe one-year drought on record.

Drought contingency plans are required by the State for wholesale water suppliers, irrigation districts, and retail water suppliers. For surface water right-holders that supply 1,000 ac-ft/yr or more for non-irrigation use and 10,000 ac-ft/yr for irrigation use, SB1 requires a water conservation plan. To aid entities in the Region with the development of these plans, example water conservation and drought management plans are provided in Appendices J and K.

In addition, conservation plans are commonly included in the management plans of GCDs or Underground Water Conservation Districts. Refer to Chapter 7 of this Plan for more detailed information concerning the drought of record in the Brazos G area, current drought preparation and considerations, and recommendations for additional regional level drought response planning tools.

1.11 Existing Programs and Goals

1.11.1 Groundwater Regulation

1.11.1.1 Priority Groundwater Management Areas

The Texas Legislature authorized the TCEQ to identify and delineate priority groundwater management areas (PGMAs) as "those areas of the State that are experiencing or that are expected to experience, within the immediately following 25-year period, critical groundwater problems, including shortages of surface water or groundwater, land subsidence resulting from groundwater withdrawal, and contamination of groundwater supplies" (§Section 35.007, Chapter 35, Title 2, Texas Water Code).

Following a PGMA designation, the TCEQ may recommend creating a GCD. Citizens in the PGMA have two years to establish a GCD. If a GCD is not established in the required timeframe, a GCD will be established that is consistent with the original TCEQ recommendation, which will be governed by a locally elected board of directors.

TCEQ designated two PGMA areas in the BGRWPA, the Central Texas-Trinity Aquifer PGMA and the Northern Trinity and Woodbine Aquifers PGMA, shown on Figure 1.22. TCEQ designated the Central Texas-Trinity Aquifer PGMA on October 31, 2008. Counties in this PGMA include Bosque, Coryell, Hill, McLennan, and Somervell. The Northern Trinity and Woodbine Aquifers PGMA was designated on February 11, 2009. This PGMA includes Collin, Cooke, Dallas, Denton, Ellis, Fannin, Grayson, Hood, Johnson, Montague, Parker, Tarrant, and Wise counties. Only Hood and Johnson counties are in the Brazos G Area.

At the time of this Plan, all affected counties in the PGMA areas are part of GCDs. In 2007 the Upper Trinity GCD was formed, which includes Hood County. In May 2009, Bosque County joined the Middle Trinity GCD. The Tablerock GCD, which included Coryell County, was dissolved by the Legislature; Coryell County joined the Middle Trinity GCD in 2009. In 2009, the Texas Legislature created the Prairielands GCD and the Southern Trinity GCD. The Prairieland GCD includes Johnson, Hill and Somervell counties. At this time, only McLennan County is part of the Southern Trinity GCD. A map of the GCDs is presented in Figure 1.23.



Figure 1.22 PGMAs

1.11.1.2 GCDs and Groundwater Management Areas

There are 13 GCDs in the BGRPA, as shown on Figure 1.23 and listed in Table 1.12. All GCDs are required to develop and implement a management plan to manage groundwater resources. A list of the GCDs' management plan approval dates is shown on Table 1.12 and are available through the TWDB website.

In 2001, SB2 of the 77th Texas Legislature authorized the TWDB to designate Groundwater Management Areas (GMAs) that would include all major and minor aquifers of the State. Sixteen GMAs were delineated and adopted by the TWDB in 2002 and cover all major and minor aquifers in Texas. The BGRWPA intersects GMA 6, 7, 8, 12, and 14. These GMAs are shown on Figure 1.23 and are listed in Table 1.13.

In 2005, House Bill 1763 of the 79th Texas Legislature required GCDs in groundwater management areas to meet and define the Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) of the groundwater resources within the groundwater management area. The legislation requires that the DFCs be defined by September 1, 2010 and every five years thereafter. This requires joint planning among the GCDs in each GMA to determine DFCs.

DFCs are defined by statute to be "the desired, quantified condition of groundwater resources (such as water levels, spring flows, or volumes) within a management area at one or more specified future times as defined by participating GCDs within a groundwater management area as part of the joint groundwater planning process." The most common DFCs are based on the volume of groundwater in storage over time, water levels (limiting decline within the aquifer), water quality (limiting deterioration of quality) or spring flow (defining a minimum flow to sustain).

After the DFCs are determined by the GMAs, the TWDB performs quantitative analysis to determine the amount of groundwater available for production that does not exceed the DFC. For aquifers where a groundwater availability model (GAM) exists, the GAM is used to develop the modeled available groundwater (MAG). The MAG estimated through this process is then used by RWPGs as the available groundwater for the planning period. For aquifers or local groundwater that are not listed as a minor or major aquifer, the water availability is based on historical use and available hydrogeological records. Table 1.13 shows the status of the DFCs development, and the status of the determination of Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) for each GMA in the BGRWPA.



Figure 1.23 GCDs and Groundwater Management Areas Located Wholly or Partially within the Brazos G Area

Table 1.12 GCD Management Plan Approval Dates

Name of District	Date Plan Approved
Bluebonnet GCD	1/27/2022
Brazos Valley GCD	5/13/2019
Clear Fork GCD	2/25/2022
Clearwater GCD	12/20/2020
Lost Pines GCD	9/21/2022
Middle Trinity GCD	7/27/2022
Post Oak Savannah GCD	11/15/2022
Prairielands GCD	5/31/2019
Rolling Plains GCD	8/25/2020
Saratoga GCD	8/31/2020
Southern Trinity GCD	9/9/2021
Upper Trinity GCD	7/6/2020
Wes-Tex GCD	3/18/2020

Table 1.13 GCDs, Aquifers, DFCs, and MAG Status by GMA for the Brazos G Area

Groundwater Management Areas			
Groundwater Management Area 6			
Clear Fork GCD, Rolling Plains GCD			
Aquifer	Major or Minor Aquifer?	DFCs Status	Modeled Available Groundwater Status
Seymour	Major	11/18/2021	Submitted 11/14/2022, GR 21-011 MAG
Dockum	Minor	11/18/2021	Submitted 11/14/2022, GR 21-011 MAG
Blaine	Minor	11/18/2021	Submitted 11/14/2022, GR 21-011 MAG
Cross Timbers	Minor	No DFC adopted(1)	-
Groundwater Management Area 7			
Wes-Tex GCD			
Aquifer	Major or Minor Aquifer?	DFCs Status	Modeled Available Groundwater Status
Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)	Major	8/19/2021	Submitted 8/12/2022, GR 21-012 MAG
Dockum	Minor	No DFC adopted(1)	-
Groundwater Management Area 8			
Clearwater UWCD, Middle Trinity GCD, Post Oak Savannah GCD[2], Prairielands GCD, Saratoga UWCD, Southern Trinity GCD, Upper Trinity GCD			
Aquifer	Major or Minor Aquifer?	DFCs Status	Modeled Available Groundwater Status
Trinity	Major	11/4/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-013 MAG

Groundwater Management Areas			
Groundwater Management Area 8 (continued)			
Clearwater UWCD, Middle Trinity GCD, Post Oak Savannah GCD[2], Prairielands GCD, Saratoga UWCD, Southern Trinity GCD, Upper Trinity GCD			
Edwards (BFZ)	Major	11/4/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-013 MAG
Brazos River Alluvium	Minor	No DFC adopted(1)	-
Ellenburger - San Saba	Minor	11/4/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-013 MAG
Hickory	Minor	11/4/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-013 MAG
Marble Falls	Minor	11/4/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-013 MAG
Woodbine	Minor	11/4/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-013 MAG
Groundwater Management Area 12			
Brazos Valley GCD, Post Oak Savannah GCD[2], Lost Pines GCD			
Aquifer	**Major or Minor Aquifer?**	**DFCs Status**	**Modeled Available Groundwater Status**
Carrizo-Wilcox	Major	11/30/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-017 MAG
Brazos River Alluvium	Minor	11/30/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-017 MAG
Queen City	Minor	11/30/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-017 MAG
Sparta	Minor	11/30/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-017 MAG
Yegua-Jackson	Minor	11/30/2021	Submitted 11/1/2022, GR 21-017 MAG
Groundwater Management Area 14			
Bluebonnet GCD			
Aquifer	**Major or Minor Aquifer?**	**DFCs Status**	**Modeled Available Groundwater Status**
Gulf Coast	Major	1/5/2022	Submitted 9/8/2022, GR 21-019 MAG

Notes:
(1) No DFC is currently adopted by GMA for this aquifer and no corresponding MAG has been published by the GMA. Availability estimates presented elsewhere in this plan are based on historic modeling and/or modeling during MAG development for other aquifers. 2 Post Oak Savannah GCD is in GMA 8 and GMA 12.

1.11.1.3 Texas Clean Rivers Act

In 1991, the 72nd Legislature passed the Texas Clean Rivers Act[23] to establish for the first time a watershed basis for water quality planning in Texas.[24,25] The Act requires each river basin in the State to be assessed for water quality and management strategies on an on-going basis. It also requires reports to be provided to the TCEQ every even-numbered year.[26] The Act provides specific guidelines for accomplishing the water quality assessments, including: (1) comprehensive assessments on a watershed basis with emphasis on non-point sources, nutrients, and toxic materials; (2) delegation of responsibility for assessments to river authorities; (3) formation of river basin steering committees; (4) discharge permitting on a basin-wide basis; and (5) assessment fees charged to wastewater- and water-rights permittees.

The BRA is a partner with the TCEQ in the CRP for the BGRWPA. The program provides funding for BRA staff to assess water quality in the Brazos River Basin and to document local problems. Also, the program provides fee payers with site-specific information on water quality such as receiving water assessments and flow data. The Basin Summary 2022 Report[27] for the Brazos River Basin provides an assessment of water quality for the basin, drawing attention in part to: (1) the exceedance of State standards raising concerns for recreation due to elevated bacteria levels, dissolved oxygen depletion, and natural salt impacts to the usability of water, (2) the need for more long-term data on water quality, (3) non-point source pollution, (4) wastewater and watershed management issues, (5) impacts to ecosystems, and (6) the needs for funding and public education. The 2022 Basin Summary provides detailed findings about water quality and related items for selected sub-watersheds of the basin. The findings most relevant to the BGRWPA were summarized in Section 1.7.2.

1.11.2 Clean Water Act

The 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which as amended is called the Clean Water Act, is the Federal law with the most impact on water quality protection in the BGRWPA. As amended in 1977 and again in 1987, the Clean Water Act: (1) establishes the framework for monitoring and controlling industrial and municipal point-source discharges through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, (2) authorizes Federal assistance for the construction of municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and (3) requires cities to obtain permits for stormwater or non-point-source discharges.[28] The Clean Water Act also includes provisions to protect specific aquatic resources. Section 303 establishes a non-degradation policy for high quality waters and provides for establishment of State standards for receiving water quality. Section 401 allows states to enforce water quality requirements for Federal projects such as dams. Section 404 provides safeguards for wetlands and other waters from the discharge of dredged or fill material. Section 305 calls for the TCEQ to prepare and submit a water quality inventory to the EPA.[29]

[23] Senate Bill 818, amending the Texas Water Code, Sections 5.103, 5.105, 26.011; T.A.C. Sections 320.1-320.9.
[24] TNRCC, Op. Cit., 1992.
[25] TNRCC, Op. Cit., 1999.
[26] BRA, "Planning and Environmental Division", [Online] Available URL: http://www.brazos.org/home.htm, 1999.
[27] BRA, Op. Cit., 2022.
[28] 33 USCA, Sections 1251 through 1387.
[29] TWDB, 1997.

Other provisions protect particular types of ecosystems such as lakes (Section 314), estuaries (Section 320), and oceans (Section 403).[30] Several of these provisions are relevant to specific water quality concerns in the BGRWPA.

1.11.3 Safe Drinking Water Act

The Safe Drinking Water Act, passed in 1974 and amended in 1986 and 1996, allows the EPA to set standards for drinking water quality. These standards are divided into two categories: (1) National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (primary standards that must be met by all public water suppliers) and (2) National Secondary Water Regulations (secondary standards that are not enforceable but are recommended). Primary standards protect water quality by limiting levels of contaminants that are known to adversely affect public health and that are anticipated to occur in water. Secondary standards have been set for contaminants that may affect cosmetic or aesthetic qualities of water (e.g., taste, odor, or color). For some constituents, the state of Texas has secondary standards that differ from the national standards.

1.11.4 Source Water Assessment and Protection Program

The TCEQ's Source Water Assessment and Protection (SWAP) Program can be an important part of water resource management. The SWAP Program, authorized by the Safe Drinking Water Act, assists local jurisdictions in preventing contamination of drinking water supplies. It identifies sources of public drinking water, determines potential contaminants, assesses water systems' susceptibility to contamination, and informs the public of the results. It is part of a comprehensive, integrated approach to clean ground and surface water undertaken by the TCEQ.

The centerpiece of the SWAP Program is a focus on prevention. Water can be easily contaminated, but it is difficult and expensive to clean up. Through the SWAP Program, by preventing contamination, jurisdictions are able to avoid the cost of removing contamination and maintain clean, reliable sources for drinking water.

The SWAP Program is designed to assist Texas communities in protecting their drinking water sources. Its goal is to increase public awareness of the importance of protecting drinking water sources and actions that can be taken to protect those sources. The SWAP Process involves seven steps:

1. Delineation (or mapping) of source water protection areas, any areas surrounding a drinking water source, whether from ground or surface water.
2. Conducting an inventory of actual or potential sources of contamination in the delineated area.
3. Conducting an analysis of the relative susceptibility of the water supply to those contamination sources and presenting the results to the public water supply in the form of a Source Water Susceptibility Assessment Report. These results provide insights into activities near your water sources and serve as the starting point for implementing source water protection.
4. Working with selected local communities to make information available to the public.

[30] Adler, R.W., Landman, J. and Cameron, D., *The Clean Water Act: Twenty Years Later*, Island Press, Washington D.C., 1993.

5. Voluntary application of best management practices to prevent contamination, such as land use practices, regulations and permits, structural measures, good housekeeping practices, public education and emergency response planning.
6. Monitoring and continually assessing source water supplies; and,
7. Conducting triennial sampling and continually monitoring, assessing and conducting protection activities.

By conducting continual monitoring, assessment and protection activities, communities can minimize potential sources of contamination and protect source water supplies over the long-term.

1.11.5 State Water Availability Modeling Initiatives

1.11.5.1 TCEQ Water Availability Models

Water Availability Models (WAMs) are computer-based simulation models used to determine water availability for surface water rights under Texas' priority system. These models are used to evaluate water availability for newly requested water rights or water right amendments. The models are also used for regional water planning. There are 20 individual WAMs that cover the 23 river basins in Texas, including coastal basins. The original hydrologic period of record within most WAMs was approximately 1940 to 1997; however, the TCEQ has been working in coordination with stakeholders throughout the State to extend this period with more recent hydrologic data. An updated Brazos WAM has now been developed that extends the hydrologic data in the official model through 2018.

There are two WAM scenarios used and maintained by TCEQ staff:

1. Full Authorization (Run3) – In the Full Authorization scenario all water rights utilize their full authorized amounts. This scenario is used to evaluate perpetual water rights and amendments.
2. Current Conditions (Run 8) – The Current Conditions scenario Includes return flows, current reservoir conditions and has water rights diversions based on historical use. This scenario is used to evaluate term water rights.

Most of the Brazos G Planning Area falls within the area covered by the Brazos WAM. Existing supplies and future water management strategies were evaluated using a modified WAM Run 3. The modified WAM Run3 includes existing and future sediment conditions for reservoirs.

1.11.5.2 TWDB Groundwater Availability Models

Groundwater Availability Models (GAMs) were developed under the direction of the TWDB. The GAMs cover most of the major and minor aquifers within Texas. The GAMs are used in the regional planning process as discussed in Section 1.11.1. Based on the agreed upon DFCs the GAMs are run to develop the MAG for each aquifer to be used in the Regional Planning Process.

1.12 Previous Water Supply Planning in the Brazos G Area

As discussed in previous sections, the Brazos G Area is large and diverse with varying needs of water users in the different parts of the Region. In response to these different needs, the Region has a history of successful local water supply planning and development. These studies are too numerous to identify and list in entirety here. Some of the more recent studies include:

1. Bosque County water treatment and distribution study to address water needs in Bosque County in the central Brazos River Basin. The study was completed in March 2004.[31]
2. The BRA and TRWD sponsored a water supply study for Parker and Johnson Counties in the central Brazos River Basin to meet the growing needs of this area. Phase 1 of the study was completed in April 2004.[32]
3. The West Central Brazos River Basin Regional Water Treatment and Distribution Facility Study evaluated water needs in the upper Brazos River Basin. This study was completed in August 2004.[33]
4. Bell/Williamson Regional Water Supply Facility Plan – Included eight participants in southern Bell County and Northern Williamson County. The study recommended the cooperation of these eight participants in development of infrastructure and water supply projects.
5. The City of Abilene and the Cities of Midland and San Angelo (Region F) have formed the West Texas Water Partnership (WTWP) to identify and secure long-range water supplies for the three cities and the surrounding region. Results from ongoing studies will be reflected in future regional water plans.
6. The FHLM-TWDB Regional Water Facility Planning Study evaluated the feasibility of a regional water system to replace and/or supplement multiple smaller water systems currently providing service within the FHLM area. The study addresses elevated arsenic concentrations experienced by study participants and also evaluates water treatment and transmission alternatives to meet the arsenic maximum contaminant level (MCL).[34]

Brief summaries of the Brazos G Regional and State Water Plans and several studies completed recently are presented in the following sections.

1.12.1 Brazos G Regional and State Water Plans

Since SB1 was passed in 1997, the Brazos G Regional Planning Group has completed four rounds of planning, with regional plans adopted in 2001, 2006, 2011, 2016, and 2021. These regional plans have been rolled up with 15 other regional plans into the State Water Plan in 2002, 2007, 2012, 2017, and 2022, respectively. Each successive plan has been updated to reflect the most relevant information at the time. This section provides a brief summary of each of the Brazos G Regional Water Plans and the State Water Plans.

---

[31] Carter-Burgess, March 2004, Bosque County Regional Water Treatment and Distribution Facilities Plan, Final Report to the Brazos River Authority.

[32] Freese and Nichols, April 2004, Regional Water Supply and Wastewater Service Study for Johnson and Parker Counties, Phase I.

[33] Freese and Nichols, August 2004, West Central Brazos River Basin Regional Water Treatment and Distribution Facility Plan.

[34] Susan Roth, 2015, Final Draft Report – FHLM Regional Water Facility Planning Study.

1.12.1.1 2001 Brazos G Regional Water Plan[35]

The 2001 Brazos G Regional Water Plan found that on a regional basis, there are sufficient water supplies to meet the projected demands. By 2050, the Region was projected to have a surplus of about 500,000 ac-ft/yr, yet there were some entities that did not have enough water to meet projected needs. The highest growth areas were identified along the I-35 corridor in the central part of the Region, straining existing groundwater supplies. Slower economic growth and implementation of previous long-term planning in the upper Brazos G Area resulted in fewer municipal needs in this part of the Region. However, water quality concerns in the upper Brazos River Basin can limit water supplies.

The major recommended strategies in the 2001 Plan included four new major reservoirs, reallocation of hydropower storage in Lake Whitney, coordinated operation of reservoir systems for the BRA and the City of Abilene, chloride control in the upper Brazos River Basin, and further development of groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox aquifer. Since the Plan was completed, the California Creek Diversion Project, a recommended strategy in the 2001 Plan for the City of Stamford to supplement supplies from Lake Stamford, has been constructed and is operational. Other smaller projects also have been completed or are in the design phase.

The recommended new major reservoirs include:

1. Millican Reservoir (Bundic Dam Site).
2. Little River Reservoir.
3. South Bend Reservoir (long-term strategy).
4. Breckenridge Reservoir (long-term strategy).

1.12.1.2 2006 Brazos G Regional Water Plan[36]

In the 2006 Plan, a comparison of total supplies available in the Region with demand for all use categories in the Region shows a surplus past the year 2050. These mask shortages that are projected to occur to individual water supply entities and water user groups. Shortages were shown for entities in 32 of the 37 counties in the Brazos G Area. The recommended water strategies included advanced water conservation, wastewater reuse, system operation of BRA Reservoirs, conjunctive use, desalination, aquifer storage and recovery, brush management, weather modification, six new on-channel and five new off-channel reservoirs, regional interconnection, Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer development and voluntary redistribution. The total supply from these recommended water supplies is over 590,000 ac-ft/yr at an estimated cost of over $1 billion.

[35] Brazos G Regional Planning Group, January 2001, Regional Water Plan.
[36] Brazos G Regional Planning Group, January 2006, Regional Water Plan.

1.12.1.3 2011 Brazos G Regional Water Plan[37]

In the 2011 Plan, a comparison of total supplies available in the Region (developed groundwater supplies and firm surface water) with demand for all use categories in the Region shows a surplus past the year 2040. These mask shortages that are projected to occur to individual water supply entities and water user groups. Shortages are projected for Williamson County starting at about the year 2020, while overall regional supplies are projected to exceed regional demands until past the year 2040. Even within most counties that have projected overall surpluses, there are individual entities that do not have sufficient supply to meet projected needs. Shortages were shown for entities in 31 of the 37 counties in the Brazos G Area. The recommended water strategies included advanced water conservation, wastewater reuse, system operation of BRA Reservoirs, conjunctive use, desalination, aquifer storage and recovery, brush management, weather modification, nine new on-channel and six new off-channel reservoirs, regional interconnection, Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer development, voluntary redistribution, storage reallocation of Federal reservoirs and reservoir connections. The total supply from these recommended water supplies is over 587,000 ac-ft/yr at an estimated cost of over $3 billion.

1.12.1.4 2016 Brazos G Regional Water Plan[38]

Municipal demands are developed assuming a hot, dry year, with 2011 typically selected as the basis for estimating daily per capita use values (gpcd) for each WUG. Conservation is considered first as water management.

The 2016 Brazos G Regional Water Plan includes recommendations for 99,573 ac-ft/yr of municipal conservation savings and another 46,662 ac-ft/yr for wastewater reuse. The conservation savings are in excess of those already included in the TWDB demand projections. Conservation recommendations for several entities in Williamson County go beyond this and call for a reduction to a target of 120 gpcd by 2070.

Total new supplies of water into the Brazos G Area total 397,655 ac-ft/yr, comprised of newly developed groundwater, supply transferred from other regions, newly developed surface water supplies, or supplies made available through conservation or augmentation of existing facilities. Total project costs for these new supplies exceed $2.5 billion.

System operation of the BRA's reservoirs can increase supplies in the Brazos G Area by nearly 167,000 ac-ft/yr (assuming interruptible supplies can be firmed up through conjunctive operation with other sources), with additional supplies available to the Region H Area in the lower basin. This strategy would more efficiently utilize the existing resources of the BRA by expanding the supply that can be developed from the BRA's existing reservoirs, thus delaying the need for new reservoirs to meet growing needs in the basin. Related to this, over drafting of Lake Granger when the reservoir is nearly full and injecting part of this supply into the Trinity Aquifer through an Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) project can yield an additional 9,050 ac-ft/yr of supply when the ASR well field is operated in conjunction with Lake Granger to meet demands.

[37] Brazos G Regional Planning Group, January 2011, Regional Water Plan.
[38] Brazos G Regional Planning Group, January 2016, Regional Water Plan.

During the Brazos G regional water planning process, water management strategies such as additional development of Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer groundwater and the Lake Granger Augmentation Project were preferred options to include in the 2016 Brazos G Regional Water Plan. When confronted by the Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) limitations of these two options, the BGRWPG had little alternative at that time but to make the Little River Off-Channel Reservoir a recommended strategy.

1.12.1.5 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan[39]

In the 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan, it was determined that the annual total water usage in the Region was projected to significantly increase from 853,170 ac-ft in 2010 to 1,408,066 ac-ft in 2070, marking a 65 percent increase over the 50-year planning horizon. Over this period, municipal and steam-electric water usage were projected to increase, while mining, irrigation, and livestock water usage were anticipated to decline as proportions of the total.

The analysis utilized the drought as the basis for water supply determinations in the Region, with hydrologic data extended to consider more recently observed drought conditions in the Brazos River basin. Fifteen aquifers underlying parts of the Brazos G Area were identified, with a combined reliable supply of approximately 500,100 ac-ft/yr by the 2070 decade. Along with surface water supplies, the significance of groundwater supplies were highlighted, such as the Seymour Aquifer in the western part of the Region, alongside the Dockum and Edwards-Trinity Aquifers. In the eastern part, the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer was identified as a prolific water supply, supplemented by lesser amounts from the Queen City, Sparta, and Brazos River Alluvium.

Strategies recommended in the 2021 Brazos G Plan included numerous and varied approaches such as water conservation, wastewater reuse, near-term construction of new reservoirs, groundwater development, the augmentation of existing reservoir supplies, brush control, desalination, aquifer storage and recovery, and regional water supply projects. The total new supplies of water into the Brazos G Area were estimated at 424,436 ac-ft/yr, with associated project costs exceeding $9 billion.

The Plan also provided recommendations for municipal conservation savings and wastewater reuse, totaling 103,439 ac-ft/yr and 38,315 ac-ft/yr, respectively. Furthermore, guidance on drought management and emergency supply measures was offered to assist water managers in managing their systems. Recommendations were made to the TWDB and the Texas Legislature regarding key water policy issues and the direction of water supply management in Texas.

1.12.1.6 Water for Texas 2002[40]

This was the first State Water Plan to be adopted by the TWDB after the passage of SB1 in 1997. It was estimated that by 2050, almost 900 cities Statewide (representing 38 percent of the projected population) and other water users will need either to reduce demand (through conservation and/or drought management) or develop additional sources of water beyond those currently available to meet their needs during droughts. The proposed water management strategies had an estimated cost of $17.9 billion.

[39] Brazos G Regional Planning Group, January 2021, Regional Water Plan.
[40] TWDB, January 2002, Texas State Water Plan.

1.12.1.7 Water for Texas 2007[41]

The State was projected to grow from 21 million people in 2000 to approximately 46 million people in 2060. It was estimated that Texas would need 8.8 million ac-ft of water by 2060 to meet this growth. The 16 RWPGs identified 4,500 water management strategies to provide an additional 9.0 million ac-ft of water. The estimated cost of these strategies was approximately $30.7 billion. Without this investment there would be a potential $9.1 billion impact to businesses and workers by 2020 with increased impact of $98.4 billion by 2060.

1.12.1.8 Water for Texas 2012[42]

The 16 RWPGs (Planning Groups) identified a total of 2,569 water user groups. Of those groups, 895 (35 percent) in 2020 would have water supply needs if the State were facing drought conditions, increasing to 1,085 (42 percent) in 2060. The Water Planning groups recommended feasible water management strategies to meet most of those needs. Solutions proposed by the Planning Groups include strategies such as the use of currently developed surface water and groundwater sources, conservation, reuse, new interbasin transfers, and development of additional groundwater and surface water resources. Twenty-six new reservoirs were recommended by the Planning Groups to meet identified needs of the water user groups. The Planning Groups estimated total capital costs over the next 50 years to meet needs for additional water supplies at $53 billion, including $27 billion to implement strategies for municipal water user groups. Meeting these costs will require a long-term financial commitment from local political subdivisions, regional authorities, and the state of Texas.

1.12.1.9 Water for Texas 2017[43]

The 16 RWPGs identified a total of 4.76 million ac-ft/yr of water needs in 2020, increasing to 8.89 million ac-ft/yr by 2070. These needs include 511,000 ac-ft/yr of municipal needs in 2020 and 3.41 million ac-ft/yr in 2070, a 567 percent increase. The 16 RWPGs recommended about 5,500 water management strategies. The principal strategies to address those needs include demand management (mostly in the form of conservation) (30 percent of the supply recommended), reuse of wastewater (14 percent), additional groundwater development (10 percent), and surface water strategies (45 percent). Planning groups recommended 26 new major reservoir that would provide about 1.1 million ac-ft/yr of new supplies. About 2,500 individual projects are associated with the recommended water management strategies, with an estimated implementation cost of $63 billion.

1.12.1.10 Water for Texas 2022[44]

The 16 RWPGs projected an increase in water needs from 3.1 million ac-ft/yr in 2020 to 6.9 million ac-ft/yr by 2070. These needs consist of 5.2 million ac-ft/yr for municipal purposes in 2020, surging to 8.5 million ac-ft/yr by 2070, marking a 63 percent rise. The Planning Groups have suggested around 5,800 water management strategies to tackle these demands. The primary strategies proposed include demand management, mainly through conservation (representing 31 percent of the recommended supply),

[41] TWDB, January 2007, Texas State Water Plan.
[42] TWDB, January 2012, Texas State Water Plan.
[43] TWDB, January 2017, Texas State Water Plan.
[44] TWDB, January 2022, Texas State Water Plan.

wastewater reuse (15 percent), additional groundwater development (12 percent), aquifer storage and recovery resources (3 percent), seawater desalination (3 percent), and surface water strategies (37 percent). These strategies are tied to approximately 2,400 individual projects. If executed, these strategies could yield an additional 7.7 million ac-ft/yr in water supplies to user groups by 2070, with an estimated implementation cost of $80 billion in 2018 dollars, not adjusting for future inflation.

1.12.2 Bosque County Regional Water Treatment and Distribution Facilities Plan

The 2001 Brazos G Regional Water Plan identified several water users in Bosque County with shortages over the planning period. In an attempt to address this widely known shortage, the BRA, TWDB, and the Cities of Clifton and Meridian jointly sponsored a study to determine the regional water needs and to evaluate existing and proposed water facilities.

The study evaluated four alternatives to supply water to the different users, including individual treatment and delivery systems to a regional facility that would serve all participants. The study recommended the regional facility, which would include expansion of the City of Clifton's water treatment plant and interconnections to the other participants, including Clifton, Childress WSC, Meridian, Valley Mills and Walnut Springs.

1.12.3 FHLM – TWDB Regional Water Facility Planning Study

FHLM WSC, in conjunction with 26 other entities, commissioned this study to evaluate the feasibility of developing a regional water infrastructure plan to serve existing and future populations through 2040 in the study area within Falls, Hill, Limestone, and McLennan Counties. Changes to the MCL for arsenic published by the EPA in 2001 caused a number of water systems to be non-compliant due to natural occurring and elevated arsenic levels in local groundwater supplies. Additionally, Regional declines in the Trinity Aquifer also created supply concerns beyond that of just the arsenic concentrations.

The study evaluated different alternatives for meeting the projects goals including blending of water with elevated arsenic concentrations, individual treatment systems violating the arsenic MCL, a new regional surface water treatment plant, and Carrizo-Aquifer development. The study recommended that the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer development project be implemented since it diversifies the water supply portfolio in a cost-effective manner for the member utilities while also securing long term water supplies.

The study noted that individual treatment by affected utilities would provide the shortest development time period, and if a negotiated Agreed Order with the EPA couldn't not be obtained for implementing the recommended Carrizo-Wilcox Regional Groundwater Project, individual treatment or blending should be pursued to satisfy EPA requirements related to the arsenic MCL.

1.12.4 Regional Water Supply and Wastewater Service Study for Johnson and Parker Counties, Phase I

The BRA and TRWD jointly commissioned a study to investigate the feasibility of developing regional water supply and wastewater treatment facilities to serve the unmet needs of the two counties. The first phase of the anticipated two-phase study was completed in April 2004. The primary objective of the first phase was to identify and evaluate raw water supply and water and wastewater treatment concepts of

mutual interest to the Authority, TRWD and their primary wholesale customers. Subject to the Phase I identification of concepts deemed worthy of additional study, a Phase II study may further study those options that show promise from an engineering, economic, water quality and institutional standpoint.

Phase I of the study identified several water supply scenarios to serve water user groups with projected shortages in each county. The study focused on concepts that would blend the higher TDS water from the Brazos Basin with lower TDS water from the Trinity River Basin to reduce the need to desalinate the Brazos Basin water. The study concluded that a regional water treatment plant in northwest Johnson County treating a blend of BRA and TRWD water could economically serve a large area of northwest Johnson, southwest Tarrant, and southeast Parker counties, including the new growth in Fort Worth's extraterritorial jurisdiction. A second option involved a plant in northeast Johnson County which could supply a large area with unmet needs including the rapidly growing areas around Mansfield and Burleson. Phase II of the study is intended to provide more detailed information required by stakeholders to allow them to further evaluate these concepts in relation to their own interests and potential participation in a regional system. Phase II has not been initiated to date.

The Upper Trinity GCD has performed a more recent planning study of the area. This study evaluated projected growth in population and water demands and identified potential water management strategies.

1.12.5 West Central Brazos River Basin Regional Water Treatment and Distribution Facility Study

The BRA, TWDB, and the US Economic Development Administration sponsored a water treatment and distribution study for water users in the upper Brazos River Basin. This study was initiated in response to the significant drought that occurred in the late 1990s and subsequent years and developed a plan to meet demands 25 percent greater than projected needs in order to account for the future uncertainties of droughts.

The West Central Brazos River Basin Regional Water Treatment and Distribution Facility Plan evaluated the water needs in an 18-county area, assessed the economic impacts of water shortages, and identified a plan to develop and efficiently utilize the water resources in the area. Specific concerns identified in the study included water quality of surface water sources, limited groundwater sources, and limited existing infrastructure to move water from areas with supply to areas with needs.

Recognizing the vulnerability of small surface lakes and the uncertainty of groundwater, this study focused on interconnecting existing supply sources and developing new supplies to provide a safe level of supply to water users and increase the reliability of existing sources to promote economic growth in the region. Collectively, over 25 potential water management strategies were evaluated to meet specific needs in the region. In addition, three general strategies (brush control, weather modification and saltwater control) were reviewed as potential means to improve water quality and quantity in the region.

The study conducted numerous hydraulic analyses to evaluate the possibility of moving water through existing and improved infrastructure, including the West Central Brazos Distribution System in Stephens County (formerly the Kerr-McKee pipeline). Two scenarios demonstrated the greatest potential impact to the region:

1. Interconnection between Abilene and North Central Texas MWA.
2. Interconnections among Shackelford WSC, Stephens County Rural WSC and the City of Throckmorton using the West Central Brazos Distribution System.

Other major strategies recommended in this study include:

- Regional water treatment plant to treat water from Possum Kingdom Lake.
- Connection from Lake Stamford to Throckmorton.
- Turkey Peak Reservoir in Palo Pinto County.
- Diverting water from the Clear Fork of the Brazos River to Hubbard Creek Lake and increasing the capacity to transport water to Abilene.

1.13 Summary of Water Loss Audits in Brazos G Area

Retail public water utilities are required to complete and submit a water loss audit form to the TWDB. The first water loss audit reports were submitted to the TWDB by March 31, 2006. Entities with greater than 3,300 connections are required to submit their water loss audit to TWDB on an annual basis. In addition, all other retail public suppliers are required to submit a water loss audit once every five years with the next scheduled audit due May 1, 2024. State law requires that water loss audits be completed by a person trained to conduct water loss auditing. The TWDB offers in-person training across the State and offers the training through an online Water Loss Auditor Training Video. The water audit reporting requirements follow the International Water Association and American Water Works Association Water Loss Control Committee methodology.

The primary purposes of a water loss audit are to account for all the water being used and to identify potential areas where water can be saved. Water losses are classified as either apparent loss or real loss. Apparent loss is the water that has been used but has not been tracked. It includes losses associated with inaccurate meters, billing adjustment and waivers, and unauthorized consumption. Real loss is the actual water loss of water from the system, and includes main breaks and leaks, customer service line breaks and leaks, and storage overflows. The sum of the apparent loss and the real loss make up the total water loss for a utility.

In the Brazos G Area in 2022, 109 public water suppliers submitted a water loss audit to TWDB. Table 1.14 summarizes the water loss audit information that was collected by the TWDB for the 2022 calendar year. The average total water loss was nearly 24 percent, which is higher than the 2017 Statewide average of 14.56 percent. The Region encourages the reduction in water loss where feasible.

Table 1.14 Summary of Water Loss Audits in the Brazos G Area

Statistic	Real Loss for WUGs with Less than 32 Connections per Mile (gal/mi/day)	Real Loss for WUGs with 32 or More Connections per Mile (gal/connection/day)	Apparent Daily Loss (gal/connection/day)Apparent Daily Loss	Total Water Use (gpcd)	Water Loss (gpcd)	Total Water Loss (%)
Median	570.30	34.80	5.61	106.00	18.00	16.98
Average	724.13	57.55	7.33	113.56	26.92	23.71

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

CHAPTER 2 PROJECTED POPULATION AND WATER DEMANDS

2.1 Introduction

The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) publishes population and water demand projections for each county in the State for use by the Regional Water Planning Groups (RWPGs). Population projections were developed for municipal water user groups (WUGs), which are defined as private or publicly owned water systems that provide more than 100 acre-feet per year (ac-ft/yr) for municipal use, and "County-Other" to capture those people living outside the WUG-sized utilities. In the Brazos G Area, population projections were completed for 289 municipal WUGs, including 37 County-Other WUGs. Multiple municipal WUGs are located in more than one county, resulting in 360 unique municipal WUG projections when the portions of WUGs located in different counties are separated. Water demand projections were also developed for other types of use on a county-wide basis, including manufacturing, steam-electric power generation, mining, irrigation, and livestock uses.

The TWDB has adopted revisions to the population and water demand projections for the Brazos G Area, as recommended by the Brazos G RWPG. Revisions have been made to the population projections, and municipal, manufacturing, irrigation, livestock, and stream electric power water demand projections. Revisions to the population and municipal water demand projections for municipal WUGs resulted from coordination with individual utilities and included modifications to both population and/or projected per-capita water use (gallons per capita per day [gpcd]) projections. Water demand projections for these non-municipal categories were revised to reflect the dry year demand in a 10-year period from 2010-2019. Generally, where documentation was determined to be lacking the default methodologies proffered by the TWDB for projecting water demands were utilized.

2.2 Population Projections

As shown in Figure 2.1, the population of the 37-county area is projected to increase from 3,032,159 in 2030 to 5,660,538 in 2080, an increase of 86.7 percent (1.73 percent annual growth). This is somewhat greater than the projected Statewide population growth during the same period of 53 percent (1.1 percent annually). In 2080, it is projected that 42.9 percent of the Brazos G Area population will live in Williamson County, 12.5 percent in Bell County, 10.4 percent in Brazos County, 7.3 percent in Johnson County, 7.2 percent in McLennan County, 3.9 percent in Taylor County, 2.6 percent in Milam County and 13.3 percent among remaining counties. Projections and growth rates for each of the 37 counties and 289 WUGs, including "County-Other," in the Brazos G Area are presented in Table 2.1.

Growth in the Brazos G Area is concentrated along the Interstate Highway 35 corridor, stretching from Williamson County in the south to Johnson County in the north. Growth is also taking place along US Highway 183 in Williamson and Lampasas Counties, Taylor and Jones Counties (Abilene area), and Brazos County (Bryan/College Station area). Milam County is projected to be the fastest growing county between 2030 and 2080, growing at 2.7 percent annually. Williamson, Johnson, Brazos, Comanche, Erath, and Hood Counties are also projected to grow at 1.0 percent or more annually. A comparison of the annual growth rates for all the counties is shown in Figure 2.2.



Figure 2.1 Population Projections

Table 2.1 Historical and Projected Population by WUG/County

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Bell County										
439 WSC	5,596	6,277	8,084	9,457	10,729	11,803	12,590	13,019	1.16%	1.22%
Bartlett	1,655	1,632	664	634	611	584	554	524	-0.14%	-1.88%
Bell Milam Falls WSC	4,904	5,061	2,263	2,404	2,511	2,573	2,642	2,721	0.32%	-1.03%
Belton	17,489	23,310	28,600	34,647	40,620	46,083	50,585	53,719	2.91%	1.40%
County-Other, Bell	-	-	4,610	5,192	5,408	5,012	4,320	3,347	-	-
Dog Ridge WSC	3,391	4,267	5,016	5,642	6,122	6,453	6,824	7,238	2.32%	0.88%
Elm Creek WSC	3,026	3,322	2,556	2,727	2,892	3,040	3,188	3,336	0.94%	0.01%
Fort Hood	29,240	27,811	20,634	21,461	22,287	23,114	23,940	24,767	-0.50%	-0.19%
Georgetown	76,135	123,177	4,394	5,982	6,533	6,542	6,648	6,555	4.93%	-4.77%
Harker Heights	26,654	33,013	36,879	42,566	48,218	50,000	50,000	50,000	2.16%	0.69%
Holland	1,091	1,054	1,209	1,232	1,251	1,269	1,288	1,306	-0.34%	0.36%
Jarrell-Schwertner	5,559	6,754	2,730	3,005	3,215	3,354	3,510	3,685	1.97%	-1.00%
Kempner WSC	14,671	16,506	2,224	2,438	2,601	2,707	2,826	2,961	1.19%	-2.82%
Killeen	127,314	152,631	173,431	198,764	221,697	247,195	272,291	297,387	1.83%	1.12%
Bell County WCID 2	1,494	1,643	1,796	1,902	1,983	2,027	2,077	2,135	0.96%	0.44%
Moffat WSC	3,914	2,805	2,066	1,844	1,646	1,469	1,311	1,170	-3.28%	-1.45%
Pendleton WSC	1,765	2,006	2,235	2,407	2,538	2,618	2,710	2,813	1.29%	0.57%
Rogers	960	921	918	891	868	839	808	774	-0.41%	-0.29%
Salado WSC	4,720	6,252	7,529	8,442	9,464	10,610	11,895	13,337	2.85%	1.27%
Temple	69,052	85,214	115,562	129,327	139,891	147,103	155,187	164,252	2.13%	1.10%
Troy	1,761	2,479	3,847	4,122	4,397	4,672	4,947	5,222	3.48%	1.25%
West Bell County WSC	3,466	3,908	4,335	4,650	4,890	5,034	5,199	5,384	1.21%	0.54%
Morgans Point Resort	3,626	4,079	5,300	5,800	6,300	6,800	7,300	7,800	1.18%	1.09%
Armstrong WSC	2,113	2,676	3,155	3,559	3,867	4,081	4,319	4,587	2.39%	0.90%
East Bell WSC	2,727	2,519	2,320	2,176	2,063	1,945	1,815	1,673	-0.79%	-0.68%
Bell County WCID 3	4,243	5,350	9,460	11,636	14,996	18,356	19,140	19,924	2.35%	2.22%
Central Texas College District	424	645	548	548	548	548	548	548	4.28%	-0.27%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Little Elm Valley WSC	1,342	1,616	1,824	2,010	2,154	2,249	2,356	2,475	1.88%	0.71%
The Grove WSC	984	991	1,149	1,369	1,586	1,805	2,023	2,242	0.07%	1.37%
Bell County WCID 1	221	250	264	264	264	264	264	264	1.24%	0.09%
Bell County Total	419,537	528,169	455,602	517,098	572,150	620,149	663,105	705,165	2.33%	0.48%
Bosque County										
Childress Creek WSC	1,660	1,307	1,293	1,262	1,213	1,171	1,121	1,067	-2.36%	-0.34%
Clifton	3,449	3,474	3,511	3,776	4,061	4,368	4,697	5,052	0.07%	0.63%
County-Other, Bosque	-	-	6,648	5,964	5,083	4,219	3,269	2,224	-	-
Cross Country WSC	2,396	2,804	281	274	264	254	243	231	1.58%	-4.08%
Meridian	1,867	1,739	1,758	1,716	1,652	1,594	1,528	1,455	-0.71%	-0.30%
Valley Mills	1,242	1,258	1,247	1,269	1,292	1,315	1,340	1,364	0.13%	0.13%
Highland Park WSC	528	505	352	343	330	318	305	290	-0.44%	-0.92%
Hilco United Services	5,840	6,251	1,309	1,405	1,508	1,618	1,737	1,865	0.68%	-2.00%
Mustang Valley WSC	1,911	1,840	1,835	1,790	1,722	1,660	1,591	1,513	-0.38%	-0.33%
Smith Bend WSC	128	127	128	125	120	116	111	105	-0.08%	-0.32%
Hog Creek WSC	381	359	73	71	69	66	63	61	-0.59%	-2.91%
Bosque County Total	19,402	19,664	18,435	17,995	17,314	16,699	16,005	15,227	0.13%	-0.43%
Brazos County										
Bryan	76,916	81,200	103,527	122,757	145,418	172,357	217,070	273,294	0.54%	2.04%
College Station	81,672	96,208	124,105	140,635	165,452	194,489	191,010	187,998	1.65%	1.12%
County-Other, Brazos	-	-	2,497	2,584	2,961	3,131	3,436	3,864	-	-
Wellborn SUD	10,022	23,176	27,844	31,712	37,506	44,684	52,741	61,791	8.74%	1.65%
Wickson Creek SUD	14,321	18,532	18,215	20,731	24,501	29,168	34,407	40,294	2.61%	1.30%
Texas A and M University	-	-	19,681	19,681	19,681	19,681	19,681	19,681	-	-
Brazos County Total	182,931	219,116	295,869	338,100	395,519	463,510	518,345	586,922	1.82%	1.66%
Burleson County										
Caldwell	4,228	4,119	4,293	4,326	4,310	4,286	4,260	4,231	-0.26%	0.04%
County-Other, Burleson	-	-	7,076	7,080	6,970	6,847	6,708	6,555	-	-
Milano WSC	2,710	2,741	1,320	1,337	1,354	1,371	1,389	1,408	0.11%	-1.10%
Snook	511	378	1,170	1,179	1,173	1,161	1,152	1,143	-2.97%	1.86%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Somerville	1,296	1,253	1,316	1,324	1,317	1,308	1,297	1,284	-0.34%	0.04%
Southwest Milam WSC	7,158	8,099	794	833	875	918	965	1,013	1.24%	-3.41%
Deanville WSC	2,280	1,835	1,926	1,940	1,928	1,914	1,898	1,881	-2.15%	0.04%
Cade Lakes WSC	427	415	436	439	437	434	430	426	-0.28%	0.04%
Burleson County Total	18,610	18,840	18,331	18,458	18,364	18,239	18,099	17,941	0.12%	-0.08%
Callahan County										
Baird	1,492	1,473	1,537	1,535	1,523	1,507	1,490	1,470	-0.13%	0.00%
Clyde	3,713	3,811	3,979	4,007	4,035	4,063	4,091	4,120	0.26%	0.13%
County-Other, Callahan	-	-	2,126	1,940	1,669	1,359	1,028	675	-	-
Cross Plains	960	881	920	918	910	899	887	872	-0.86%	-0.02%
Potosi WSC	5,611	6,520	231	231	229	226	223	219	1.51%	-5.50%
Coleman County SUD	-	-	169	177	185	193	202	211	-	-
Callahan County WSC	1,917	2,206	2,304	2,343	2,383	2,424	2,466	2,508	1.41%	0.21%
Eula WSC	2,287	2,517	2,629	2,711	2,797	2,884	2,975	3,068	0.96%	0.33%
Hamby WSC	1,249	1,256	243	251	258	266	274	282	0.06%	-2.46%
Westbound WSC	2,421	2,383	175	175	173	172	169	166	-0.16%	-4.34%
Callahan County Total	19,650	21,047	14,313	14,288	14,162	13,993	13,805	13,591	0.69%	-0.73%
Comanche County										
Comanche	4,399	4,278	4,307	4,259	4,183	4,158	4,138	4,120	-0.28%	-0.06%
County-Other, Comanche	-	-	7,117	6,845	6,445	6,276	6,087	5,870	-	-
De Leon	2,178	2,185	2,226	2,284	2,361	2,405	2,460	2,531	0.03%	0.25%
Comanche County Total	6,577	6,463	13,650	13,388	12,989	12,839	12,685	12,521	-0.17%	1.11%
Coryell County										
Copperas Cove	29,515	33,519	48,375	63,971	73,604	79,781	81,693	78,916	1.28%	1.44%
County-Other, Coryell	-	-	3,543	3,737	3,668	3,328	2,931	2,468	-	-
Elm Creek WSC	3,026	3,322	489	492	492	490	484	474	0.94%	-3.19%
Fort Hood	29,240	27,811	15,566	16,190	16,813	17,437	18,060	18,684	-0.50%	-0.66%
Gatesville	14,830	14,984	15,649	15,956	16,219	16,239	16,284	16,353	0.10%	0.15%
Kempner WSC	14,671	16,506	4,308	4,350	4,305	4,197	4,075	3,938	1.19%	-2.36%
Coryell City WSD	4,811	5,872	4,984	5,099	5,163	5,131	5,098	5,069	2.01%	-0.24%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Multi County WSC	3,218	3,743	3,306	3,386	3,425	3,400	3,373	3,348	1.52%	-0.19%
Central Texas College District	424	645	343	343	343	343	343	343	4.28%	-1.05%
Flat WSC	510	632	682	698	707	700	695	691	2.17%	0.15%
Fort Gates WSC	1,959	2,174	2,345	2,402	2,430	2,413	2,395	2,376	1.05%	0.15%
Mountain WSC	1,494	1,811	1,955	2,002	2,024	2,010	1,994	1,979	1.94%	0.15%
Mustang Valley WSC	1,911	1,840	27	27	28	27	28	26	-0.38%	-6.85%
Oglesby	530	478	515	528	534	530	526	522	-1.03%	0.15%
The Grove WSC	984	991	168	199	231	263	294	326	0.07%	-1.84%
Coryell County Total	107,123	114,328	102,255	119,380	129,986	136,289	138,273	135,513	0.65%	0.28%
Eastland County										
Cisco	3,935	3,919	3,947	4,027	4,135	4,172	4,225	4,295	-0.04%	0.15%
County-Other, Eastland	-	-	2,976	2,877	2,504	2,338	2,055	1,636	-	-
Eastland	3,955	3,537	3,515	3,187	2,908	2,684	2,499	2,357	-1.11%	-0.67%
Gorman	1,077	955	952	886	798	745	685	619	-1.20%	-0.72%
Ranger	2,447	2,279	2,273	2,146	2,039	1,959	1,899	1,865	-0.71%	-0.33%
Rising Star	751	699	698	659	626	601	583	572	-0.71%	-0.33%
Staff WSC	1,100	1,223	1,156	1,259	1,396	1,466	1,549	1,649	1.07%	0.50%
Westbound WSC	2,421	2,383	2,230	2,266	2,316	2,330	2,351	2,382	-0.16%	0.00%
Eastland County Total	15,686	14,995	17,747	17,307	16,722	16,295	15,846	15,375	-0.45%	0.04%
Erath County										
County-Other, Erath	-	-	18,207	19,748	21,549	23,679	26,068	28,756	-	-
Dublin	3,513	3,148	2,877	2,582	2,322	2,019	1,759	1,537	-1.09%	-1.19%
Stephenville	16,735	20,372	26,797	29,440	32,581	36,832	41,538	46,758	1.99%	1.39%
Gordon	654	635	6	6	6	6	6	6	-0.29%	-7.48%
Erath County Total	20,902	24,155	47,887	51,776	56,458	62,536	69,371	77,057	1.46%	1.95%
Falls County										
Bell Milam Falls WSC	4,904	5,061	1,254	1,169	1,079	993	901	797	0.32%	-3.03%
Bruceville Eddy	4,478	4,227	1,253	1,654	1,766	1,885	2,013	2,273	-0.58%	-1.03%
County-Other, Falls	-	-	6,889	6,241	5,485	4,767	3,806	2,510	-	-
Marlin	5,425	4,944	4,571	4,317	4,104	3,924	3,839	3,890	-0.92%	-0.40%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Rosebud	1,416	1,270	1,190	1,109	1,036	953	892	853	-1.08%	-0.66%
West Brazos WSC	2,050	2,144	770	739	715	696	693	714	0.45%	-1.82%
East Bell WSC	2,727	2,519	117	119	122	125	132	143	-0.79%	-4.67%
Cego-Durango WSC	949	1,023	1,174	1,343	1,527	1,676	1,875	2,154	0.75%	1.25%
Levi WSC	862	941	393	515	635	718	802	882	0.88%	-0.11%
Little Elm Valley WSC	1,342	1,616	46	70	95	117	143	179	1.88%	-3.60%
North Milam WSC	1,348	982	9	7	6	5	4	3	-3.12%	-9.20%
Falls County Total	25,501	24,727	17,666	17,283	16,570	15,859	15,100	14,398	-0.31%	-0.90%
Fisher County										
The Bitter Creek WSC	1,624	1,554	667	642	625	616	606	596	-0.44%	-1.58%
County-Other, Fisher	-	-	907	874	850	835	823	811	-	-
Roby	604	549	533	514	498	491	483	475	-0.95%	-0.24%
Rotan	1,659	1,482	1,436	1,386	1,346	1,328	1,306	1,285	-1.12%	-0.24%
S U N WSC	2,115	2,212	16	15	15	15	16	14	0.45%	-8.09%
Fisher County Total	6,002	5,797	3,559	3,431	3,334	3,285	3,234	3,181	-0.35%	-1.00%
Grimes County										
County-Other, Grimes	-	-	10,456	10,977	11,335	11,491	11,551	11,445	-	-
Navasota	7,004	7,424	7,917	8,239	8,513	8,722	8,956	9,216	0.58%	0.36%
Wickson Creek SUD	14,321	18,532	4,771	5,214	5,578	5,899	6,261	6,668	2.61%	-1.69%
Dobbin Plantersville WSC	-	-	4,587	5,071	5,469	5,822	6,221	6,672	-	-
G and W WSC	-	-	1,398	1,500	1,584	1,656	1,737	1,827	-	-
MSEC Enterprises	-	-	196	305	474	736	1,143	1,776	-	-
TDCJ Luther Units	1,153	1,007	1,170	1,170	1,170	1,170	1,170	1,170	-1.34%	0.25%
TDCJ W Pack Unit	1,453	1,597	1,675	1,675	1,675	1,675	1,675	1,675	0.95%	0.08%
Grimes County Total	23,931	28,560	32,170	34,151	35,798	37,171	38,714	40,449	1.78%	0.58%
Hamilton County										
County-Other, Hamilton	-	-	3,461	3,433	3,389	3,348	3,297	3,235	-	-
Hamilton	2,775	2,676	2,700	2,693	2,693	2,654	2,610	2,562	-0.36%	-0.07%
Hico	1,284	1,228	1,224	1,197	1,171	1,146	1,120	1,096	-0.44%	-0.19%
Coryell City WSD	4,811	5,872	257	263	273	273	273	273	2.01%	-4.99%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Multi County WSC	3,218	3,743	624	563	465	461	457	452	1.52%	-3.46%
Hamilton County Total	12,088	13,519	8,266	8,149	7,991	7,882	7,757	7,618	1.13%	-0.95%
Haskell County										
County-Other, Haskell	-	-	2,221	2,178	2,090	2,058	2,022	1,985	-	-
Haskell	3,436	3,190	3,179	3,119	3,042	3,021	2,999	2,977	-0.74%	-0.12%
Haskell County Total	3,436	3,190	5,400	5,297	5,132	5,079	5,021	4,962	-0.74%	0.74%
Hill County										
Brandon Irene WSC	2,054	1,906	1,949	2,005	2,045	2,084	2,129	2,180	-0.75%	0.22%
County-Other, Hill	-	-	4,438	4,568	4,655	4,742	4,841	4,949	-	-
Files Valley WSC	2,485	3,077	3,600	3,707	3,776	3,847	3,928	4,019	2.16%	0.45%
Gholson WSC	2,021	2,365	1,125	1,160	1,180	1,201	1,228	1,257	1.58%	-1.05%
Hillsboro	7,922	7,930	14,997	15,442	15,726	16,026	16,364	16,742	0.01%	1.25%
Hubbard	1,425	1,396	1,480	1,523	1,550	1,580	1,613	1,651	-0.21%	0.28%
Itasca	1,687	1,603	1,698	1,748	1,780	1,814	1,852	1,895	-0.51%	0.28%
Navarro Mills WSC	-	-	17	19	18	19	19	20	-	-
Parker WSC	1,950	1,922	259	267	271	276	283	288	-0.14%	-3.11%
Rio Vista	841	953	5	5	5	6	6	6	1.26%	-8.10%
Double Diamond Utilities	1,237	2,536	1,342	1,381	1,407	1,434	1,463	1,497	7.44%	-0.87%
Whitney	2,374	2,289	2,424	2,496	2,541	2,590	2,646	2,707	-0.36%	0.28%
Woodrow Osceola WSC	2,395	2,681	2,842	2,926	2,979	3,035	3,100	3,172	1.13%	0.28%
Hill County WSC	2,579	2,841	3,010	3,102	3,157	3,217	3,284	3,361	0.97%	0.28%
Birome WSC	1,108	1,194	677	697	711	723	739	756	0.75%	-0.76%
Bold Springs WSC	1,624	1,706	128	132	134	138	140	143	0.49%	-4.05%
Chatt WSC	615	566	1,251	1,289	1,312	1,337	1,364	1,398	-0.83%	1.52%
Hilco United Services	5,840	6,251	4,651	4,790	4,877	4,971	5,075	5,191	0.68%	-0.31%
Post Oak SUD	1,435	1,494	878	904	920	938	957	979	0.40%	-0.70%
Hill County Total	39,592	42,710	46,771	48,161	49,044	49,978	51,031	52,211	0.76%	0.34%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Hood County										
Acton MUD	16,038	13,539	11,497	12,488	13,563	14,732	16,001	17,380	-1.68%	0.42%
County-Other, Hood	-	-	41,090	46,243	51,396	56,945	63,226	70,335	-	-
Granbury	11,309	14,124	16,684	18,969	21,288	23,820	26,669	29,871	2.25%	1.26%
Tolar	701	950	1,153	1,333	1,517	1,720	1,947	2,205	3.09%	1.41%
Lipan	751	845	937	1,020	1,103	1,189	1,287	1,397	1.19%	0.84%
Santo SUD	1,913	2,064	10	7	5	4	3	2	0.76%	-10.92%
Hood County Total	30,712	31,522	71,371	80,060	88,872	98,410	109,133	121,190	0.26%	2.27%
Johnson County										
Fort Worth	-	-	-	-	5,081	8,066	10,001	9,917	-	-
Mansfield	-	-	6,512	9,258	12,029	14,640	17,563	20,835	-	-
Acton MUD	16,038	13,539	71	64	57	51	46	41	-1.68%	-9.21%
Alvarado	3,403	4,199	4,988	5,732	6,477	7,150	7,908	8,756	2.12%	1.23%
Bethany SUD	2,712	3,093	3,488	3,852	4,214	4,531	4,889	5,290	1.32%	0.90%
Bethesda WSC	23,540	29,776	35,321	40,859	46,413	51,444	57,094	63,439	2.38%	1.27%
Burleson	34,023	43,515	42,810	50,305	57,834	64,697	72,401	81,047	2.49%	1.04%
Cleburne	26,455	27,492	36,047	40,636	45,230	49,329	53,937	59,118	0.39%	1.28%
County-Other, Johnson	-	-	12,805	13,084	9,227	6,487	4,313	3,385	-	-
Crowley	-	-	178	262	349	429	520	622	-	-
Godley	944	1,155	1,365	1,562	1,760	1,939	2,139	2,363	2.04%	1.20%
Grandview	1,250	1,496	1,754	1,996	2,238	2,455	2,699	2,975	1.81%	1.15%
Johnson County SUD	37,979	45,092	69,832	88,295	98,435	107,461	117,620	129,052	1.73%	1.77%
Keene	5,395	5,713	6,066	6,361	6,650	6,876	7,130	7,421	0.57%	0.44%
Mountain Peak SUD	-	-	4,710	5,852	7,271	9,035	11,226	13,949	-	-
Parker WSC	1,950	1,922	1,676	1,657	1,635	1,599	1,560	1,519	-0.14%	-0.39%
Rio Vista	841	953	1,064	1,212	1,382	1,575	1,794	2,045	1.26%	1.28%
Venus	2,769	2,589	2,416	2,266	2,121	1,967	1,824	1,691	-0.67%	-0.71%
Double Diamond Utilities	1,237	2,536	550	737	926	1,103	1,301	1,524	7.44%	-0.85%
Johnson County Total	158,536	183,070	231,653	273,990	309,329	340,834	375,965	414,989	1.45%	1.37%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Jones County										
Anson	2,384	2,321	2,291	2,195	2,094	1,984	1,863	1,731	-0.27%	-0.49%
County-Other, Jones	-	-	7,090	6,767	6,374	5,928	5,410	4,818	-	-
Hamlin	2,062	1,763	1,544	1,350	1,182	1,039	926	837	-1.55%	-1.23%
Hawley WSC	4,817	4,760	4,536	4,555	4,573	4,593	4,612	4,631	-0.12%	-0.05%
Stamford	3,176	2,939	2,846	2,628	2,391	2,135	1,841	1,490	-0.77%	-1.13%
Hamby WSC	1,249	1,256	206	188	168	146	120	88	0.06%	-4.33%
S U N WSC	2,115	2,212	983	1,157	1,347	1,558	1,824	2,174	0.45%	-0.03%
Jones County Total	15,803	15,251	19,496	18,840	18,129	17,383	16,596	15,769	-0.35%	0.06%
Kent County										
County-Other, Kent	-	-	245	247	242	252	264	277	-	-
Jayton	534	511	492	493	509	524	541	559	-0.44%	0.15%
Kent County Total	534	511	737	740	751	776	805	836	-0.44%	0.82%
Knox County										
County-Other, Knox	-	-	900	871	815	764	696	601	-	-
Knox City	1,087	1,020	1,004	999	996	991	986	984	-0.63%	-0.06%
Munday	1,233	1,183	1,162	1,178	1,199	1,210	1,239	1,292	-0.41%	0.15%
Red River Authority of Texas	-	-	56	55	49	45	40	33	-	-
Benjamin	-	-	186	183	169	157	141	125	-	-
Knox County Total	2,320	2,203	3,308	3,286	3,228	3,167	3,102	3,035	-0.52%	0.54%
Lampasas County										
Copperas Cove	29,515	33,519	1,429	2,252	2,828	3,411	3,671	3,632	1.28%	-3.64%
County-Other, Lampasas	-	-	740	764	768	761	749	739	-	-
Kempner WSC	14,671	16,506	10,482	10,860	10,908	10,782	10,641	10,479	1.19%	-0.75%
Lampasas	7,133	7,786	8,600	9,500	10,390	11,152	11,468	11,297	0.88%	0.62%
Corix Utilities Texas Inc	10,206	10,712	5,553	5,754	5,781	5,714	5,639	5,555	0.49%	-1.09%
Multi County WSC	3,218	3,743	45	49	48	47	47	45	1.52%	-7.10%
Lampasas County Total	64,743	72,266	26,849	29,179	30,723	31,867	32,215	31,747	1.11%	-1.36%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Lee County										
Aqua WSC	-	-	1,640	1,702	1,769	1,837	1,908	1,982	-	-
County-Other, Lee	-	-	2,717	2,696	2,531	2,342	2,137	1,915	-	-
Giddings	5,027	5,137	5,497	5,576	5,497	5,394	5,279	5,149	0.22%	0.00%
Lee County WSC	7,712	8,839	6,918	7,020	6,916	6,783	6,634	6,464	1.37%	-0.52%
Lexington	1,352	1,322	1,951	1,979	1,950	1,912	1,869	1,823	-0.22%	0.54%
Southwest Milam WSC	7,158	8,099	515	544	575	609	643	680	1.24%	-4.04%
Lee County Total	21,249	23,397	19,238	19,517	19,238	18,877	18,470	18,013	0.97%	-0.43%
Limestone County										
Bistone Municipal WSD	524	524	522	507	487	467	445	424	0.00%	-0.35%
Coolidge	884	738	736	714	685	658	627	597	-1.79%	-0.35%
County-Other, Limestone	-	-	2,782	2,712	2,619	2,534	2,446	2,352	-	-
Groesbeck	3,984	3,223	3,225	3,147	3,047	2,952	2,859	2,761	-2.10%	-0.26%
Mexia	7,522	6,948	6,936	6,746	6,495	6,262	6,017	5,762	-0.79%	-0.31%
Tri County SUD	1,210	3,527	3,515	3,411	3,271	3,140	3,004	2,857	11.29%	-0.35%
Birome WSC	1,108	1,194	91	90	85	82	79	76	0.75%	-4.49%
Point Enterprise WSC	-	-	469	455	435	418	400	380	-	-
Post Oak SUD	1,435	1,494	129	124	120	115	109	105	0.40%	-4.33%
Prairie Hill WSC	1,183	1,256	690	670	641	615	589	560	0.60%	-1.34%
SLC WSC	1,011	1,002	1,000	968	929	893	854	811	-0.09%	-0.35%
White Rock Water SUD	1,974	2,019	2,012	1,953	1,872	1,799	1,719	1,635	0.23%	-0.35%
Limestone County Total	20,835	21,925	22,107	21,497	20,686	19,935	19,148	18,320	0.51%	-0.30%
McLennan County										
Waco	123,008	137,862	156,758	171,499	184,144	197,795	213,102	230,264	1.15%	0.86%
Bellmead	10,009	10,471	11,152	11,534	11,869	12,109	12,397	12,735	0.45%	0.33%
Bruceville Eddy	4,478	4,227	5,343	5,387	5,750	6,138	6,551	6,869	-0.58%	0.81%
Chalk Bluff WSC	2,643	2,702	3,608	4,108	4,608	5,108	5,608	6,108	0.22%	1.37%
Childress Creek WSC	1,660	1,307	43	57	69	84	100	120	-2.36%	-3.90%
County-Other, McLennan	-	-	5,941	7,763	8,169	8,357	8,741	9,567	-	-
Crawford	610	728	870	989	1,090	1,206	1,336	1,480	1.78%	1.19%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Cross Country WSC	2,396	2,804	3,029	3,453	3,814	4,228	4,691	5,206	1.58%	1.04%
Elm Creek WSC	3,026	3,322	1,415	1,491	1,576	1,680	1,788	1,900	0.94%	-0.93%
Gholson WSC	2,021	2,365	3,435	3,958	4,403	4,921	5,496	6,136	1.58%	1.60%
H and H WSC	-	-	1,475	1,521	1,560	1,585	1,615	1,651	-	-
Hewitt	13,537	15,779	17,127	17,127	17,127	17,127	17,127	17,127	1.54%	0.14%
Lacy Lakeview	6,234	6,800	7,585	8,166	8,667	9,183	9,766	10,423	0.87%	0.71%
Lorena	2,502	2,645	2,863	3,004	3,126	3,236	3,361	3,506	0.56%	0.47%
Mart	2,232	1,854	1,798	1,693	1,606	1,461	1,306	1,139	-1.84%	-0.81%
McGregor	5,042	5,342	9,961	10,520	11,005	11,458	11,977	12,573	0.58%	1.44%
Moody	1,459	1,491	1,868	2,118	2,368	2,618	2,868	3,118	0.22%	1.24%
North Bosque WSC	1,621	1,818	2,075	2,327	2,609	2,925	3,279	3,677	1.15%	1.18%
Riesel	900	943	1,231	1,314	1,398	1,482	1,565	1,649	0.47%	0.94%
Robinson	9,465	11,340	13,570	15,486	17,672	20,168	23,017	26,268	1.82%	1.41%
Valley Mills	1,242	1,258	20	16	13	10	8	6	0.13%	-8.52%
West	2,428	2,162	2,834	2,926	3,021	3,119	3,220	3,324	-1.15%	0.72%
West Brazos WSC	2,050	2,144	1,520	1,679	1,815	1,963	2,130	2,317	0.45%	0.13%
Woodway	8,504	9,445	10,240	10,240	10,240	10,240	10,240	10,240	1.06%	0.13%
Coryell City WSD	4,811	5,872	1,050	1,093	1,129	1,160	1,194	1,234	2.01%	-2.57%
Axtell WSC	1,029	1,130	1,775	2,025	2,275	2,525	2,775	3,025	0.94%	1.65%
Birome WSC	1,108	1,194	543	608	666	730	801	880	0.75%	-0.51%
Bold Springs WSC	1,624	1,706	1,722	1,815	1,894	1,968	2,051	2,146	0.49%	0.38%
Central Bosque WSC	755	785	836	866	891	909	932	959	0.39%	0.33%
East Crawford WSC	683	726	985	1,038	1,084	1,126	1,175	1,230	0.61%	0.88%
Eol WSC	1,758	1,561	1,873	2,048	2,223	2,398	2,573	2,748	-1.18%	0.95%
Highland Park WSC	528	505	165	169	172	174	176	178	-0.44%	-1.72%
Hilltop WSC	692	719	765	792	815	832	852	876	0.38%	0.33%
Leroy Tours Gerald WSC	1,262	1,354	1,557	1,658	1,761	1,863	1,962	1,972	0.71%	0.63%
Levi WSC	862	941	1,800	1,887	1,961	2,026	2,102	2,189	0.88%	1.42%
McLennan County WCID 2	1,330	1,243	1,185	1,095	1,020	902	777	638	-0.67%	-1.11%
Prairie Hill WSC	1,183	1,256	694	808	903	1,017	1,142	1,280	0.60%	0.03%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Ross WSC	1,889	2,148	2,473	2,733	2,955	3,199	3,475	3,781	1.29%	0.95%
Spring Valley WSC	1,744	2,090	2,505	2,853	3,150	3,492	3,872	4,296	1.83%	1.21%
Texas State Technical College	425	2,057	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	17.08%	-1.19%
Windsor Water	649	557	647	680	715	751	789	830	-1.52%	0.67%
Hog Creek WSC	381	359	297	300	303	300	299	298	-0.59%	-0.31%
McLennan County Total	229,780	255,012	287,633	311,844	332,636	354,573	379,236	406,963	1.05%	0.78%
Milam County										
Bell Milam Falls WSC	4,904	5,061	1,426	1,402	1,351	1,304	1,253	1,201	0.32%	-2.37%
Cameron	5,551	5,287	5,320	5,237	5,060	4,898	4,728	4,552	-0.49%	-0.25%
County-Other, Milam	-	-	7,187	47,187	77,187	122,187	122,187	122,187	-	-
Milano WSC	2,710	2,741	1,491	1,466	1,413	1,363	1,312	1,256	0.11%	-1.29%
Rockdale	5,326	5,180	7,428	7,480	7,533	7,586	7,639	7,693	-0.28%	0.66%
Southwest Milam WSC	7,158	8,099	5,588	5,493	5,297	5,114	4,922	4,721	1.24%	-0.90%
Thorndale	1,210	1,165	1,775	1,888	2,008	2,136	2,272	2,417	-0.38%	1.22%
North Milam WSC	1,348	982	976	959	923	891	858	820	-3.12%	-0.30%
Salem Elm Ridge WSC	921	872	878	863	831	803	773	743	-0.55%	-0.27%
Milam County Total	29,128	29,387	32,069	71,975	101,603	146,282	145,944	145,590	0.09%	2.70%
Nolan County										
Sweetwater	11,698	11,457	11,590	11,502	11,345	11,157	10,962	10,768	-0.21%	-0.10%
The Bitter Creek WSC	1,624	1,554	964	1,038	1,127	1,211	1,315	1,445	-0.44%	-0.12%
County-Other, Nolan	-	-	1,218	1,110	957	791	586	327	-	-
Roscoe	1,222	1,152	1,092	1,060	1,026	1,001	985	982	-0.59%	-0.27%
Nolan County Total	14,544	14,163	14,864	14,710	14,455	14,160	13,848	13,522	-0.27%	-0.08%
Palo Pinto County										
County-Other, Palo Pinto	-	-	3,089	3,093	3,061	3,043	3,027	3,007	-	-
Mineral Wells	16,603	14,626	16,926	17,863	18,795	19,737	19,737	19,737	-1.26%	0.50%
Strawn	640	528	547	548	542	539	536	532	-1.91%	0.01%
Double Diamond Utilities	1,237	2,536	945	947	937	932	926	921	7.44%	-1.67%
Possum Kingdom WSC	1,505	1,373	1,401	1,402	1,387	1,380	1,371	1,362	-0.91%	-0.01%
Gordon	654	635	653	653	646	644	640	635	-0.29%	0.00%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC	973	1,023	1,061	1,061	1,051	1,045	1,039	1,031	0.50%	0.01%
North Rural WSC	2,459	2,714	1,654	1,656	1,639	1,630	1,620	1,609	0.99%	-0.87%
Palo Pinto WSC	816	722	748	750	746	745	742	741	-1.22%	0.04%
Santo SUD	1,913	2,064	1,995	1,996	1,977	1,965	1,953	1,939	0.76%	-0.10%
Sportsmans World MUD	101	73	76	76	75	75	74	74	-3.19%	0.02%
Sturdivant Progress WSC	2,099	2,229	2,285	2,288	2,264	2,251	2,237	2,222	0.60%	-0.01%
Palo Pinto County Total	29,000	28,523	31,380	32,333	33,120	33,986	33,902	33,810	-0.17%	0.28%
Robertson County										
Bremond	851	780	781	762	738	709	679	647	-0.87%	-0.31%
Calvert	1,154	932	1,042	1,016	983	942	899	856	-2.11%	-0.14%
County-Other, Robertson	-	-	1,926	1,769	1,584	1,382	1,174	954	-	-
Franklin	1,951	1,956	1,959	1,913	1,857	1,786	1,715	1,640	0.03%	-0.29%
Hearne	5,202	5,248	5,253	5,114	4,946	4,740	4,524	4,295	0.09%	-0.33%
Robertson County WSC	2,460	2,662	3,370	3,300	3,255	3,216	3,203	3,225	0.79%	0.32%
Wellborn SUD	10,022	23,176	1,808	1,761	1,702	1,632	1,558	1,480	8.74%	-4.48%
Wickson Creek SUD	14,321	18,532	392	382	370	355	338	322	2.61%	-6.53%
Twin Creek WSC	864	922	922	899	869	832	795	755	0.65%	-0.33%
Robertson County Total	36,825	54,208	17,453	16,916	16,304	15,594	14,885	14,174	3.94%	-2.21%
Shackelford County										
Albany	2,125	1,917	1,780	1,607	1,425	1,301	1,157	992	-1.02%	-1.09%
County-Other, Shackelford	-	-	228	174	131	97	72	52	-	-
Hamby WSC	1,249	1,256	485	525	558	568	579	597	0.06%	-1.23%
Fort Griffin SUD	1,087	1,117	461	466	469	462	456	452	0.27%	-1.50%
Shackelford County Total	4,461	4,290	2,954	2,772	2,583	2,428	2,264	2,093	-0.39%	-1.19%
Somervell County										
County-Other, Somervell	-	-	1,407	1,455	1,474	1,463	1,450	1,436	-	-
Glen Rose	2,443	2,592	2,776	2,865	2,905	2,890	2,872	2,853	0.59%	0.16%
Somervell County Water District	-	2,820	5,630	5,820	5,897	5,853	5,804	5,748	-	1.19%
Somervell County Total	2,443	5,412	9,813	10,140	10,276	10,206	10,126	10,037	8.28%	1.03%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Stephens County										
Breckenridge	6,210	5,577	5,483	5,189	4,767	4,473	4,199	3,798	-1.07%	-0.64%
County-Other, Stephens	-	-	315	258	215	180	153	132	-	-
Fort Belknap WSC	3,848	3,833	53	64	79	90	107	127	-0.04%	-5.52%
Stephens Regional SUD	2,677	2,788	2,565	2,635	2,715	2,790	2,945	3,114	0.41%	0.18%
Possum Kingdom WSC	1,505	1,373	12	6	3	2	1	1	-0.91%	-11.34%
Fort Griffin SUD	1,087	1,117	521	554	600	637	549	549	0.27%	-1.18%
Staff WSC	1,100	1,223	95	112	135	154	178	208	1.07%	-2.91%
Stephens County Total	16,427	15,911	9,044	8,818	8,514	8,326	8,132	7,929	-0.32%	-1.15%
Stonewall County										
Aspermont	854	735	666	627	576	540	504	468	-1.49%	-0.75%
County-Other, Stonewall	-	-	462	433	391	371	349	323	-	-
Stonewall County Total	854	735	1,128	1,060	967	911	853	791	-1.49%	0.12%
Taylor County										
Abilene	109,350	120,609	134,466	145,047	153,959	162,895	172,845	184,001	0.98%	0.71%
County-Other, Taylor	-	-	1,516	836	461	247	129	63	-	-
Hawley WSC	4,817	4,760	308	342	371	404	440	480	-0.12%	-3.75%
Merkel	2,697	2,627	2,617	2,542	2,477	2,348	2,212	2,071	-0.26%	-0.40%
Potosi WSC	5,611	6,520	7,501	8,571	9,492	10,557	11,739	13,053	1.51%	1.16%
Steamboat Mountain WSC	3,741	5,286	7,215	9,053	10,634	12,558	14,683	17,030	3.52%	1.97%
Tye	1,190	1,098	1,016	904	807	665	511	344	-0.80%	-1.92%
Coleman County SUD	-	-	169	179	179	179	179	179	-	-
Hamby WSC	1,249	1,256	479	588	679	789	913	1,048	0.06%	-0.30%
Lawn	314	272	242	209	180	153	130	110	-1.43%	-1.50%
North Runnels WSC	-	-	589	668	735	813	902	998	-	-
View Caps WSC	1,643	1,772	1,963	2,115	2,245	2,380	2,532	2,703	0.76%	0.71%
S U N WSC	2,115	2,212	1,349	1,344	1,340	1,312	1,283	1,254	0.45%	-0.94%
Taylor County Total	132,727	146,412	159,430	172,398	183,559	195,300	208,498	223,334	0.99%	0.71%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Throckmorton County										
County-Other, Throckmorton	-	-	154	146	138	134	125	119	-	-
Fort Belknap WSC	3,848	3,833	90	73	53	51	51	48	-0.04%	-7.04%
Throckmorton	776	683	617	573	537	507	478	447	-1.27%	-0.70%
Stephens Regional SUD	2,677	2,788	266	246	227	214	203	189	0.41%	-4.39%
Baylor SUD	-	-	7	6	6	5	4	4	-	-
Fort Griffin SUD	1,087	1,117	159	153	152	143	133	124	0.27%	-3.60%
Throckmorton County Total	8,388	8,421	1,293	1,197	1,113	1,054	994	931	0.04%	-3.60%
Washington County										
Brenham	15,004	16,490	17,003	17,245	17,179	17,196	17,214	17,232	0.95%	0.07%
County-Other, Washington	-	-	10,918	10,501	10,262	9,525	8,788	8,050	-	-
Lee County WSC	7,712	8,839	120	128	136	145	154	164	1.37%	-6.43%
Corix Utilities Texas Inc	10,206	10,712	3,372	3,478	3,588	3,700	3,816	3,936	0.49%	-1.65%
Central Washington County WSC	1,850	3,274	3,623	3,806	3,610	3,865	4,145	4,453	5.87%	0.51%
Chappell Hill WSC	488	487	493	495	499	491	482	472	-0.02%	-0.05%
West End WSC	-	-	329	333	332	332	331	330	-	-
Washington County Total	35,260	39,802	35,858	35,986	35,606	35,254	34,930	34,637	1.22%	-0.23%
Williamson County										
Cedar Park	60,921	83,703	92,024	92,024	92,024	92,024	92,024	92,024	3.23%	0.16%
Round Rock	105,184	123,672	145,880	180,164	214,132	221,167	227,537	233,092	1.63%	1.06%
Bartlett	1,655	1,632	975	988	1,001	1,018	1,034	1,052	-0.14%	-0.73%
Bell Milam Falls WSC	4,904	5,061	353	448	559	682	818	972	0.32%	-2.71%
Brushy Creek MUD	18,653	17,253	19,423	19,423	19,423	19,421	19,421	19,421	-0.78%	0.20%
County-Other, Williamson	-	-	53,875	100,341	128,100	158,466	192,605	230,986	-	-
Fern Bluff MUD	5,809	5,664	5,426	5,646	5,877	5,881	5,881	5,881	-0.25%	0.06%
Florence	1,242	1,319	1,416	1,520	1,638	1,773	1,921	2,085	0.60%	0.77%
Georgetown	76,135	123,177	247,802	433,143	595,264	734,394	896,686	1,041,920	4.93%	3.62%
Granger	1,512	1,296	1,234	1,329	1,431	1,540	1,658	1,785	-1.53%	0.53%
Hutto	10,998	16,813	23,452	32,559	45,199	62,749	87,113	120,937	4.34%	3.34%
Jarrell-Schwertner	5,559	6,754	65,322	70,725	73,829	77,081	80,485	84,051	1.97%	4.29%

UG/County	Historical		Projections						Annual Percent Growth	
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2010-2020	2020-2080
Jonah Water SUD	9,650	19,300	30,251	43,078	58,212	74,739	93,341	114,268	7.18%	3.01%
Leander	30,790	66,009	137,045	173,735	185,078	187,376	188,909	190,010	7.92%	1.78%
Liberty Hill	1,802	3,902	6,367	9,260	12,675	16,400	20,596	25,316	8.03%	3.17%
Manville WSC	-	-	8,232	8,318	8,395	8,499	8,600	8,703	-	-
Southwest Milam WSC	7,158	8,099	1,703	2,165	2,707	3,299	3,966	4,716	1.24%	-0.90%
Taylor	15,036	15,767	27,500	39,552	53,155	65,755	79,921	95,847	0.48%	3.05%
Williamson Travis Counties MUD 1	5,190	5,255	3,832	3,851	3,870	3,889	3,909	3,928	0.12%	-0.48%
Williamson County MUD 10	3,056	3,723	3,780	3,780	3,780	3,780	3,780	3,780	1.99%	0.03%
Williamson County MUD 11	1,807	3,734	5,921	8,483	11,505	14,805	18,522	22,700	7.53%	3.05%
Vista Oaks MUD	2,294	2,611	2,765	2,765	2,765	2,765	2,765	2,765	1.30%	0.10%
Block House MUD	6,137	5,934	5,749	5,555	5,370	5,190	5,017	4,848	-0.34%	-0.34%
Paloma Lake MUD 1	380	3,395	3,447	3,447	3,447	3,447	3,447	3,447	24.48%	0.03%
Paloma Lake MUD 2	438	2,366	2,506	2,506	2,506	2,506	2,506	2,506	18.37%	0.10%
Sonterra MUD	1,469	9,938	19,498	30,746	44,040	58,538	74,871	93,254	21.07%	3.80%
Walsh Ranch MUD	535	812	824	824	824	824	824	824	4.26%	0.02%
Williamson County WSID 3	2,961	3,836	4,546	6,001	7,716	9,592	11,701	14,071	2.62%	2.19%
Noack WSC	706	719	738	757	776	799	824	851	0.18%	0.28%
Lakeside MUD 3	-	-	17	22	28	35	44	53	-	-
Williamson County Total	381,981	541,744	921,903	1,283,155	1,585,326	1,838,434	2,130,726	2,426,093	3.56%	2.53%
Young County										
County-Other, Young	-	-	3,410	3,436	3,487	3,514	3,546	3,583	-	-
Fort Belknap WSC	3,848	3,833	3,710	3,759	3,880	3,929	3,983	4,044	-0.04%	0.09%
Graham	7,576	7,248	7,421	7,354	7,039	6,991	6,930	6,860	-0.44%	-0.09%
Baylor SUD	-	-	116	116	116	115	116	117	-	-
Young County Total	-	-	14,657	14,665	14,522	14,549	14,575	14,604	-	-
Brazos G Total	**2,157,518**	**2,579,445**	**3,032,159**	**3,649,340**	**4,183,073**	**4,682,109**	**5,160,738**	**5,660,538**	**1.80%**	**1.32%**

Notes:
SUD – special utility district; MUD – municipal utility district; WSC – water supply corporation; WSD – water supply district; WSID - water, sewage, irrigation, and drainage



Figure 2.2 Projected Annual County Growth Rates in the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area

2.2.1 Revisions in Municipal WUGs from the 2021 Planning Cycle

Certain WUGs that were part of the 2021 planning cycle underwent reorganization. Some of them are no longer included in the 2026 planning cycle, while others have been newly added to the 2026 planning cycle. These revisions are shown in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 Revisions in Brazos G WUGs list from 2021 Planning Cycle

2021 PLAN	2026 PLAN
County-Other, Bell	Bell County WCID 1
County-Other, Burleson	Cade Lakes WSC
County-Other, Knox	Benjamin
County-Other, Mclennan	Hog Creek WSC
County-Other, Williamson	Noack WSC
County-Other, Taylor	S U N WSC
County-Other, Eastland	Westbound WSC
Bethany WSC	Bethany SUD
Bethany Hearne WSC	Hearne
County-Other, Burnet	Corrix Utilities Texas Inc
County-Other, Llano	Corrix Utilities Texas Inc
Mitchell County Utility	Corrix Utilities Texas Inc
Williamson County MUD 9	Vista Oaks MUD
County-Other, Ellis	Hilco United Services
County-Other, Hill	Hilco United Services
White Rock WSC	White Rock Water SUD
Parker County SUD	Not in 2026 Plan
Pflugerville	Not in 2026 Plan
Not in 2021 Plan	Lakeside MUD 3
Not in 2021 Plan	MSEC Enterprises
Not in 2021 Plan	Navarro Mills WSC
Not in 2021 Plan	Steamboat Mountain WSC

Notes:
(1) Source: Name revision information obtained from regional planning group meeting materials, accessed in January 2024 via link: *2022-07-13-Group-Materials-Update2.pdf (brazosgwater.org)*
(2) Some customers within County-Other WUGs receive service from the WUGs indicated in the table above (Column "2026 Plan"). However, there are still customers who are located within County-Other WUGs in the 2026 Plan.

2.2.2 Revisions to Population Projections

The Brazos G RWPG requested to revise the population projections for 354 of the 360 WUG-county splits, and the TWDB approved 333 of these requests. For 18 WUG-county splits, the TWDB recommended further revisions, and for the remaining four WUG-county splits, the TWDB did not approve the requests. The approved population projections are 12 percent higher in 2030, 20 percent higher in 2050, and 14 percent higher in 2080 compared to the draft projections that were initially developed by TWDB.

2.3 Water Demand Projections

Water demand projections have been compiled for each type of consumptive water use (municipal, manufacturing, steam-electric, mining, irrigation, and livestock); projections for non-consumptive water uses, such as navigation, hydroelectric generation, environmental flows, and recreation, are not presented. Demands are totaled for those WUGs for which the primary planning area is Brazos G and for only the portion within Brazos G. As shown in Table 2.3, total water use for the area is projected to increase from 1,119,518 acre-feet (ac-ft) in 2030 to 1,571,453 ac-ft in 2080, a 40 percent increase. The trend in total water use is shown in Figure 2.3. The six types of water use as percentages of total water use are shown for 2030 and 2080 in Figure 2.4. The projections indicate that municipal water use as percentages of the total water use will increase from 2030 to 2080, while steam electric, irrigation, manufacturing, and livestock water use are projected to decrease as percentages of the total. Water use for mining is projected to be constant between 2030 and 2080.

2.3.1 Revisions to Municipal Demand Projections

The Brazos G RWPG requested revisions to the baseline gpcd's for 281 WUG-county splits. TWDB approved all but one WUG, because the requested gpcd did not align with the WUG's self-reported net use in the WUS. Region G requested revisions to the draft plumbing code savings for projections for 12 WUG-County splits, nine were approved and three were not approved because the supporting documentation did not clarify if the proposed revision was due to passive savings from plumbing code laws or active conservation. The approved municipal demand projections are 21 percent higher in 2030, 28 percent higher in 2050, and 22 percent higher in 2080 compared to the draft projections that were initially developed by TWDB.

2.3.2 Municipal Water Demand

Municipal water use is defined as water that is used by households (e.g., drinking, bathing, food preparation, dishwashing, laundry, flushing toilets, lawn watering and landscaping, swimming pools), commercial establishments, (e.g., restaurants, car washes, hotels, laundromats, and office buildings) and for fire protection, public recreation and sanitation. This type of water must meet safe-drinking water standards as specified by federal and state laws and regulations.

Table 2.3 Brazos G Area Total Water Demand by Type of Use (ac-ft/yr)

Water Use	Historical(1)		Projections(1)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Municipal	326,414	383,011	552,334	654,908	746,902	832,014	915,785	1,002,767
Manufacturing	46,131	9,718	16,847	17,474	18,124	18,800	19,498	20,223
Steam-Electric	76,545	204,266	158,660	158,660	158,660	158,660	158,660	158,660
Mining	53,383	16,454	27,389	28,139	25,835	26,406	25,893	26,283
Irrigation	298,754	310,817	320,150	320,150	319,772	319,536	319,382	319,382
Livestock	51,943	44,064	44,138	44,138	44,138	44,138	44,138	44,138
Brazos G Total	**853,170**	**968,330**	**1,119,518**	**1,223,469**	**1,313,431**	**1,399,554**	**1,483,356**	**1,571,453**

Notes:
(1) 2010 demand obtained from the 2021 Plan, and the 2020 demand obtained from the TWDB Water Use Survey. Projections from TWDB.



Figure 2.3 Projected Total Water Demand



Figure 2.4 Total Water Demand by Type of Use in 2030 and 2080

Municipal water demand projections are computed by multiplying the projected population of an entity by the entity's projected per capita water use, adjusted downward for expected conservation savings due primarily to continued implementation of the 1991 State Water-Efficient Plumbing Act. Full implementation of the Act – retrofit of all existing fixtures with water-efficient fixtures and water-efficient fixtures installed in all new construction – was assumed to occur by Year 2045.

Table 2.4 presents projected per capita water use for WUGs in the Brazos G Area. These per capita water use rates reflect reductions due to implementation of the 1991 State Water-Efficient Plumbing Act. These reductions vary depending on the rural/urban nature of each WUG and projected growth, which typically range from 0 to 20 gpcd. However, in some cases revisions in gpcd were made to make the value consistent with similar WUGs. As a result, individual WUGs may have reductions well outside this typical range.

Per capita water use varies widely in the Brazos G Area and generally ranges between 60 gpcd to 472 gpcd. Five WUGs within the Region have per capita water use in excess of 800 gpcd. The base year average gpcd for Brazos G was 181 gpcd and the median is 159 gpcd. Lower per capita water uses are typically associated with smaller, rural water utilities where outside water use for lawns or landscaping is limited or is supplemented with individual residential wells and/or stock tanks. Larger per capita water use is typically associated with areas having large suburban residential growth and/or established urban areas having significant commercial water use, or locations with high seasonal use but smaller year-round population (e.g., Texas A&M University).

The Conservation Task Force formed by the 78th Texas Legislature had previously recommended a Statewide target per capita water use of 140 gpcd.[1] While recent efforts have acknowledged the variability in the characterizations of per capita water use, for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G RWP the RWPG has continued to use the 140 gpcd amount as a means of identifying a threshold for potential conservation activities.

Table 2.4 Per Capita Water Use for WUGs in the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area (gpcd)

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Bell County								
439 WSC	172	168	167	167	167	167	167	5
Bartlett	183	179	177	178	177	177	177	5
Bell Milam Falls WSC	162	157	157	157	157	157	157	5
Belton	157	153	152	152	152	152	152	5
County-Other, Bell	151	147	146	147	147	147	146	4
Dog Ridge WSC	172	168	167	167	167	167	167	5
Elm Creek WSC	143	139	138	138	138	138	138	5
Fort Hood	215	210	210	210	210	210	210	5
Georgetown	173	169	168	168	168	168	168	5
Harker Heights	178	174	173	173	173	173	173	5

[1] Water Conservation Implementation Task Force, Report to the 79th Texas Legislature, Texas Water Development Board, Special Report, Austin, Texas, November 2004.

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Holland	105	100	100	100	100	100	100	5
Jarrell-Schwertner	125	120	120	120	120	120	120	5
Kempner WSC	176	171	171	171	171	171	171	5
Killeen	125	120	120	120	120	120	120	5
Bell County WCID 2	175	170	170	170	170	170	170	5
Moffat WSC	167	162	162	162	162	161	162	5
Pendleton WSC	169	165	164	164	164	164	164	5
Rogers	164	159	158	158	159	158	158	6
Salado WSC	296	292	291	291	291	291	291	5
Temple	227	222	222	222	222	222	222	5
Troy	119	115	114	114	114	114	114	5
West Bell County WSC	166	161	161	161	161	161	161	5
Morgans Point Resort	135	130	130	130	130	130	130	5
Armstrong WSC	159	155	154	154	154	154	154	5
East Bell WSC	155	150	150	150	150	150	150	5
Bell County WCID 3	161	157	156	156	156	156	156	5
Central Texas College District	283	280	279	279	279	279	279	4
Little Elm Valley WSC	171	167	167	166	166	166	166	5
The Grove WSC	139	135	134	135	135	134	134	5
Bell County WCID 1	338	331	331	331	331	331	331	6
Bosque County								
Childress Creek WSC	230	226	225	225	225	225	225	5
Clifton	201	196	196	196	196	196	196	5
County-Other, Bosque	125	120	120	120	120	120	120	5
Cross Country WSC	178	175	173	172	172	173	174	5
Meridian	145	140	140	139	139	140	140	5
Valley Mills	179	174	174	173	174	174	173	5
Highland Park WSC	264	259	258	260	258	258	259	5
Hilco United Services	187	182	182	182	182	182	182	5
Mustang Valley WSC	215	211	210	210	210	210	210	5
Smith Bend WSC	133	126	129	126	131	129	128	6
Hog Creek WSC	962	954	956	957	960	949	951	6
Brazos County								
Bryan	169	164	164	164	164	164	164	5
College Station	177	172	172	172	172	172	172	5
County-Other, Brazos	132	125	125	125	125	125	125	7
Wellborn SUD	188	184	184	184	184	184	184	4

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Wickson Creek SUD	139	135	134	134	134	134	134	5
Texas A and M University	477	472	472	472	472	472	472	5
Burleson County								
Caldwell	196	191	190	191	191	190	191	5
County-Other, Burleson	104	99	99	99	99	99	99	5
Milano WSC	167	162	162	162	162	162	162	5
Snook	318	313	312	312	312	312	312	6
Somerville	187	182	181	181	182	181	181	6
Southwest Milam WSC	190	186	184	185	185	185	185	5
Deanville WSC	175	170	169	169	169	169	169	6
Cade Lakes WSC	230	225	226	225	224	224	224	5
Callahan County								
Baird	196	191	191	191	191	191	191	6
Clyde	96	91	91	91	91	91	91	5
County-Other, Callahan	72	67	66	66	66	66	66	6
Cross Plains	210	205	204	204	205	204	205	6
Potosi WSC	139	135	135	133	134	132	135	5
Coleman County SUD	236	232	232	232	231	230	228	6
Callahan County WSC	78	74	73	73	73	73	73	5
Eula WSC	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	-
Hamby WSC	116	110	110	111	111	111	111	6
Westbound WSC	73	66	66	67	67	69	70	5
Comanche County								
Comanche	113	108	108	108	108	108	108	5
County-Other, Comanche	95	90	90	90	90	90	90	5
De Leon	99	94	93	93	94	94	93	5
Coryell County								
Copperas Cove	119	114	114	114	114	114	114	5
County-Other, Coryell	106	101	101	101	101	101	101	5
Elm Creek WSC	143	139	138	138	138	138	137	5
Fort Hood	215	210	210	210	210	210	210	5
Gatesville	246	241	241	241	241	241	241	5
Kempner WSC	176	172	171	171	171	171	171	5
Coryell City WSD	163	159	159	159	159	159	159	4
Multi County WSC	93	89	88	88	88	88	88	5
Central Texas College District	283	281	278	278	278	278	278	4
Flat WSC	258	254	253	254	254	253	253	4

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Fort Gates WSC	187	182	182	182	182	182	182	5
Mountain WSC	157	153	152	152	152	152	152	5
Mustang Valley WSC	215	198	198	223	198	223	206	5
Oglesby	74	69	69	69	69	68	68	5
The Grove WSC	139	133	135	135	136	134	134	5
Eastland County								
Cisco	170	165	164	165	165	164	164	6
County-Other, Eastland	82	76	76	76	76	76	76	6
Eastland	160	155	154	154	154	154	154	6
Gorman	109	104	104	104	103	104	104	5
Ranger	166	161	160	160	160	160	160	6
Rising Star	171	166	165	165	165	165	165	5
Staff WSC	143	139	138	138	138	138	139	5
Westbound WSC	73	68	68	68	68	68	68	5
Erath County								
County-Other, Erath	126	121	121	121	121	121	121	5
Dublin	105	100	100	100	99	99	99	5
Stephenville	136	131	131	131	131	131	131	5
Gordon	230	298	298	298	298	298	298	6
Falls County								
Bell Milam Falls WSC	162	157	157	157	157	157	157	5
Bruceville Eddy	245	240	240	240	240	239	240	5
County-Other, Falls	114	109	108	108	108	108	108	6
Marlin	267	262	262	262	262	262	262	5
Rosebud	114	110	109	109	109	109	109	5
West Brazos WSC	159	154	155	154	154	155	154	5
East Bell WSC	155	153	150	146	150	149	150	5
Cego-Durango WSC	159	154	154	154	154	154	154	5
Levi WSC	238	234	232	233	233	233	233	5
Little Elm Valley WSC	171	175	166	169	168	169	165	5
North Milam WSC	173	198	128	149	179	223	298	5
Fisher County								
The Bitter Creek WSC	140	135	135	134	135	134	135	5
County-Other, Fisher	104	98	98	99	98	99	98	6
Roby	207	203	201	201	202	201	201	5
Rotan	165	160	160	160	160	160	160	5
S U N WSC	97	112	119	119	119	112	64	5

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Grimes County								
County-Other, Grimes	127	122	122	122	122	122	122	5
Navasota	183	178	178	178	178	178	178	5
Wickson Creek SUD	139	135	134	134	134	134	134	5
Dobbin Plantersville WSC	69	65	64	64	64	64	64	5
G and W WSC	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	-
MSEC Enterprises	205	200	202	202	201	201	201	4
TDCJ Luther Units	247	243	243	243	243	243	243	4
TDCJ W Pack Unit	245	240	239	239	239	239	239	6
Hamilton County								
County-Other, Hamilton	112	107	107	106	107	106	107	5
Hamilton	179	174	173	173	174	173	174	5
Hico	134	129	128	128	129	128	129	6
Coryell City WSD	163	160	160	157	157	157	157	4
Multi County WSC	93	89	87	88	87	88	89	5
Haskell County								
County-Other, Haskell	120	115	114	114	115	114	114	6
Haskell	174	169	169	168	169	168	169	5
Hill County								
Brandon Irene WSC	249	244	243	243	243	243	243	6
County-Other, Hill	100	95	94	94	94	94	94	6
Files Valley WSC	179	175	175	174	175	175	174	5
Gholson WSC	127	123	122	123	122	122	122	5
Hillsboro	211	206	206	206	206	206	206	5
Hubbard	132	127	127	127	127	127	127	5
Itasca	110	105	105	105	105	105	105	5
Navarro Mills WSC	96	105	94	99	94	94	89	5
Parker WSC	147	141	140	142	142	142	143	5
Rio Vista	159	179	179	179	149	149	149	5
Double Diamond Utilities	1,023	1,020	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019	4
Whitney	172	167	167	167	166	167	167	5
Woodrow Osceola WSC	176	172	171	171	171	171	171	5
Hill County WSC	131	127	126	126	126	126	126	5
Birome WSC	137	133	132	132	132	132	132	5
Bold Springs WSC	135	133	129	127	129	128	131	5
Chatt WSC	162	157	156	156	156	156	156	6

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Hilco United Services	187	182	182	182	182	182	182	5
Post Oak SUD	205	200	199	200	200	200	200	5
Hood County								
Acton MUD	185	180	180	180	180	180	180	5
County-Other, Hood	94	90	89	89	89	89	89	5
Granbury	175	170	169	169	169	169	169	6
Tolar	148	144	143	144	143	144	143	5
Lipan	143	139	138	138	138	138	138	5
Santo SUD	125	89	128	179	223	-	-	5
Johnson County								
Fort Worth	177	-	-	172	172	172	172	5
Mansfield	245	241	240	240	240	240	240	5
Acton MUD	185	176	181	172	175	175	174	5
Alvarado	125	120	120	120	120	120	120	5
Bethany SUD	127	122	122	122	122	122	122	5
Bethesda WSC	188	184	183	183	183	183	183	5
Burleson	143	139	138	138	138	138	138	5
Cleburne	192	187	187	187	187	187	187	5
County-Other, Johnson	96	91	91	91	91	91	91	5
Crowley	133	130	129	128	129	129	128	5
Godley	116	111	111	111	111	111	111	5
Grandview	153	148	148	148	148	148	148	5
Johnson County SUD	123	119	118	118	118	118	118	5
Keene	130	128	128	128	128	128	128	2
Mountain Peak SUD	281	277	277	277	277	277	277	4
Parker WSC	147	142	142	141	142	142	142	5
Rio Vista	159	154	154	154	154	154	154	5
Venus	168	163	162	162	162	162	163	6
Double Diamond Utilities	1,023	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019	4
Jones County								
Anson	139	134	134	134	134	134	134	5
County-Other, Jones	113	108	107	107	107	107	107	6
Hamlin	187	182	182	182	181	181	181	5
Hawley WSC	109	104	104	104	104	104	104	5
Stamford	233	228	228	228	228	228	228	5
Hamby WSC	116	113	109	112	110	112	112	6
S U N WSC	97	93	92	92	92	92	92	5

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Kent County								
County-Other, Kent	109	106	105	103	103	105	103	6
Jayton	180	176	174	175	175	175	174	5
Knox County								
County-Other, Knox	93	88	87	88	88	87	88	6
Knox City	224	219	219	219	219	218	219	5
Munday	180	175	175	175	175	174	175	5
Red River Authority of Texas	220	207	211	219	218	223	216	5
Benjamin	277	274	273	269	273	272	271	5
Lampasas County								
Copperas Cove	119	114	114	114	114	114	114	5
County-Other, Lampasas	121	115	115	115	115	114	115	6
Kempner WSC	176	172	171	171	171	171	171	5
Lampasas	167	162	162	162	162	162	162	5
Corix Utilities Texas Inc	170	165	165	165	165	165	165	5
Multi County WSC	93	79	91	93	95	95	79	5
Lee County								
Aqua WSC	148	144	143	143	143	143	143	5
County-Other, Lee	94	89	88	88	88	88	88	6
Giddings	188	183	183	183	183	183	183	5
Lee County WSC	129	125	124	124	124	124	124	5
Lexington	177	172	172	172	172	171	172	5
Southwest Milam WSC	190	185	185	185	185	185	185	5
Limestone County								
Bistone Municipal WSD	419	416	414	414	415	415	415	5
Coolidge	174	170	169	169	170	169	169	5
County-Other, Limestone	86	81	80	80	80	80	80	6
Groesbeck	167	162	161	161	161	161	161	6
Mexia	133	132	132	132	132	132	132	1
Tri County SUD	116	112	112	112	112	112	112	4
Birome WSC	137	137	129	137	131	136	129	5
Point Enterprise WSC	128	124	124	123	124	123	122	5
Post Oak SUD	205	201	202	201	202	197	204	5
Prairie Hill WSC	183	179	179	178	179	177	179	5
SLC WSC	95	90	89	89	89	89	89	6
White Rock Water SUD	101	96	96	96	96	96	96	5

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
McLennan County								
Waco	222	217	216	217	216	217	217	6
Bellmead	120	115	115	115	115	115	115	5
Bruceville Eddy	245	240	240	240	240	240	240	5
Chalk Bluff WSC	147	143	142	142	142	142	142	5
Childress Creek WSC	230	228	219	220	223	223	223	5
County-Other, McLennan	115	110	110	110	110	110	110	5
Crawford	212	207	207	207	207	207	207	5
Cross Country WSC	178	173	173	173	173	173	173	5
Elm Creek WSC	143	139	138	138	138	138	138	5
Gholson WSC	127	123	122	122	122	122	122	5
H and H WSC	125	120	120	120	120	120	120	5
Hewitt	176	171	171	171	171	171	171	5
Lacy Lakeview	125	120	120	120	120	120	120	5
Lorena	171	167	166	166	166	166	166	5
Mart	233	228	228	227	227	228	227	5
McGregor	238	233	233	233	233	233	233	5
Moody	135	130	130	130	130	130	130	5
North Bosque WSC	279	274	274	274	274	274	274	5
Riesel	118	113	112	112	112	112	112	6
Robinson	200	195	195	195	195	195	195	5
Valley Mills	179	179	167	206	179	223	149	5
West	165	160	160	160	159	159	160	5
West Brazos WSC	159	154	154	154	154	154	154	5
Woodway	351	346	346	346	346	346	346	5
Coryell City WSD	163	159	158	159	159	159	158	4
Axtell WSC	157	152	152	152	152	152	152	5
Birome WSC	137	133	132	133	132	133	132	5
Bold Springs WSC	135	131	130	130	130	130	130	5
Central Bosque WSC	161	156	156	155	155	156	155	5
East Crawford WSC	304	300	299	299	299	299	299	5
Eol WSC	113	109	108	108	108	108	108	5
Highland Park WSC	264	260	259	260	257	259	261	5
Hilltop WSC	143	138	138	138	137	137	138	6
Leroy Tours Gerald WSC	115	111	110	110	110	110	110	5
Levi WSC	238	234	233	233	233	233	233	5
McLennan County WCID 2	172	167	166	166	166	167	167	6

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Prairie Hill WSC	183	179	178	178	178	178	178	5
Ross WSC	140	135	135	135	135	135	135	5
Spring Valley WSC	160	155	155	155	155	155	155	5
Texas State Technical College	1,804	1,800	1,799	1,799	1,799	1,799	1,799	5
Windsor Water	148	144	143	142	143	143	143	5
Hog Creek WSC	962	956	955	955	955	955	956	6
Milam County								
Bell Milam Falls WSC	162	157	157	157	157	157	157	5
Cameron	217	212	212	212	212	212	212	5
County-Other, Milam	111	106	105	105	105	105	105	6
Milano WSC	167	162	162	162	162	162	162	5
Rockdale	198	193	193	193	193	193	193	5
Southwest Milam WSC	190	185	185	185	185	185	185	5
Thorndale	138	133	132	132	132	133	133	5
North Milam WSC	173	168	168	167	167	168	168	5
Salem Elm Ridge WSC	175	171	170	170	170	170	171	5
Nolan County								
Sweetwater	144	139	139	139	139	139	139	5
The Bitter Creek WSC	140	135	135	135	135	134	135	5
County-Other, Nolan	105	99	98	98	98	98	98	7
Roscoe	186	181	180	180	180	180	180	6
Palo Pinto County								
County-Other, Palo Pinto	84	79	78	78	78	78	78	6
Mineral Wells	180	175	175	175	175	175	175	5
Strawn	207	202	202	201	202	202	201	6
Double Diamond Utilities	1,023	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019	4
Possum Kingdom WSC	384	379	378	378	378	378	378	6
Gordon	230	224	224	224	225	225	224	6
Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC	112	108	107	107	107	107	107	5
North Rural WSC	100	96	95	95	95	95	95	5
Palo Pinto WSC	127	122	121	121	121	122	122	6
Santo SUD	125	120	120	120	120	120	120	5
Sportsmans World MUD	890	881	881	881	881	881	881	7
Sturdivant Progress WSC	97	93	92	92	92	92	92	5
Robertson County								
Bremond	183	178	178	178	178	177	178	6
Calvert	235	230	229	230	229	229	229	5

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
County-Other, Robertson	102	97	97	97	97	97	96	5
Franklin	133	128	128	128	127	128	128	5
Hearne	152	147	147	147	147	147	147	5
Robertson County WSC	143	138	137	137	137	137	138	6
Wellborn SUD	188	184	184	184	184	184	184	4
Wickson Creek SUD	139	134	133	135	133	135	133	5
Twin Creek WSC	223	218	217	218	218	218	218	5
Shackelford County								
Albany	276	271	271	271	270	271	271	5
County-Other, Shackelford	90	86	82	82	83	87	86	6
Hamby WSC	116	110	111	110	110	111	111	6
Fort Griffin SUD	171	167	165	166	166	166	166	5
Somervell County								
County-Other, Somervell	109	105	105	105	105	105	105	4
Glen Rose	199	194	194	193	193	193	193	6
Somervell County Water District	240	236	235	235	235	235	235	5
Stephens County								
Breckenridge	161	156	156	156	156	156	156	5
County-Other, Stephens	97	91	90	91	89	88	88	7
Fort Belknap WSC	124	118	126	124	119	117	120	5
Stephens Regional SUD	178	173	173	173	173	172	173	5
Possum Kingdom WSC	384	372	446	298	446	-	-	6
Fort Griffin SUD	171	166	166	165	165	166	166	5
Staff WSC	143	141	136	139	139	140	137	5
Stonewall County								
Aspermont	331	326	325	325	326	326	324	6
County-Other, Stonewall	107	102	101	100	101	102	102	5
Taylor County								
Abilene	183	178	178	178	178	178	178	5
County-Other, Taylor	104	97	96	97	98	97	99	8
Hawley WSC	109	104	104	103	104	103	104	5
Merkel	117	112	112	112	111	111	112	5
Potosi WSC	139	134	134	134	134	134	134	5
Steamboat Mountain WSC	123	119	118	118	118	118	118	5
Tye	143	138	136	137	137	136	138	6
Coleman County SUD	236	232	229	229	229	229	229	6
Hamby WSC	116	112	111	110	111	110	111	6

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Lawn	178	173	171	174	175	172	170	6
North Runnels WSC	109	105	104	104	104	104	104	5
View Caps WSC	150	145	144	144	144	145	144	6
S U N WSC	97	93	92	92	92	92	92	5
Throckmorton County								
County-Other, Throckmorton	86	81	79	78	80	79	83	5
Fort Belknap WSC	124	119	122	118	123	123	112	5
Throckmorton	216	211	210	211	210	211	210	6
Stephens Regional SUD	178	175	174	173	171	172	175	5
Baylor SUD	197	255	149	149	179	223	223	6
Fort Griffin SUD	171	168	163	164	169	168	166	5
Washington County								
Brenham	230	225	224	224	224	224	224	6
County-Other, Washington	116	111	111	111	111	111	111	5
Lee County WSC	129	126	126	125	123	122	125	5
Corix Utilities Texas Inc	170	165	165	165	165	165	165	5
Central Washington County WSC	123	118	118	118	118	118	118	5
Chappell Hill WSC	198	194	193	193	193	193	193	5
West End WSC	98	92	94	91	91	92	92	5
Williamson County								
Cedar Park	191	187	186	186	186	186	186	5
Round Rock	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	-
Bartlett	183	179	178	177	178	178	178	5
Bell Milam Falls WSC	162	157	157	157	157	157	157	5
Brushy Creek MUD	185	180	180	180	180	180	180	5
County-Other, Williamson	140	136	136	136	136	136	136	4
Fern Bluff MUD	194	190	189	189	189	189	189	5
Florence	136	131	130	131	130	131	131	5
Georgetown	173	169	168	168	168	168	168	5
Granger	145	140	140	140	140	139	140	5
Hutto	107	103	102	102	102	102	102	5
Jarrell-Schwertner	125	120	120	120	120	120	120	5
Jonah Water SUD	188	184	184	184	184	184	184	4
Leander	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	-
Liberty Hill	111	107	107	107	107	107	107	4
Manville WSC	140	135	135	135	135	135	135	5
Southwest Milam WSC	190	186	185	185	185	185	185	5

WUG/County	Per Capita Use Rates (GPCD)							Average Reduction Due to Plumbing Fixtures Act (2030-2080)
	Base	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Taylor	120	115	115	115	115	115	115	5
Williamson Travis Counties MUD 1	141	136	136	136	136	136	136	5
Williamson County MUD 10	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	-
Williamson County MUD 11	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	-
Vista Oaks MUD	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	-
Block House MUD	130	125	125	125	125	125	125	5
Paloma Lake MUD 1	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	-
Paloma Lake MUD 2	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	-
Sonterra MUD	108	105	105	105	105	105	105	3
Walsh Ranch MUD	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	-
Williamson County WSID 3	184	179	179	179	179	178	178	6
Noack WSC	189	184	184	184	184	184	184	5
Lakeside MUD 3	128	105	122	128	128	122	118	4
Young County								
County-Other, Young	110	105	104	104	104	104	104	6
Fort Belknap WSC	124	119	119	119	119	119	119	5
Graham	302	297	296	297	297	297	296	6
Baylor SUD	197	192	192	192	194	192	191	6

Annual municipal water demand for the area is projected to increase by 301,305 ac-ft between 2030 and 2080, from 552,334 ac-ft to 1,002,767 ac-ft, an 82 percent increase. As can be seen in Figure 2.5, seven counties - Bell, Brazos, Coryell, Johnson, McLennan, Taylor, and Williamson - are projected to account for 88 percent of the total municipal water demand in 2080. Municipal water demand projections for all WUGs, with county totals, are presented in Table 2.5.

The 82 percent projected increase in municipal water demand over the 2030–2080 planning horizon is less than the projected population increase of 87 percent due to expected savings in per capita water use resulting from continued implementation of the 1991 State Water-Efficient Plumbing Fixtures Act.



Figure 2.5 Municipal Water Demand Projections

Table 2.5 Projected Municipal Water Demand by WUG/County in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Bell County						
439 WSC	1,517	1,769	2,007	2,207	2,355	2,435
Armstrong WSC	547	615	668	705	746	792
Bartlett	133	126	122	116	110	104
Bell County WCID 1	98	98	98	98	98	98
Bell County WCID 2	343	362	378	386	396	407
Bell County WCID 3	1,659	2,033	2,620	3,207	3,344	3,481
Bell Milam Falls WSC	399	422	441	452	464	478
Belton	4,887	5,899	6,916	7,846	8,613	9,146
Central Texas College District	172	171	171	171	171	171
County-Other, Bell	760	852	888	823	709	549
Dog Ridge WSC	942	1,057	1,147	1,209	1,279	1,356
East Bell WSC	391	365	346	326	305	281
Elm Creek WSC	397	422	447	470	493	516
Fort Hood	4,861	5,038	5,232	5,426	5,620	5,814
Georgetown	830	1,127	1,231	1,233	1,253	1,235
Harker Heights	7,173	8,252	9,348	9,693	9,693	9,693

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Holland	136	138	140	142	144	146
Jarrell-Schwertner	368	404	432	451	472	495
Kempner WSC	427	467	498	519	542	567
Killeen	23,409	26,702	29,783	33,208	36,579	39,951
Little Elm Valley WSC	341	375	401	419	439	461
Moffat WSC	376	334	298	266	237	212
Morgans Point Resort	774	843	916	989	1,061	1,134
Pendleton WSC	412	443	467	481	498	517
Rogers	164	158	154	149	143	137
Salado WSC	2,459	2,753	3,086	3,459	3,878	4,349
Temple	28,782	32,127	34,751	36,542	38,551	40,803
The Grove WSC	174	206	239	272	304	337
Troy	494	527	562	597	632	667
West Bell County WSC	783	837	880	906	935	969
Bell County Total	84,208	94,922	104,667	112,768	120,064	127,301
Bosque County						
Childress Creek WSC	327	318	306	295	282	269
Clifton	772	827	890	957	1,029	1,107
County-Other, Bosque	894	799	681	565	438	298
Cross Country WSC	55	53	51	49	47	45
Highland Park WSC	102	99	96	92	88	84
Hilco United Services	267	286	307	330	354	380
Hog Creek WSC	78	76	74	71	67	65
Meridian	276	269	258	249	239	228
Mustang Valley WSC	433	421	405	391	374	356
Smith Bend WSC	18	18	17	17	16	15
Valley Mills	243	247	251	256	261	265
Bosque County Total	3,465	3,413	3,336	3,272	3,195	3,112
Brazos County						
Bryan	19,037	22,504	26,658	31,597	39,794	50,101
College Station	23,940	27,047	31,819	37,404	36,735	36,155
County-Other, Brazos	350	361	413	437	480	539
Texas A&M University	10,415	10,400	10,400	10,400	10,400	10,400
Wellborn SUD	5,744	6,526	7,718	9,195	10,853	12,715
Wickson Creek SUD	2,745	3,111	3,677	4,378	5,164	6,048
Brazos County Total	62,231	69,949	80,685	93,411	103,426	115,958
Burleson County						
Cade Lakes WSC	110	111	110	109	108	107

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Caldwell	919	923	920	915	909	903
County-Other, Burleson	788	785	773	759	744	727
Deanville WSC	367	368	366	363	360	357
Milano WSC	240	242	245	249	252	255
Snook	410	412	410	406	403	400
Somerville	268	269	267	266	263	261
Southwest Milam WSC	165	172	181	190	200	210
Burleson County Total	3,267	3,282	3,272	3,257	3,239	3,220
Callahan County						
Baird	329	328	325	322	318	314
Callahan County WSC	190	192	195	199	202	205
Clyde	407	407	410	413	416	419
Coleman County SUD	44	46	48	50	52	54
County-Other, Callahan	159	144	124	101	76	50
Cross Plains	211	210	208	206	203	200
Eula WSC	250	258	266	275	283	292
Hamby WSC	30	31	32	33	34	35
Potosi WSC	35	35	34	34	33	33
Westbound WSC	13	13	13	13	13	13
Callahan County Total	1,668	1,664	1,655	1,646	1,630	1,615
Comanche County						
Comanche	522	514	505	502	499	497
County-Other, Comanche	719	687	647	630	611	589
De Leon	235	239	247	252	258	265
Comanche County Total	1,476	1,440	1,399	1,384	1,368	1,351
Coryell County						
Central Texas College District	108	107	107	107	107	107
Copperas Cove	6,204	8,169	9,399	10,188	10,432	10,077
Coryell City WSD	888	906	917	911	906	900
County-Other, Coryell	401	421	413	375	330	278
Elm Creek WSC	76	76	76	76	75	73
Flat WSC	194	198	201	199	197	196
Fort Gates WSC	479	489	495	491	488	484
Fort Hood	3,667	3,801	3,947	4,094	4,240	4,386
Gatesville	4,228	4,301	4,372	4,378	4,390	4,408
Kempner WSC	828	834	825	804	781	755
Mountain WSC	334	341	345	343	340	337
Multi County WSC	328	334	337	335	332	330

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Mustang Valley WSC	6	6	7	6	7	6
Oglesby	40	41	41	41	40	40
The Grove WSC	25	30	35	40	44	49
Coryell County Total	17,806	20,054	21,517	22,388	22,709	22,426
Eastland County						
Cisco	730	742	762	769	778	791
County-Other, Eastland	255	244	213	198	174	139
Eastland	610	550	502	463	432	407
Gorman	111	103	93	86	80	72
Ranger	410	385	366	352	341	335
Rising Star	130	122	116	111	108	106
Staff WSC	180	195	216	227	240	256
Westbound WSC	170	173	177	178	180	182
Eastland County Total	2,596	2,514	2,445	2,384	2,333	2,288
Erath County						
County-Other, Erath	2,475	2,671	2,915	3,203	3,526	3,890
Dublin	323	288	259	225	196	171
Gordon	2	2	2	2	2	2
Stephenville	3,936	4,305	4,765	5,387	6,075	6,838
Erath County Total	6,736	7,266	7,941	8,817	9,799	10,901
Falls County						
Bell Milam Falls WSC	221	205	190	175	158	140
Bruceville Eddy	337	444	474	506	540	610
Cego-Durango WSC	203	232	263	289	323	372
County-Other, Falls	842	758	666	579	462	305
East Bell WSC	20	20	20	21	22	24
Levi WSC	103	134	166	187	209	230
Little Elm Valley WSC	9	13	18	22	27	33
Marlin	1,343	1,266	1,204	1,151	1,126	1,141
North Milam WSC	2	1	1	1	1	1
Rosebud	146	135	126	116	109	104
West Brazos WSC	133	128	123	120	120	123
Falls County Total	3,359	3,336	3,251	3,167	3,097	3,083
Fisher County						
County-Other, Fisher	100	96	94	92	91	89
Roby	121	116	112	111	109	107
Rotan	258	248	241	238	234	230
S U N WSC	2	2	2	2	2	1

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
The Bitter Creek WSC	101	97	94	93	91	90
Fisher County Total	582	559	543	536	527	517
Grimes County						
County-Other, Grimes	1,434	1,499	1,548	1,569	1,577	1,563
Dobbin Plantersville WSC	332	365	394	419	448	480
G & W WSC	94	101	106	111	117	123
MSEC Enterprises	44	69	107	166	257	400
Navasota	1,581	1,641	1,695	1,737	1,784	1,835
TDCJ Luther Units	319	318	318	318	318	318
TDCJ W Pack Unit	451	449	449	449	449	449
Wickson Creek SUD	719	783	837	885	940	1,001
Grimes County Total	4,974	5,225	5,454	5,654	5,890	6,169
Hamilton County						
Coryell City WSD	46	47	48	48	48	48
County-Other, Hamilton	415	410	404	400	393	386
Hamilton	527	523	523	516	507	498
Hico	177	172	168	165	161	158
Multi County WSC	62	55	46	45	45	45
Hamilton County Total	1,227	1,207	1,189	1,174	1,154	1,135
Haskell County						
County-Other, Haskell	286	279	268	264	259	254
Haskell	602	589	574	571	566	562
Haskell County Total	888	868	842	835	825	816
Hill County						
Birome WSC	101	103	105	107	109	112
Bold Springs WSC	19	19	19	20	20	21
Brandon Irene WSC	532	546	557	568	580	594
Chatt WSC	220	225	229	233	238	244
County-Other, Hill	470	481	490	499	510	521
Double Diamond Utilities	1,533	1,576	1,606	1,637	1,670	1,709
Files Valley WSC	706	725	738	752	768	785
Gholson WSC	155	159	162	164	168	172
Hilco United Services	950	976	994	1,013	1,034	1,058
Hill County WSC	427	438	446	454	464	475
Hillsboro	3,465	3,558	3,623	3,693	3,770	3,858
Hubbard	211	216	220	224	229	234
Itasca	200	205	209	213	218	223
Navarro Mills WSC	2	2	2	2	2	2

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Parker WSC	41	42	43	44	45	46
Post Oak SUD	197	202	206	210	214	219
Rio Vista	1	1	1	1	1	1
Whitney	454	466	474	483	494	505
Woodrow Osceola WSC	546	561	571	582	594	608
Hill County Total	10,230	10,501	10,695	10,899	11,128	11,387
Hood County						
Acton MUD	2,320	2,511	2,728	2,963	3,218	3,495
County-Other, Hood	4,127	4,623	5,138	5,692	6,320	7,031
Granbury	3,178	3,601	4,041	4,522	5,062	5,670
Lipan	146	158	171	184	199	216
Santo SUD	1	1	1	1	-	-
Tolar	186	214	244	276	313	354
Hood County Total	9,958	11,108	12,323	13,638	15,112	16,766
Johnson County						
Acton MUD	14	13	11	10	9	8
Alvarado	673	770	871	961	1,063	1,177
Bethany SUD	478	526	575	619	668	722
Bethesda WSC	7,272	8,384	9,523	10,556	11,715	13,017
Burleson	6,647	7,781	8,946	10,007	11,199	12,536
Cleburne	7,557	8,493	9,453	10,310	11,273	12,355
County-Other, Johnson	1,310	1,330	938	659	438	344
Crowley	26	38	50	62	75	89
Double Diamond Utilities	628	841	1,057	1,259	1,485	1,739
Fort Worth	-	-	978	1,553	1,925	1,909
Godley	170	194	219	241	266	294
Grandview	291	330	370	406	447	492
Johnson County SUD	9,290	11,697	13,041	14,236	15,582	17,097
Keene	870	912	953	986	1,022	1,064
Mansfield	1,755	2,488	3,233	3,935	4,721	5,600
Mountain Peak SUD	1,461	1,813	2,252	2,799	3,477	4,321
Parker WSC	267	263	259	254	248	241
Rio Vista	184	209	238	271	309	352
Venus	442	412	386	358	332	308
Johnson County Total	39,335	46,494	53,353	59,482	66,254	73,665
Jones County						
Anson	345	329	314	297	279	259
County-Other, Jones	857	814	767	713	651	579

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Hamby WSC	26	23	21	18	15	11
Hamlin	315	275	241	211	188	170
Hawley WSC	530	529	531	534	536	538
S U N WSC	102	119	139	161	188	224
Stamford	728	671	610	545	470	380
Jones County Total	2,903	2,760	2,623	2,479	2,327	2,161
Kent County						
County-Other, Kent	29	29	28	29	31	32
Jayton	97	96	100	103	106	109
Kent County Total	126	125	128	132	137	141
Knox County						
Benjamin	57	56	51	48	43	38
County-Other, Knox	89	85	80	75	68	59
Knox City	246	245	244	243	241	241
Munday	228	231	235	237	242	253
Red River Authority of Texas	13	13	12	11	10	8
Knox County Total	633	630	622	614	604	599
Lampasas County						
Copperas Cove	183	288	361	436	469	464
Corix Utilities Texas Inc	1,028	1,062	1,067	1,054	1,041	1,025
County-Other, Lampasas	95	98	99	98	96	95
Kempner WSC	2,015	2,081	2,090	2,066	2,039	2,008
Lampasas	1,562	1,720	1,881	2,019	2,076	2,045
Multi County WSC	4	5	5	5	5	4
Lampasas County Total	4,887	5,254	5,503	5,678	5,726	5,641
Lee County						
Aqua WSC	264	273	284	295	306	318
County-Other, Lee	271	267	250	232	211	189
Giddings	1,129	1,141	1,124	1,103	1,080	1,053
Lee County WSC	965	975	961	942	922	898
Lexington	376	381	375	368	359	351
Southwest Milam WSC	107	113	119	126	133	141
Lee County Total	3,112	3,150	3,113	3,066	3,011	2,950
Limestone County						
Birome WSC	14	13	13	12	12	11
Bistone Municipal WSD	243	235	226	217	207	197
Coolidge	140	135	130	125	119	113
County-Other, Limestone	251	242	234	226	218	210

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groesbeck	585	569	551	534	517	499
Mexia	1,026	997	960	926	890	852
Point Enterprise WSC	65	63	60	58	55	52
Post Oak SUD	29	28	27	26	24	24
Prairie Hill WSC	138	134	128	123	117	112
SLC WSC	101	97	93	89	85	81
Tri County SUD	442	427	409	393	376	358
White Rock Water SUD	217	210	201	193	185	176
Limestone County Total	3,251	3,150	3,032	2,922	2,805	2,685
McLennan County						
Axtell WSC	303	345	387	430	473	515
Bellmead	1,441	1,482	1,525	1,556	1,593	1,636
Birome WSC	81	90	99	108	119	130
Bold Springs WSC	252	264	275	286	298	312
Bruceville Eddy	1,438	1,446	1,544	1,648	1,759	1,844
Central Bosque WSC	146	151	155	158	163	167
Chalk Bluff WSC	576	653	732	812	891	971
Childress Creek WSC	11	14	17	21	25	30
Coryell City WSD	187	194	201	206	212	219
County-Other, McLennan	734	953	1,003	1,026	1,073	1,175
Crawford	202	229	253	280	310	343
Cross Country WSC	588	669	739	819	909	1,008
East Crawford WSC	331	348	363	377	394	412
Elm Creek WSC	220	231	244	260	276	294
EOL WSC	228	248	269	290	311	332
Gholson WSC	472	542	603	674	752	840
H & H WSC	199	205	210	213	217	222
Hewitt	3,289	3,278	3,278	3,278	3,278	3,278
Highland Park WSC	48	49	50	50	51	52
Hilltop WSC	118	122	126	128	131	135
Hog Creek WSC	318	321	324	321	320	319
Lacy Lakeview	1,022	1,095	1,162	1,231	1,309	1,397
Leroy Tours Gerald WSC	193	204	217	230	242	243
Levi WSC	471	492	512	529	548	571
Lorena	534	557	580	600	624	651
Mart	460	432	409	372	333	290
McGregor	2,602	2,741	2,867	2,985	3,121	3,276
McLennan County WCID 2	222	204	190	168	145	119

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Moody	273	308	344	380	417	453
North Bosque WSC	638	714	801	898	1,006	1,129
Prairie Hill WSC	139	161	180	203	228	255
Riesel	156	165	175	186	196	207
Robinson	2,970	3,380	3,857	4,401	5,023	5,733
Ross WSC	375	412	446	482	524	570
Spring Valley WSC	436	496	547	607	673	746
Texas State Technical College	2,016	2,015	2,015	2,015	2,015	2,015
Valley Mills	4	3	3	2	2	1
Waco	38,126	41,590	44,657	47,967	51,680	55,842
West	509	523	540	557	575	594
West Brazos WSC	263	290	313	339	368	400
Windsor Water	104	109	114	120	126	133
Woodway	3,973	3,967	3,967	3,967	3,967	3,967
McLennan County Total	66,668	71,692	76,293	81,180	86,677	92,826
Milam County						
Bell Milam Falls WSC	251	246	237	229	220	211
Cameron	1,265	1,242	1,200	1,161	1,121	1,079
County-Other, Milam	853	5,575	9,120	14,437	14,437	14,437
Milano WSC	271	266	256	247	238	228
North Milam WSC	184	180	173	167	161	154
Rockdale	1,609	1,616	1,627	1,639	1,650	1,662
Salem Elm Ridge WSC	168	164	158	153	147	142
Southwest Milam WSC	1,161	1,137	1,097	1,059	1,019	978
Thorndale	265	280	298	317	338	359
Milam County Total	6,027	10,706	14,166	19,409	19,331	19,250
Nolan County						
County-Other, Nolan	135	122	105	87	64	36
Roscoe	222	214	207	202	199	198
Sweetwater	1,808	1,786	1,762	1,733	1,703	1,672
The Bitter Creek WSC	146	157	170	183	198	218
Nolan County Total	2,311	2,279	2,244	2,205	2,164	2,124
Palo Pinto County						
County-Other, Palo Pinto	272	271	268	266	265	263
Double Diamond Utilities	1,079	1,081	1,069	1,064	1,057	1,051
Gordon	164	164	162	162	161	159
Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC	128	127	126	125	124	123
Mineral Wells	3,321	3,493	3,675	3,860	3,860	3,860

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
North Rural WSC	177	176	174	173	172	171
Palo Pinto WSC	102	102	101	101	101	101
Possum Kingdom WSC	594	594	587	584	581	577
Santo SUD	269	268	265	264	262	260
Sportsmans World MUD	75	75	74	74	73	73
Strawn	124	124	122	122	121	120
Sturdivant Progress WSC	237	236	234	232	231	229
Palo Pinto County Total	6,542	6,711	6,857	7,027	7,008	6,987
Robertson County						
Bremond	156	152	147	141	135	129
Calvert	269	261	253	242	231	220
County-Other, Robertson	210	192	172	150	127	103
Franklin	281	274	266	255	245	235
Hearne	867	841	813	779	744	706
Robertson County WSC	522	508	501	495	493	497
Twin Creek WSC	225	219	212	203	194	184
Wellborn SUD	373	362	350	336	321	305
Wickson Creek SUD	59	57	56	53	51	48
Robertson County Total	2,962	2,866	2,770	2,654	2,541	2,427
Shackelford County						
Albany	541	487	432	394	351	301
County-Other, Shackelford	22	16	12	9	7	5
Fort Griffin SUD	86	86	87	86	85	84
Hamby WSC	60	65	69	70	72	74
Shackelford County Total	709	654	600	559	515	464
Somervell County						
County-Other, Somervell	166	171	173	172	171	169
Glen Rose	603	621	629	626	622	618
Somervell County Water District	1,487	1,534	1,554	1,542	1,529	1,515
Somervell County Total	2,256	2,326	2,356	2,340	2,322	2,302
Stephens County						
Breckenridge	960	905	831	780	732	662
County-Other, Stephens	32	26	22	18	15	13
Fort Belknap WSC	7	9	11	12	14	17
Fort Griffin SUD	97	103	111	118	102	102
Possum Kingdom WSC	5	3	1	1	-	-
Staff WSC	15	17	21	24	28	32
Stephens Regional SUD	498	510	525	540	569	602

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Stephens County Total	1,614	1,573	1,522	1,493	1,460	1,428
Stonewall County						
Aspermont	243	228	210	197	184	170
County-Other, Stonewall	53	49	44	42	40	37
Stonewall County Total	296	277	254	239	224	207
Taylor County						
Abilene	26,848	28,860	30,633	32,411	34,391	36,611
Coleman County SUD	44	46	46	46	46	46
County-Other, Taylor	165	90	50	27	14	7
Hamby WSC	60	73	84	98	113	130
Hawley WSC	36	40	43	47	51	56
Lawn	47	40	35	30	25	21
Merkel	329	318	310	293	276	259
North Runnels WSC	69	78	86	95	105	116
Potosi WSC	1,129	1,284	1,422	1,582	1,759	1,956
S U N WSC	140	138	138	135	132	129
Steamboat Mountain WSC	960	1,200	1,410	1,665	1,947	2,258
Tye	157	138	124	102	78	53
View Caps WSC	319	342	363	385	410	437
Taylor County Total	30,303	32,647	34,744	36,916	39,347	42,079
Throckmorton County						
Baylor SUD	2	1	1	1	1	1
County-Other, Throckmorton	14	13	12	12	11	11
Fort Belknap WSC	12	10	7	7	7	6
Fort Griffin SUD	30	28	28	27	25	23
Stephens Regional SUD	52	48	44	41	39	37
Throckmorton	146	135	127	119	113	105
Throckmorton County Total	256	235	219	207	196	183
Washington County						
Brenham	4,284	4,332	4,315	4,319	4,324	4,328
Central Washington County WSC	480	502	476	510	547	588
Chappell Hill WSC	107	107	108	106	104	102
Corix Utilities Texas Inc	624	642	662	683	704	726
County-Other, Washington	1,362	1,302	1,272	1,181	1,090	998
Lee County WSC	17	18	19	20	21	23
West End WSC	34	35	34	34	34	34
Washington County Total	6,908	6,938	6,886	6,853	6,824	6,799
Williamson County						

WUG/County	Projected Demands[1]					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Bartlett	195	197	199	203	206	210
Bell Milam Falls WSC	62	79	98	120	144	171
Block House MUD	808	777	751	726	702	678
Brushy Creek MUD	3,927	3,913	3,913	3,913	3,913	3,913
Cedar Park	19,246	19,186	19,186	19,186	19,186	19,186
County-Other, Williamson	8,194	15,232	19,446	24,055	29,238	35,064
Fern Bluff MUD	1,152	1,195	1,244	1,245	1,245	1,245
Florence	208	222	240	259	281	305
Georgetown	46,824	81,637	112,193	138,415	169,003	196,376
Granger	194	208	224	241	259	279
Hutto	2,703	3,731	5,180	7,191	9,983	13,860
Jarrell-Schwertner	8,816	9,504	9,921	10,358	10,816	11,295
Jonah Water SUD	6,238	8,863	11,977	15,377	19,205	23,510
Lakeside MUD 3	2	3	4	5	6	7
Leander	19,035	24,131	25,707	26,026	26,239	26,392
Liberty Hill	763	1,105	1,513	1,957	2,458	3,021
Manville WSC	1,248	1,255	1,266	1,282	1,297	1,313
Noack WSC	152	156	160	165	170	175
Paloma Lake MUD 1	537	537	537	537	537	537
Paloma Lake MUD 2	390	390	390	390	390	390
Round Rock	22,714	28,052	33,340	34,436	35,428	36,292
Sonterra MUD	2,294	3,607	5,166	6,867	8,783	10,940
Southwest Milam WSC	354	448	561	683	821	977
Taylor	3,550	5,083	6,831	8,450	10,270	12,317
Vista Oaks MUD	431	431	431	431	431	431
Walsh Ranch MUD	128	128	128	128	128	128
Williamson County MUD 10	589	589	589	589	589	589
Williamson County MUD 11	922	1,321	1,791	2,305	2,884	3,534
Williamson County WSID 3	912	1,200	1,543	1,918	2,339	2,813
Williamson Travis Counties MUD 1	584	585	588	591	594	597
Williamson County Total	153,172	213,765	265,117	308,049	357,545	406,545
Young County						
Baylor SUD	25	25	25	25	25	25
County-Other, Young	401	401	407	410	414	418
Fort Belknap WSC	496	500	516	523	530	538
Graham	2,470	2,442	2,338	2,322	2,302	2,278
Young County Total	3,392	3,368	3,286	3,280	3,271	3,259
Brazos G Total	**552,334**	**654,908**	**746,902**	**832,014**	**915,785**	**1,002,767**

2.3.3 Manufacturing Water Demand

Manufacturing is an integral part of the economy of the Brazos G Area, and water is critical to the manufacturing process for many industries. It can be used in a variety of ways, including as a component of the final product, as a cooling agent during the manufacturing process, or for cleaning/wash-down of parts and/or products. In the Brazos G Area, industries that are major water users include food and kindred products, apparel, fabricated metal, machinery, stone and concrete production, and micro-chip production.

Manufacturing water demand was projected by the TWDB by taking industry-specific water demand coefficients, adjusted for water-use efficiencies (recycling/reuse), and applying them to growth trends for each industry. These growth trends assume expansion of existing capacity and building of new facilities, continuation of historical trends of interaction between oil price changes and industrial activity, and that the makeup of each county's manufacturing base remains constant throughout the 50-year planning horizon.

Manufacturing use is projected to increase 20 percent, from 16,847 ac-ft in 2030 to 20,223 ac-ft in 2080 (Table 2.6). The trend in manufacturing use by county is shown in Figure 2.6. McLennan, Johnson, Brazos, Williamson and Bell Counties account for 79 percent of the total use in 2080.

Table 2.6 Projected Manufacturing Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)

County	Projections					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Bell	966	1,002	1,039	1,078	1,118	1,160
Bosque	5	5	5	5	5	5
Brazos	2,139	2,219	2,302	2,388	2,477	2,569
Burleson	139	144	149	155	161	167
Comanche	20	21	22	23	24	25
Coryell	5	5	5	5	5	5
Eastland	60	62	64	66	68	71
Erath	90	93	96	100	104	108
Fisher	196	203	211	219	227	235
Grimes	398	413	428	444	461	478
Hamilton	20	21	22	23	24	25
Haskell	2	2	2	2	2	2
Hill	7	7	7	7	7	7
Hood	19	20	21	22	23	24
Johnson	2,440	2,531	2,625	2,723	2,824	2,929
Lampasas	234	243	252	261	271	281
Lee	11	11	11	11	11	11
Limestone	253	262	272	282	292	303
McLennan	5,745	5,959	6,181	6,411	6,649	6,896
Nolan	539	559	580	602	624	647
Palo Pinto	28	29	30	31	32	33

County	Projections					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Robertson	60	62	64	66	68	71
Somervell	5	5	5	5	5	5
Stephens	8	8	8	8	8	8
Taylor	720	747	775	804	834	865
Washington	696	722	749	777	806	836
Williamson	1,944	2,017	2,093	2,172	2,254	2,339
Young	98	102	106	110	114	118
Brazos G Total	**16,847**	**17,474**	**18,124**	**18,800**	**19,498**	**20,223**



Figure 2.6 Manufacturing Water Demand Projections

2.3.4 Steam-Electric Water Demand

The steam-electric generation process uses water in boilers and for cooling. The projections for steam-electric water demand were developed by the TWDB and are based on power generation projections—determined by population and manufacturing growth—and on power generation capacity and freshwater use for that projected capacity. Somervell, Robertson, Limestone, Bell, and Grimes Counties account for 94 percent of total steam-electric water use in 2080. Steam-Electric water use is projected to remain constant at 158,860 ac-ft from 2030 to 2080 (Table 2.7 and Figure 2.7).

Table 2.7 Projected Steam-Electric Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)

County	Projected Demands (1)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Bell	4,714	4,714	4,714	4,714	4714	4,714
Bosque	2,880	2,880	2,880	2,880	2,880	2,880
Brazos	600	600	600	600	600	600
Burleson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Callahan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comanche	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coryell	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Erath	0	0	0	0	0	0
Falls	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fisher	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grimes	4,703	4,703	4,703	4,703	4,703	4,703
Hamilton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haskell	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hill						
Hood	3,151	3,151	3,151	3,151	3,151	3,151
Johnson	1,915	1,915	1,915	1,915	1915	1,915
Jones	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lampasas	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limestone	22,936	22,936	22,936	22,936	22936	22,936
McLennan	15	15	15	15	15	15
Milam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nolan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palo Pinto	677	677	677	677	677	677
Robertson	45,867	45,867	45,867	45,867	45867	45,867
Shackelford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somervell	70,362	70,362	70,362	70,362	70362	70,362
Stephens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stonewall	0	0	0	0	0	0
Taylor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Throckmorton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Williamson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Young	840	840	840	840	840	840
Brazos G Total	**158,660**	**158,660**	**158,660**	**158,660**	**158,660**	**158,660**

Notes:
(1) Projections adopted by the TWDB, as requested by the Brazos G RWPG (Appendix Q).



Figure 2.7 Steam-Electric Water Demand Projections

2.3.5 Mining Water Demand

Projections for mining water demand were developed by the TWDB and are based on projected production of mineral commodities, and historic rates of water use, moderated by water requirements of technological processes used in mining.

Mining use in the Brazos G Area is expected to decrease by four percent between 2030 and 2080, from 27,389 ac-ft to 26,283 ac-ft. Hood, Burleson, Limestone, Brazos, and Somervell Counties account for 71 percent of total mining water use in 2080 (Table 2.8 and Figure 2.8).

Table 2.8 Projected Mining Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)

County	Projected Demands (1)					
	2030	2040	2030	2060	2030	2080
Bell	393	444	493	544	594	642
Bosque	884	921	944	959	968	971
Brazos	2,670	2,698	2,725	2,741	2,765	2,799
Burleson	5,569	5,569	5,569	5,569	5,569	5,569
Callahan	2	2	2	2	2	2
Comanche	94	96	99	102	104	107
Coryell	3	4	4	4	5	5
Eastland	321	322	322	322	322	322
Erath	15	16	17	18	19	20
Falls	30	30	29	30	31	32
Fisher	106	106	106	106	106	106
Grimes	228	228	228	228	228	228
Haskell	4	4	4	4	4	4
Hill	99	103	107	110	112	114
Hood	4,356	4,746	5,086	5,351	5,557	5,694
Johnson	193	185	206	229	254	279
Jones	9	9	9	9	9	9
Kent	15	15	15	15	15	15
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lampasas	3	3	3	3	3	3
Lee	1,236	1,236	1,236	1,236	1,236	1,236
Limestone	3,519	3,624	3,738	3,831	2,914	2,985
McLennan	363	385	407	429	451	472
Milam	832	833	835	836	837	838
Nolan	70	70	70	70	70	70
Palo Pinto	26	27	28	29	29	30
Robertson	3,600	3,600	600	600	600	600
Shackelford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somervell	1,362	1,458	1,533	1,597	1,649	1,686
Stephens	10	10	10	10	10	10
Stonewall	20	20	20	20	20	20
Taylor	514	532	547	558	566	571
Throckmorton	112	112	112	112	112	112
Washington	728	728	728	728	728	728
Williamson	2	2	2	3	3	3
Young	1	1	1	1	1	1
Brazos G Total	**27,389**	**28,139**	**25,835**	**26,406**	**25,893**	**26,283**

Notes:
(1) Projections from TWDB.



Figure 2.8 Mining Water Demand Projections

2.3.6 Irrigation Water Demand

The irrigation water demand projections were developed by the TWDB and are based on specific assumptions regarding resource constraints, crop prices, crop yields, agricultural policy, and technological advances in irrigation systems.

Major crops grown in the Region include feed grains, small grains, cotton, pecans, and peanuts. Table 2.9 shows that irrigation water demand will decrease 0.24 percent from 2030 to 2080, mostly attributable to technological advances in irrigation techniques as well as projected reductions in irrigated acreage. Figure 2.9 shows the trend in irrigation use, with Robertson, Haskell, Knox, Brazos, and Comanche Counties accounting for 69 percent of total irrigation water use in 2080.

Table 2.9 Projected Irrigation Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)

County	Projected Demands (1)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Bell	3,108	3,108	3,108	3,108	3,108	3,108
Bosque	2,995	2,995	2,995	2,995	2,995	2,995
Brazos	35,818	35,818	35,818	35,818	35,818	35,818
Burleson	22,118	22,118	22,118	22,118	22,118	22,118
Callahan	522	522	522	522	522	522
Comanche	26,274	26,274	26,274	26,274	26,274	26,274
Coryell	343	343	343	343	343	343
Eastland	4,393	4,393	4,393	4,393	4,393	4,393
Erath	6,985	6,985	6,985	6,985	6,985	6,985
Falls	6,944	6,944	6,950	6,956	6,963	6,963
Fisher	4,289	4,289	4,289	4,289	4,289	4,289
Grimes	707	707	707	707	707	707
Hamilton	1,148	1,148	1,148	1,148	1,148	1,148
Haskell	49,755	49,755	49,755	49,755	49,755	49,755
Hill	1,374	1,374	1,374	1,374	1,374	1,374
Hood	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800	7,800
Johnson	542	542	542	542	542	542
Jones	2,702	2,702	2,702	2,702	2,702	2,702
Kent	927	927	927	927	927	927
Knox	37,031	37,031	37,031	37,031	37,031	37,031
Lampasas	521	521	521	521	521	521
Lee	939	939	939	939	939	939
Limestone	8	8	8	8	8	8
McLennan	5,122	5,122	5,122	5,122	5,122	5,122
Milam	5,812	5,812	5,812	5,812	5,812	5,812
Nolan	12,961	12,961	12,577	12,335	12,174	12,174
Palo Pinto	2,168	2,168	2,168	2,168	2,168	2,168
Robertson	73,272	73,272	73,272	73,272	73,272	73,272
Shackelford	194	194	194	194	194	194
Somervell	335	335	335	335	335	335
Stephens	153	153	153	153	153	153
Stonewall	95	95	95	95	95	95
Taylor	1,426	1,426	1,426	1,426	1,426	1,426
Throckmorton	71	71	71	71	71	71
Washington	251	251	251	251	251	251
Williamson	399	399	399	399	399	399
Young	648	648	648	648	648	648
Brazos G Total	**320,150**	**320,150**	**319,722**	**319,536**	**319,382**	**319,382**

Notes:
(1) Projections from TWDB.



Figure 2.9 Irrigation Water Demand Projections

2.3.7 Livestock Water Demand

In the 37-county Brazos G Area, the principal livestock type is dairy, with some beef cattle. The Brazos G Area contains widespread cow-calf operators, with concentrated dairy production in Comanche and Erath Counties. The livestock water demand projections developed by the TWDB are based upon estimates of the maximum carrying capacity of the rangeland of the area and the estimated number of gallons of water per head of livestock per day. Additionally, economics of milk production and environmental impacts of the operations are major factors in the projections of the water demands for this category of livestock.

Livestock drinking water is obtained from wells, stock watering ponds, and streams. As can be seen in Table 2.9, it is projected that the annual livestock water demand will remain constant at 44,138 ac-ft between 2030 and 2080. Figure 2.10 shows the trend in livestock use, with Erath, Comanche, Robertson, Falls and Palo Pinto Counties accounting for 34 percent of total livestock water use in 2080.

Table 2.10 Projected Livestock Water Demand in the Brazos G Area (ac-ft/yr)

County	Projected Demands (1)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Bell	977	977	977	977	977	977
Bosque	936	936	936	936	936	936
Brazos	1,098	1,098	1,098	1,098	1,098	1,098
Burleson	1,259	1,259	1,259	1,259	1,259	1,259
Callahan	861	861	861	861	861	861
Comanche	3,436	3,436	3,436	3,436	3,436	3,436
Coryell	1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109
Eastland	962	962	962	962	962	962
Erath	5,984	5,984	5,984	5,984	5,984	5,984
Falls	1,904	1,904	1,904	1,904	1,904	1,904
Fisher	484	484	484	484	484	484
Grimes	1,447	1,447	1,447	1,447	1,447	1,447
Hamilton	1,505	1,505	1,505	1,505	1,505	1,505
Haskell	424	424	424	424	424	424
Hill	1,276	1,276	1,276	1,276	1,276	1,276
Hood	486	486	486	486	486	486
Johnson	1,488	1,488	1,488	1,488	1,488	1,488
Jones	515	515	515	515	515	515
Kent	276	276	276	276	276	276
Knox	534	534	534	534	534	534
Lampasas	585	585	585	585	585	585
Lee	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,242
Limestone	1,495	1,495	1,495	1,495	1,495	1,495
McLennan	1,642	1,642	1,642	1,642	1,642	1,642
Milam	1,524	1,524	1,524	1,524	1,524	1,524
Nolan	275	275	275	275	275	275
Palo Pinto	1,830	1,830	1,830	1,830	1,830	1,830
Robertson	2,036	2,036	2,036	2,036	2,036	2,036
Shackelford	546	546	546	546	546	546
Somervell	151	151	151	151	151	151
Stephens	429	429	429	429	429	429
Stonewall	383	383	383	383	383	383
Taylor	761	761	761	761	761	761
Throckmorton	614	614	614	614	614	614
Washington	1,544	1,544	1,544	1,544	1,544	1,544
Williamson	1,532	1,532	1,532	1,532	1,532	1,532
Young	588	588	588	588	588	588
Brazos G Total	**44,138**	**44,138**	**44,138**	**44,138**	**44,138**	**44,138**

Notes:
(1) Projections from TWDB.



Figure 2.10 Livestock Water Demand Projections

2.3.8 Wholesale Water Providers

A wholesale water provider (WWP) in the 2026 Brazos G Plan is any entity that delivers or sells water wholesale, whether treated or raw, or that the Brazos G RWPG expects to sell water during the planning period. Seventy-three WUGs are also WWPs in the Brazos G Area, e.g., they sell wholesale water to neighboring water systems in addition to meeting their own municipal demands. In addition,12 WWPs provide only wholesale water to entities in the Brazos G Area. The total contractual demands in Brazos G for those 12 WWPs are shown in Table 2.11.

Table 2.11 Brazos G Related Contractual Demands for non-WUG WWPs (ac-ft/yr)

Wholesale Water Provider	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Aquilla WSD	5,952	5,952	5,952	5,952	5,952	
Bell County WCID #1	44,069	47,447	50,736	54,014	57,279	
Bluebonnet WSC	7,125	7,125	7,125	7,125	7,125	
Brazos River Authority[1]	493,010	493,255	493,548	493,908	494,176	
Central Texas WSC	10,537	10,537	10,537	10,537	10,537	
Colorado River MWD	4,850	4,679	4,509	4,338	4168	
Eastland County WSD	5,395	5,395	5,395	5,395	5,395	
Lower Colorado River Authority[2]	70,640	70,640	70,640	70,640	70,640	
North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority	1,650	1,650	1,650	1,650	1,650	
Palo Pinto County MWD #1	9,651	9,706	9,777	9,848	9,906	
Upper Leon MWD	4,572	4,572	4,572	4,572	4,572	
West Central Texas MWD	15,620	13,260	10,900	8,540	6,200	

Notes:
(1) Includes contractual demands for Region C portion of Parker County SUD located in both Brazos G and Region C.
(2) Includes contractual demands for Region K portion of Pflugerville located both Brazos G and Region K.

2.3.9 Major Water Providers

Projected retail and wholesale demands by category of use for the major water providers identified by the Brazos G RWPG are shown in Appendix O.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

CHAPTER 3 EVALUATION OF CURRENT WATER SUPPLIES

3.1 Surface Water Supplies

Streamflow in the Brazos River and its tributaries, along with reservoirs in the Brazos River Basin, comprise a vast supply of surface water in the Brazos G Area. Diversion and use of this surface water occurs throughout the entire Region with over 1,000 water rights currently issued. These water rights provide authorization for an owner to divert, store, and use the water; however, they do not guarantee that a dependable supply will be available from the water source. The availability of water to a water right is dependent on several factors, including hydrologic conditions (i.e., rainfall, runoff, spring flow), priority date of the water right, quantity of authorized storage, and any special conditions associated with the water right (i.e., instream flow requirements, maximum diversion rate).

3.1.1 Texas Water Right System

The State of Texas owns the surface water within the State's watercourses and is responsible for the appropriation of these waters. Surface water is currently allocated by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) for the use and benefit of all people of the State. Historically, Texas water law is based on a combination of the riparian and prior appropriation doctrines. The riparian doctrine extends from the Spanish and Mexican governments that ruled Texas prior to 1836. After 1840, the riparian doctrine provided landowners the right to make reasonable use of water for irrigation or for other consumptive uses. In 1889, the prior appropriation doctrine was first adopted by Texas, which is based on the concept of "first in time is first in right." Over the years, the combination of riparian and prior appropriation doctrines resulted in an essentially unmanageable system. Various types of water rights existed simultaneously, and many rights were unrecorded.

In 1967, the Texas Legislature passed the Water Rights Adjudication Act to merge the riparian water rights into the prior appropriation system, creating a unified water rights system. The adjudication process has taken many years and is essentially complete. In the end, Certificates of Adjudication have been issued for entities recognized as having legitimate water rights. Today, individuals or groups seeking a new water right must submit an application to the TCEQ. The TCEQ determines if the water right will be issued and under what conditions. The water rights grant a certain quantity of water to be diverted and/or stored, a priority date, and often come with some restrictions on when and how the right may be used. Restrictions may include a maximum diversion rate and/or an instream flow restriction to protect existing water rights and environmental resources.

The priority date of a water right is essential to the operation of the water rights system. Each right is issued a priority date based on the date of first capture, or the appropriation date. The established priority system must be adhered to by all water right holders when diverting or storing water for use. A right holder must pass all water to downstream senior water rights when conditions are such that the senior water rights would not be satisfied otherwise.

3.1.2 Types of Water Rights

There are various types of water rights: Certificates of Adjudication, permits, term permits, and temporary permits. Certificates of Adjudication were issued in perpetuity for approved claims during the adjudication process. This type of water right was issued based on historical use rather than water availability. Therefore, the amount of water to which rights exist exceeds the amount of water available during a drought for some streams. The TCEQ issues new permits only where drought flows are sufficient to meet the requested amount. Permits, like Certificates of Adjudication, are issued in perpetuity and may be bought and sold like other property interests. Term permits may be issued by the TCEQ in areas where waters are fully appropriated, but not yet fully used. Term permits are usually issued for 10 years and may be renewed if, after 10 years, other water right holders are still not fully using the water in the basin. Temporary permits are issued for up to three years. Temporary permits are issued mainly for road construction projects, where water is used to suppress dust, to compact soils, and to start the growth of new vegetation. As term and temporary permits are not permanent water rights, they are not considered in the process of determining available water supplies.

Water rights can include the right to divert and/or store the appropriated water. A run-of-the-river water right provides for the diversion of streamflow and does not include storage of water for use during dry periods. These rights have no authorization to store water, only the right to take water from the stream. Availability of water to a run-of-the-river right may be limited by streamflow, pumping rate, or diversion location.

Water rights that include provisions for storage of water allow a water right holder to impound streamflow for use at a later time. The storage provides water for use during dry periods, when water may not be available due to hydrologic conditions or because existing flows are required to be passed to downstream senior water rights.

While most water rights are diverted and used within the river basin of origin, water rights that divert from one river basin to another basin require an interbasin transfer authorization. Several types of transfers that receive special consideration include emergency transfers, transfers of water from a river basin for use in an adjoining coastal basin (such as from the Brazos River Basin to the San Jacinto-Brazos Coastal Basin), diversions of less than 3,000 acre-feet per year (ac-ft/yr), and diversions within any city or county that has any portion in the basin of origin.

3.1.3 Water Rights in the Brazos River Basin

The TCEQ maintains a database of all active water rights, which is available for download from the TCEQ's website. The July 2024 version of this database indicates that the TCEQ has issued 1,134 active water rights totaling 3,854,018 ac-ft/yr of authorized diversions for the Brazos River Basin. Since 2020, three permanent water rights totaling 52,976 ac-ft/yr have been issued. The summary statistics referenced herein are based on the information reflected in this July 2024 version of the database.

It is important to note that a small percentage of the water rights represent a large percentage of the total authorized diversion volume in the Brazos River Basin. The Brazos River Authority (BRA) System Operation Permit alone makes up 11 percent of the total authorized diversion volume. Forty-six other major water rights make up 3,148,642 ac-ft/yr (82 percent) of the authorized diversion volume. The BRA, Gulf Coast Water Authority, and Dow Chemical Company are the three largest water right holders and own approximately 71 percent of the total authorized diversion amount in the basin. The remaining

1,090 water rights primarily consist of small irrigation rights distributed throughout the river basin. Figure 3.1 shows a comparison of significant water rights in the Brazos River Basin by number of rights and diversion volume.



Figure 3.1 Distribution of Water Rights in the Brazos River Basin

The Brazos G Area includes the majority of the water rights in the Brazos River Basin. A total of 987 water rights exist in the Brazos G portion of the Brazos River Basin, with a total authorized diversion of 1,457,202 ac-ft/yr. In the Brazos G portion of the Brazos River Basin, 31 water rights (3.1 percent) make up 1,225,975 ac-ft/yr (84.1 percent) of the authorized diversion volume. The remaining 956 water rights primarily consist of small irrigation rights distributed throughout the area.

Region H, located downstream of the Brazos G Area, has a total of only 43 water rights (3.8 percent) in the Brazos River Basin, but these include some very large rights comprising 1,838,937 ac-ft/yr (47.7 percent) of the total authorized diversions in the basin. Other planning areas make up a small percentage of the remaining water rights and total authorized diversions in the basin, and six water rights contain diversion points in multiple planning areas. Water rights by planning area are summarized in Figure 3.2 and Figure 3.3.



Figure 3.2 Comparison of Number of Water Rights in the Brazos River Basin by Planning Area



Figure 3.3 Comparison of Authorized Diversion Volume (acre-feet/year) in the Brazos River Basin by Planning Area

The authorized diversions in Region H generally consist of very large, senior priority, run-of-the-river water rights. In comparison, water rights in the Brazos G Area are larger in number and diversion volume; however, the water rights are generally junior in priority to those downstream in Region H. Therefore, in times of drought, when streamflows are low, diversions of water from streams in the Brazos G Area may be restricted for several of the water right holders. A comparison of the quantity of authorized diversions relative to the priority date of the water rights in Brazos G and Region H is presented in Figure 3.4. Major water rights are defined as having an authorized diversion greater than 10,000 ac-ft/yr and/or 5,000 ac-ft/yr of authorized storage. Figure 3.6 shows the location of major water rights in the Brazos River Basin. A list of all water rights, summarized from the TCEQ water right database for all rights in the Brazos G Area, is provided in Appendix F.



Figure 3.4 Comparison of Cumulative Diversion Volume and Priority Date for the Brazos G Area and Region H

While Region H includes a large quantity of senior priority water rights, most of these water rights have very little storage associated with them and, therefore, may be described primarily as run-of-the-river water rights. The water rights in Brazos G are generally junior to those water rights in Region H; however, there is a substantial volume of reservoir storage associated with the water rights in Brazos G to provide a firm supply. The total authorized storage in the Brazos River Basin is approximately 4,287,065 ac-ft, with 3,719,378 ac-ft (87 percent) located in Brazos G. In Region H, the quantity of reservoir storage is 285,887 ac-ft (6.7 percent) of the total authorized storage volume in the river basin. Since the development of the 2021 Brazos G Plan, 20,816 ac-ft of new storage has been permitted in Brazos G and Region H, the majority of which is a permit for the City of Lubbock to store 20,708 ac-ft.

The large quantity of reservoir storage in Brazos G provides for a firm supply of water during drought conditions, when streamflows are low. Figure 3.5 presents a comparison of the total authorized storage and annual diversion volume for the Brazos G Area and Region H.



**Assumes BRA System Operations Permit authorized diversion volume is split between Region G and Region H*

Figure 3.5 Comparison of Storage and Diversion Volumes for Brazos G and Region H

A total of 48 major reservoirs, defined as authorized storage capacities greater than 5,000 ac-ft, exist in the Brazos River Basin. The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) owns several of these reservoirs, including Lake Georgetown, Lake Aquilla, Lake Granger, Lake Proctor, Lake Somerville, Lake Waco, Lake Belton, Lake Stillhouse Hollow, and Lake Whitney. These reservoirs were built for the primary purpose of flood control; however, they also included other benefits such as water supply and recreation. For purposes of water supply, the USACE has contracted conservation storage in each reservoir to the BRA. The BRA owns the water right for each reservoir and manages the water supply conservation storage in each reservoir, except for Lake Waco, which is controlled by the City of Waco. Other major reservoirs in the basin that provide municipal, industrial, and irrigation water supply are owned by the BRA, City of Abilene, City of Mineral Wells, Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District (MWD) No. 1, West Central Texas MWD, City of Cisco, City of Breckenridge, City of Sweetwater, City of Cleburne, and City of Stamford. A summary of major reservoirs in the Brazos River Basin is presented in Table 3.1a and the locations of the reservoirs are shown in Figure 3.6 and Table 3.1b.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-



Figure 3.6 Major Water Rights and Reservoirs in the Brazos River Basin

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 3.1a Major Reservoirs[1] of the Brazos River Basin

Reservoir	Water Right Owner	Authorized Storage (ac-ft)	Authorized Diversion (ac-ft)	Priority Date	County	Planning Region
Abilene	City of Abilene	11,868	1,675	1/23/1918	Taylor	G
Alcoa Lake	Aluminum Company of America	15,650	14,000	12/12/1951	Milam	G
Alan Henry	City of Lubbock	115,937	35,200	10/5/1981	Garza	O
Allens Creek	BRA/City of Houston	145,553	202,000	9/1/1999	Austin	H
Aquilla	BRA	52,400	13,896	10/25/1976	Hill	G
Belton	BRA	457,600	100,257	12/16/1963	Bell	G
Belton	US Dept. of the Army[2]	12,000	10,000 2,000	8/24/1953 8/23/1954	Bell	G
Dow - Brazoria Reservoir	Dow Chemical[3]	21,973	--	4/7/1952	Brazoria	H
Dow - Harris Reservoir	Dow Chemical[3]	10,200	--	2/14/1942	Brazoria	H
Cisco	City of Cisco	45,110	1,971 1,000	4/16/1920 11/8/1954	Eastland	G
Daniel	City of Breckenridge	11,400	2,100	4/26/1946	Stephens	G
Dansby Power Plant	City of Bryan	15,227	850	5/30/1972	Brazos	G
Eagle Nest Lake	US Dept. of the Interior	11,315	1,800	1/15/1948	Brazoria	H
Fort Phantom Hill	City of Abilene	73,960	30,690	3/25/1937	Jones	G
Georgetown	BRA	37,100	13,610	2/12/1968	Williamson	G
Gibbons Creek Power	Texas Municipal Power Agency	26,824 5,260	9,740	2/22/1977 3/9/1989	Grimes	G
Graham/Eddleman	City of Graham	4,503 39,000 8,883	5,000 15,000	11/21/1927 11/15/1954 9/16/1957	Young	G
Granbury	BRA	155,000	64,712	2/13/1964	Hood	G
Granger	BRA	65,500	19,840	2/12/1968	Williamson	G
Hubbard Creek Lake	West Central Texas MWD	317,750	52,800 3,200	5/28/1957 8/14/1972	Stephens	G
Leon	Eastland Co WSD	28,000	1,265 2,438 2,597	5/17/1931 3/21/1952 3/25/1986		
Limestone	BRA	217,494 225,400	65,074	5/6/1974 9/4/1979	Robertson	G
Miller's Creek	North Central Texas MWA	30,696	5,000	10/1/1958	Baylor	B

Reservoir	Water Right Owner	Authorized Storage (ac-ft)	Authorized Diversion (ac-ft)	Priority Date	County	Planning Region
Palo Pinto	Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1	44,100 24	16,000 2,500	7/3/1962 9/8/1964	Palo Pinto	G
Pat Cleburne Reservoir	City of Cleburne	25,600	5,760 240	8/6/1962 3/29/1976	Johnson	G
Possum Kingdom	BRA	724,739	230,750	4/6/1938	Palo Pinto	G
Proctor	BRA	59,400	19,658	12/16/1963	Comanche	G
Smithers Lake	Houston L&P	18,750	28,711	12/16/1955	Fort Bend	H
Somerville	BRA	160,110	48,000	12/16/1963	Washington	G
Squaw Creek Reservoir	Luminant	151,500	23,180	4/25/1973	Somervell	G
Stamford	City of Stamford	60,000	10,000	6/8/1949	Haskell	G
Stillhouse Hollow	BRA	235,700	67,768	12/16/1963	Bell	G
Sweetwater	City of Sweetwater	10,000	3,740	10/17/1927	Nolan	G
Tradinghouse Steam	Luminant	37,800	12,000 15,000	8/21/1926 9/16/1966	McLennan	G
Twin Oak Steam Electric	Luminant	30,319	13,200	7/1/1974	Robertson	G
Waco	City of Waco	104,100 87,962	39,100 19,100 900 20,770	1/10/1929 4/16/1985 2/21/1979 9/12/1986	McLennan	G
Whitney	BRA	50,000	18,336	8/30/1982	Hill	G
White River Reservoir	White River MWD	33,160 5,072 6,665	6,000	9/22/1958 11/21/1960 8/16/1971	Crosby	O

Notes:
WSD – water supply district.
(1) A major reservoir is defined as one with an authorized capacity equal to or greater than 5,000 ac-ft.
(2) The Dept. of the Army (Fort Hood) owns water rights in Lake Belton alongside the BRA.
(3) The Dow Chemical Company holds diversion rights from the Brazos River totaling 238,156 ac-ft/yr with priority dates ranging from 1929 to 1976, which are used in conjunction with the two off-channel reservoirs.

Table 3.1b Major Water Rights and Reservoirs in the Brazos River Basin

WRID	Owner	Priority Date	Diversion Amount (ac-ft)	Storage Amount (ac-ft)
ADJ2315	City of Waco	1/10/1929	55,902	104,100
ADJ2315	City of Waco	4/16/1958	19,100	
ADJ2315	City of Waco	2/21/1979	900	
ADJ2936	US Department of the Army	8/24/1953	10,300	12,033
ADJ2936	US Department of the Army	8/23/1954	2,000	

WRID	Owner	Priority Date	Diversion Amount (ac-ft)	Storage Amount (ac-ft)
ADJ2938	City of Temple	10/30/1915	15,804	500
ADJ2938	City of Temple	1/11/1957	20,000	
ADJ3440	Joe O. Bishop	5/17/1965		1,750
ADJ3440	Joe O. Bishop	5/15/1972		334
ADJ3440	Lago Grande LP	6/13/1958	2,000	4,477
ADJ3440	Lago Grande LP	5/15/1972	31	918
ADJ3444	North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority	10/1/1958	5,000	30,696
ADJ3458	City of Graham	11/21/1927	5,000	4,503
ADJ3458	City of Graham	11/15/1954	15,000	39,000
ADJ3458	City of Graham	9/16/1957		8,883
ADJ3458	City of Graham	2/8/1982		40
ADJ3470	Eastland County Water Supply District	3/21/1952	2,438	28,000
ADJ3470	Eastland County Water Supply District	12/20/1985	1,265	
ADJ3470	Eastland County Water Supply District	3/25/1986	2,598	
ADJ3693	White River MWD	9/22/1958	6,000	33,160
ADJ3693	White River MWD	11/21/1960		5,072
ADJ3693	White River MWD	8/16/1971		6,665
ADJ3711	White River MWD	1/20/1970	10,600	57,420
ADJ3758	SLR Property I, LP	12/12/1951	18,000	
ADJ4031	Palo Pinto County MWD 1	7/3/1962	16,000	44,100
ADJ4031	Palo Pinto County MWD 1	9/8/1964	2,500	24
ADJ4031	Palo Pinto County MWD 1	11/25/2009		5,692
ADJ4039	City of Mineral Wells	11/15/1920	1,680	7,065
ADJ4039	City of Mineral Wells	3/22/1943	840	
ADJ4097	Texas Utilities Electric Company, Inc.	4/25/1973	23,180	151,500
ADJ4106	City of Cleburne	8/6/1962	5,760	25,600
ADJ4106	City of Cleburne	3/29/1976	240	
ADJ4106	City of Cleburne	8/30/2004		
ADJ4106	City of Cleburne	2/9/2017	6,739	
ADJ4130	City of Sweetwater	10/17/1927	3,740	10,000
ADJ4139	City of Abilene	8/3/1949	30,000	60
ADJ4139	City of Abilene	8/22/1955		548
ADJ4139	City of Abilene	12/8/1967		
ADJ4142	City of Abilene	1/23/1918	1,675	11,868
ADJ4150	City of Abilene	10/10/1927	3,880	8,500
ADJ4151	City of Clyde	10/12/1928	2,500	6,500

WRID	Owner	Priority Date	Diversion Amount (ac-ft)	Storage Amount (ac-ft)
ADJ4161	City of Abilene	3/25/1937	55,330	73,960
ADJ4179	City of Stamford	6/8/1949	10,000	60,000
ADJ4179	City of Stamford	4/4/2000		705
ADJ4211	City of Cisco	4/16/1920	1,971	9,363
ADJ4211	City of Cisco	5/2/1929		35,637
ADJ4211	City of Cisco	9/5/1978	56	
ADJ4213	West Central Texas MWD	5/28/1957	56,000	317,750
ADJ4214	City Of Breckenridge	4/26/1946	2,100	11,400
ADJ4342	Tradinghouse Power Company LLC	8/21/1926	12,000	37,800
ADJ4342	Tradinghouse Power Company LLC	9/16/1966	15,000	
ADJ4345	BASF Corporation	3/6/1951	10,000	8,500
ADJ4355	City of Marlin	4/9/1948	4,000	3,135
ADJ4355	City of Marlin	11/27/1956	4,000	
ADJ4355	City of Marlin	11/1/1976		791
ADJ4355	City of Marlin	12/31/1990		6,560
ADJ5155	BRA	4/6/1938	230,750	724,739
ADJ5156	BRA	2/13/1964	64,712	155,000
ADJ5157	BRA	8/30/1982	18,336	50,000
ADJ5158	BRA	10/25/1976	13,896	52,400
ADJ5159	BRA	12/16/1963	19,658	59,400
ADJ5160	BRA	12/16/1963	100,257	457,600
ADJ5161	BRA	12/16/1963	67,768	235,700
ADJ5162	BRA	2/12/1968	13,610	37,100
ADJ5163	BRA	2/12/1968	19,840	65,500
ADJ5164	BRA	12/16/1963	48,000	160,110
ADJ5165	BRA	5/6/1974	65,074	217,494
ADJ5165	BRA	9/4/1979		225,400
ADJ5166	BRA		650,000	
ADJ5168	Gulf Coast Water Authority	1/15/1926	99,932	
ADJ5168	Gulf Coast Water Authority	3/17/1947		7,308
ADJ5168	Gulf Coast Water Authority	4/29/1999		65
ADJ5171	Gulf Coast Water Authority	2/1/1939	75,000	
ADJ5171	Gulf Coast Water Authority	12/12/1950	50,000	
ADJ5268	City of Bryan	5/30/1972	161,300	15,227
ADJ5272	SLR Property I, LP	12/12/1951	14,000	15,650
ADJ5272	SLR Property I, LP			
ADJ5287	Bi-Stone Municipal Water Supply District	4/15/1957	2,952	9,600

WRID	Owner	Priority Date	Diversion Amount (ac-ft)	Storage Amount (ac-ft)
ADJ5298	Texas Utilities Electric Company, Inc.	7/1/1974	1,378,000	30,319
ADJ5301	Camp Creek Water Company	6/14/1948		8,400
ADJ5311	Gibbons Tract 1, LP	2/22/1977	9,740	32,084
ADJ5320	NRG Texas Power LLC	10/23/1926	40,000	
ADJ5322	Gulf Coast Water Authority	2/8/1929	40,000	864
ADJ5322	Gulf Coast Water Authority	3/14/1955	40,000	
ADJ5322	Gulf Coast Water Authority	7/25/1983	75,000	
ADJ5325	NRG Texas Power LLC	12/16/1955	28,711	18,750
ADJ5328	The Dow Chemical Company	2/28/1929	20,000	
ADJ5328	The Dow Chemical Company	2/14/1942	210,000	10,230
ADJ5328	The Dow Chemical Company	4/3/1951	7,500	600
ADJ5328	The Dow Chemical Company	4/7/1952		21,973
ADJ5328	The Dow Chemical Company	12/31/1954	20	
ADJ5328	The Dow Chemical Company	4/4/1960	65,000	
ADJ5328	The Dow Chemical Company	3/8/1976	3,136	
ADJ5328	The Dow Chemical Company			56,760
ADJ5332	United States Department of Energy	6/25/1979	135	
ADJ5332	United States Department of Energy	4/27/1981	4	
ADJ5332	United States Department of Energy	7/14/2000	52,000	
ADJ5366	Brazosport Water Authority	4/4/1960	45,000	
ADJ5492	US Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service	1/15/1948	1,800	11,315
WRPERM12190	SLR Property I, LP	9/4/2007		7,237
WRPERM2925	BRA	9/1/1999	301,650	145,533
WRPERM3985	City of Lubbock	3/7/1983	32,991	
WRPERM3985	City of Lubbock		13,825	
WRPERM4146	City of Lubbock	10/5/1981	35,000	115,937
WRPERM5085	City of Robinson	8/14/1986	13,100	8,037
WRPERM5094	City of Waco	9/12/1986	20,081	87,962
WRPERM5094	City of Waco	1/21/1988	688	
WRPERM5540	SLR Property I, LP	10/9/1995		7,529
WRPERM5803	SLR Property I, LP	7/24/2003	650	17,359
WRPERM5803	SLR Property I, LP		50,000	50,000
WRPERM5851	BRA	10/15/2004	434,703	
WRPERM5912	City of Bryan		14,282	
WRPERM5913	City of College Station		12,881	
WRPERM5921	City of Lubbock	4/17/2006	50,000	20,708

A number of interbasin transfer permits exist in the Brazos River Basin. These permits include both authorizations for diversions from the Brazos River Basin to adjacent river basins and from adjacent river basins to the Brazos River Basin. Most of the interbasin transfer permits are obviously located near the basin divide. Examples of interbasin transfers that authorize diversions from an adjacent river basin to the Brazos River Basin include Lake Meredith (Canadian River Basin) to the Lubbock and Plainview areas in Lubbock and Hale County; Oak Creek Reservoir (Colorado River Basin) to the City of Sweetwater in Nolan County; and Lake Travis (Colorado River Basin) to the City of Cedar Park in Williamson County. Interbasin transfers authorized for diversion from the Brazos River Basin to other river basins include Lake Mexia in Limestone County to part of the City of Mexia that lies in the Trinity River Basin; Teague City Lake in Freestone County to part of the City of Teague that lies in the Trinity River Basin; and Lake Granbury in Hood County to part of Johnson County that lies in the Trinity River Basin. A summary of interbasin transfers (excluding transfers authorized to adjacent coastal basins) associated with the Brazos River Basin is presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Interbasin Transfers Associated with the Brazos River Basin[1]

River Basin of Origin	Location of Use			Description	Authority Diversion (ac-ft/yr)	Priority Date
	River Basin	Planning Region	County			
Brazos	Trinity	G	Johnson	Lake Granbury to Johnson County	20,000	11/7/1986
Brazos	Trinity	G	Limestone	Lake Mexia to part of Mexia	N/A	N/A
Brazos	Trinity	C	Freestone	Teague City Lake to part of Teague	N/A	N/A
Brazos	Colorado	G	Lampasas	Brazos River to City of Lampasas	180	6/23/2014
Brazos	Trinity	C	Multiple	Lake Possum Kingdom to Trinity Basin	5,240	11/7/1986
Canadian	Brazos	O	Lubbock	Lake Meredith to Lubbock Co. Area	151,200	1/30/1956
Colorado	Brazos	G	Fisher	Lake J B Thomas to Fisher Co.	N/A	N/A
Colorado	Brazos	G	Nolan	Oak Creek Res. to Lake Trammel/Sweetwater	3,000	N/A
Colorado	Brazos	G	Callahan	Lake Clyde to Clyde	200	2/2/1965
Colorado	Brazos	G	Callahan, Fisher, Jones, Nolan, Schackelford, Taylor	Lake O. H. Ivie to Abilene	15,000	2/2/1978
Colorado	Brazos	G	Williamson	Lake Austin to Williamson Co.	N/A	N/A
Colorado	Brazos	G	Williamson	Lake Travis to Cedar Park	16,500	N/A
Colorado	Brazos	G	Williamson	Lake Travis to Leander	6,400	N/A
Colorado	Brazos	F	Fisher	Snyder to City of Rotan	N/A	N/A
Red	Brazos	B	Archer	Small Lakes to Megargel	N/A	N/A

River Basin of Origin	Location of Use			Description	Authority Diversion (ac-ft/yr)	Priority Date
	River Basin	Planning Region	County			
Red	Brazos	B	Archer	Lake Cooper & Olney to Olney	35	8/11/1980
Red	Brazos	O	Floyd	Lake MacKenzie to Floydada & Lockney	N/A	N/A
Trinity	Brazos	G	Grimes	Lake Livingston to Grimes County SE	N/A	6/27/1998
Trinity	Brazos	C	Parker	Lake Weatherford to part of Weatherford	N/A	N/A

Notes:
(1) Excludes transfers authorized to adjacent coastal basins.

3.1.4 Water Supply Contracts

Many entities within Brazos G obtain surface water through water supply contracts. These supplies are usually obtained from entities that own surface water rights, and the contracts specify the quantity of water each year to a buyer for an established unit price. The BRA is the largest provider of water supply contracts in Brazos G, and has contracted to sell 750,220 ac-ft/yr in Regions G and H from its system of reservoirs in the Brazos River Basin. The BRA contracts raw water to various entities for long-term, firm supply as well as shorter-term interruptible supply for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and mining uses. Other water right holders that contract large quantities of raw water supply to other entities include the West Central Texas MWD and the Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1. The West Central Texas MWD contracts raw water from Hubbard Creek Reservoir for municipal use to the cities of Abilene, Albany, Anson, and Breckenridge. The City of Abilene provides water to several other surrounding cities and water supply corporations. The Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1 contracts raw water from Lake Palo Pinto for industrial use to Brazos Electric Co-op as well as for municipal use for the City of Mineral Wells and several smaller water supply corporations.

Table 3.3 summarizes water supply contracts and other current demands held by the identified wholesale water providers (WWPs) and water user groups (WUGs) within Brazos G, and includes other demands that those entities meet currently, such as a portion of county-aggregated manufacturing demands, etc. Note that some of the supplies show change between decades. These changes reflect either anticipated changes in contracted amounts (through cancellation or amendment) or "meets" contracts where a WWP agrees to meet the water supply needs of the customer without a fixed annual contractual amount. The contracts shown make up the bulk of the water contracts in the planning area; however, there are numerous smaller entities which often contract with each other for emergency supplies or various other reasons which are not summarized here. Certain WUGs and WWPs may be located within multiple planning areas. All WUGs and WWPs listed are identified by their primary planning area. The contract and WUG municipal demands shown are not split by primary and secondary planning areas. Contract demands assigned to municipal WUGs supply to portion of both primary and other regions.

Table 3.3 Water Supply Contracts and Other Current Demands Supplied by WUGs and WWPs (acre-feet/year)

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BRA AQUILLA LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM						
Aquilla WSD	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953
Cleburne	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300
Hilco United Services	150	150	150	150	150	150
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**11,403**	**11,403**	**11,403**	**11,403**	**11,403**	**11,403**
BRA LITTLE RIVER LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM						
439 WSC	1,409	1,409	1,409	1,409	1,409	1,409
Bell County WCID 1	62,509	62,509	62,509	62,509	62,509	62,509
Belton	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
Bluebonnet WSC	8,301	8,301	8,301	8,301	8,301	8,301
Brushy Creek MUD	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Central Texas WSC	11,295	11,295	11,295	11,295	11,295	11,295
Coryell City Water Supply District	300	300	300	300	300	300
County-Other, Milam	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
County-Other, Williamson	310	310	310	310	310	310
Fort Gates WSC	200	200	200	200	200	200
Gatesville	5,898	5,898	5,898	5,898	5,898	5,898
Georgetown	45,707	45,707	45,707	45,707	45,707	45,707
Harker Heights	3,535	3,535	3,535	3,535	3,535	3,535
Irrigation, Bell	308	308	308	308	308	308
Irrigation, Comanche	6,652	6,652	6,652	6,652	6,652	6,652
Irrigation, Williamson	15	15	15	15	15	15
Jarrell-Schwertner	5,386	5,350	5,318	5,286	5,248	5,217
Jonah Water SUD	6,238	8,863	11,977	15,377	19,205	23,510
Kempner WSC	9,150	9,150	9,150	9,150	9,150	9,150
Lampasas	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500
McGregor	810	810	810	810	810	810
Round Rock	24,854	24,854	24,854	24,854	24,854	24,854
Salado WSC	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600
Sonterra MUD	2,744	2,744	2,744	2,744	2,744	2,744
Taylor	3,452	3,697	3,990	4,350	4,729	4,729
Temple	30,453	30,453	30,453	30,453	30,453	30,453
The Grove WSC	400	400	400	400	400	400
Upper Leon MWD	6,437	6,437	6,437	6,437	6,437	6,437
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**254,963**	**257,797**	**261,172**	**264,900**	**269,069**	**273,343**
BRA MAIN STEM LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM						
Abilene	11,681	11,681	11,681	11,681	11,681	11,681
Acton MUD	7,400	7,400	7,400	7,400	7,400	7,400
Brenham	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Cleburne	9,700	9,700	9,700	9,700	9,700	9,700
County-Other, Hood	840	840	840	840	840	840
Double Diamond Utilities	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Fort Griffin SUD	353	353	353	353	353	353
Graham	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Granbury	10,800	10,800	10,800	10,800	10,800	10,800
Irrigation, Brazos	350	350	350	350	350	350
Irrigation, Hill	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Irrigation, Hood	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300
Irrigation, Palo Pinto	625	625	625	625	625	625
Irrigation, Somervell	350	350	350	350	350	350
Johnson County SUD	9,528	9,528	9,528	9,528	9,528	9,528
Livestock, Palo Pinto	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Lorena	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
Marlin	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Mining, Stephens	560	560	560	560	560	560
Possum Kingdom WSC	750	750	750	750	750	750
Robinson	2,323	2,323	2,323	2,323	2,323	2,323
Rosebud	100	100	100	100	100	100
SLC WSC	200	200	200	200	200	200
Sportsmans World MUD	125	125	125	125	125	125
Stamford	1,820	1,820	1,820	1,820	1,820	1,820
Steam-Electric Power, Bosque	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
Steam-Electric Power, Hood	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Steam-Electric Power, Limestone	21,837	21,837	21,837	21,837	21,837	21,837
Steam-Electric Power, Robertson	32,438	32,438	32,438	32,438	32,438	32,438
Steam-Electric Power, Somervell	53,000	53,000	53,000	53,000	53,000	53,000
Stephens Regional SUD	800	800	800	800	800	800
Wellborn SUD	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
West Central Texas MWD	235	235	235	235	235	235
Whitney	750	750	750	750	750	750
Dow Inc (Region H)	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
Gulf Coast Water Authority (Region H)	49,880	49,880	49,880	49,880	49,880	49,880
Irrigation, Waller (Region H)	50	50	50	50	50	50
Mining, Parker (Region C)	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Parker County SUD (Region C)	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300
Richmond (Region H)	2,932	2,932	2,932	2,932	2,932	2,932
Sugar Land (Region H)	6,388	6,388	6,388	6,388	6,388	6,388
Irrigation, Parker (Region C)	430	430	430	430	430	430
Lubbock (Region O)	961	961	961	961	961	961

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
NRG (Region H)	83,000	83,000	83,000	83,000	83,000	83,000
Pecan Grove MUD 1 (Region H)	700	700	700	700	700	700
Rosenberg (Region H)	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**370,606**	**370,606**	**370,606**	**370,606**	**370,606**	**370,606**
BRA (PURCHASED FROM LOWER COLORADO RIVER AUTHORITY)						
Georgetown	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Liberty Hill	2,572	2,572	2,572	2,572	2,572	2,572
Round Rock	20,928	20,928	20,928	20,928	20,928	20,928
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**24,700**	**24,700**	**24,700**	**24,700**	**24,700**	**24,700**
BRA SYSTEM OPERATIONS PERMIT SUPPLY						
Abilene	7,737	7,737	7,737	7,737	7,737	7,737
Brenham	774	774	774	774	774	774
County-Other, Palo Pinto	15	15	15	15	15	15
Double Diamond Utilities	619	619	619	619	619	619
Irrigation, Brazos	348	348	348	348	348	348
Irrigation, Falls	309	309	309	309	309	309
Irrigation, Hood	774	774	774	774	774	774
Irrigation, Palo Pinto	100	100	100	100	100	100
Mining, Somervell	54	54	54	54	54	54
Possum Kingdom WSC	1,934	1,934	1,934	1,934	1,934	1,934
Sportsmans World MUD	290	290	290	290	290	290
West Central Texas MWD	695	695	695	695	695	695
Dow Inc (Region H)	15,473	15,473	15,473	15,473	15,473	15,473
Gulf Coast Water Authority (Region H)	36,362	36,362	36,362	36,362	36,362	36,362
Irrigation, Waller (Region H)	90	90	90	90	90	90
Manufacturing, Brazoria (Region H)	3,868	3,868	3,868	3,868	3,868	3,868
Manufacturing, Galveston (Region H)	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700
Manvel (Region H)	3,731	3,731	3,731	3,731	3,731	3,731
Mining, Parker (Region C)	387	387	387	387	387	387
Parker County SUD (Region C)	774	774	774	774	774	774
Richmond (Region H)	2,773	2,773	2,773	2,773	2,773	2,773
Sugar Land (Region H)	10,279	10,279	10,279	10,279	10,279	10,279
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**93,086**	**93,086**	**93,086**	**93,086**	**93,086**	**93,086**
AQUILLA WATER SUPPLY DISTRICT						
Brandon Irene WSC	287	287	287	287	287	287
Chatt WSC	86	86	86	86	86	86
Files Valley WSC	1,149	1,149	1,149	1,149	1,149	1,149
Hill County WSC	230	230	230	230	230	230
Hillsboro	3,640	3,640	3,640	3,640	3,640	3,640
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**5,392**	**5,392**	**5,392**	**5,392**	**5,392**	**5,392**

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BELL COUNTY WCID 1						
439 WSC	750	750	750	750	750	750
Bell County WCID 3	1,490	1,490	1,490	1,490	1,490	1,490
Belton	5,966	5,966	5,966	5,966	5,966	5,966
Copperas Cove	8,824	8,824	8,824	8,824	8,824	8,824
Harker Heights	5,265	5,265	5,265	5,265	5,265	5,265
Killeen	39,964	39,964	39,964	39,964	39,964	39,964
Bell County WCID 1 (Municipal WUG Demand)	98	98	98	98	98	98
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**62,357**	**62,357**	**62,357**	**62,357**	**62,357**	**62,357**
BLUEBONNET WSC						
Bruceville Eddy	938	938	938	938	938	938
Elm Creek WSC	654	654	654	654	654	654
McGregor	2,139	2,139	2,139	2,139	2,139	2,139
Moffat WSC	869	869	869	869	869	869
Moody	401	401	401	401	401	401
Pendleton WSC	461	461	461	461	461	461
Spring Valley WSC	301	301	301	301	301	301
Woodway	1,362	1,362	1,362	1,362	1,362	1,362
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**7,125**	**7,125**	**7,125**	**7,125**	**7,125**	**7,125**
CENTRAL TEXAS WSC						
Armstrong WSC	1,564	1,564	1,564	1,564	1,564	1,564
Bell Milam Falls WSC	2,327	2,327	2,327	2,327	2,327	2,327
Belton	125	125	125	125	125	125
County-Other, Bell	224	224	224	224	224	224
County-Other, Falls	326	326	326	326	326	326
County-Other, Milam	244	244	244	244	244	244
Dog Ridge WSC	840	840	840	840	840	840
East Bell WSC	847	847	847	847	847	847
Holland	331	331	331	331	331	331
Jarrell-Schwertner	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Kempner WSC	5,420	5,420	5,420	5,420	5,420	5,420
Little Elm Valley WSC	547	547	547	547	547	547
Rogers	486	486	486	486	486	486
Rosebud	525	525	525	525	525	525
Salado WSC	700	700	700	700	700	700
Salem Elm Ridge WSC	347	347	347	347	347	347
West Bell County WSC	1,660	1,660	1,660	1,660	1,660	1,660
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**18,013**	**18,013**	**18,013**	**18,013**	**18,013**	**18,013**
EASTLAND COUNTY WSD						
Eastland	3,314	3,314	3,314	3,314	3,314	3,314

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Manufacturing, Eastland	56	56	56	56	56	56
Ranger	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**5,395**	**5,395**	**5,395**	**5,395**	**5,395**	**5,395**
NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS MUNICIPAL WATER AUTHORITY						
Aspermont	118	118	118	118	118	118
Benjamin	64	64	64	64	64	64
County-Other, Haskell	236	236	236	236	236	236
Haskell	712	712	712	712	712	712
Knox City	187	187	187	187	187	187
Munday	291	291	291	291	291	291
Baylor SUD (Region B)	74	74	74	74	74	74
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,682**	**1,682**	**1,682**	**1,682**	**1,682**	**1,682**
PALO PINTO COUNTY MWD 1						
Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC	250	250	250	250	250	250
Mineral Wells	5,656	5,656	5,656	5,656	5,656	5,656
Steam-Electric Power, Palo Pinto	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**9,906**	**9,906**	**9,906**	**9,906**	**9,906**	**9,906**
UPPER LEON MWD						
Comanche	706	706	706	706	706	706
County-Other, Comanche	9	9	9	9	9	9
De Leon	307	307	307	307	307	307
Dublin	598	598	598	598	598	598
Gorman	169	169	169	169	169	169
Hamilton	921	921	921	921	921	921
Stephenville	1,862	1,862	1,862	1,862	1,862	1,862
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**4,572**	**4,572**	**4,572**	**4,572**	**4,572**	**4,572**
WEST CENTRAL TEXAS MWD						
Abilene	10,720	8,360	6,000	3,640	1,300	1,300
Albany	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400
Anson	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600
Breckenridge	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**15,620**	**13,260**	**10,900**	**8,540**	**6,200**	**6,200**
ABILENE						
Baird	77	77	77	77	77	77
Clyde	307	307	307	307	307	307
County-Other, Taylor	322	322	322	322	322	322
Eula WSC	61	61	61	61	61	61
Hamby WSC	308	308	308	308	308	308
Hawley WSC	384	384	384	384	384	384
Irrigation, Jones	340	340	340	340	340	340

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation, Shackelford	166	166	166	166	166	166
Irrigation, Taylor	510	510	510	510	510	510
Lawn	153	153	153	153	153	153
Manufacturing, Taylor	671	671	671	671	671	671
Merkel	353	353	353	353	353	353
Potosi WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
S U N WSC	230	230	230	230	230	230
Steamboat Mountain WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
Tye	184	184	184	184	184	184
View Caps WSC	199	199	199	199	199	199
Abilene (Municipal WUG Demand)	26,848	28,860	30,633	32,411	34,391	36,611
Ballinger (Region F)	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**32,977**	**34,989**	**36,762**	**38,540**	**40,520**	**42,740**
ACTON MUD						
County-Other, Hood	782	801	844	888	1,496	2,077
Acton MUD (Municipal WUG Demand)	2,334	2,524	2,739	2,973	3,227	3,503
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,116**	**3,325**	**3,583**	**3,861**	**4,723**	**5,580**
ALBANY						
Fort Griffin SUD	219	219	216	215	215	215
Albany (Municipal WUG Demand)	541	487	432	394	351	301
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**760**	**706**	**648**	**609**	**566**	**516**
ANSON						
Hamlin	534	526	523	513	505	497
Hawley WSC	221	221	221	221	221	221
Anson (Municipal WUG Demand)	345	329	314	297	279	259
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,100**	**1,076**	**1,058**	**1,031**	**1,005**	**977**
BISTONE MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY DISTRICT						
Coolidge	225	225	225	225	225	225
County-Other, Limestone	280	280	280	280	280	280
Mexia	2,067	2,047	1,941	1,830	1,721	1,615
White Rock Water SUD	274	274	274	274	274	274
Bistone Municipal Water Supply District (Municipal WUG Demand)	243	235	226	217	207	197
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,089**	**3,061**	**2,946**	**2,826**	**2,707**	**2,591**
BRANDON IRENE WSC						
County-Other, Hill	31	32	33	34	35	35
Brandon Irene WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	553	571	584	598	613	631
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**584**	**603**	**617**	**632**	**648**	**666**
BRECKENRIDGE						
Manufacturing, Stephens	8	8	8	8	8	8
Breckenridge (Municipal WUG Demand)	960	905	831	780	732	662

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**968**	**913**	**839**	**788**	**740**	**670**
BRENHAM						
Manufacturing, Washington	208	208	208	208	208	208
Brenham (Municipal WUG Demand)	4,284	4,332	4,315	4,319	4,324	4,328
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**4,492**	**4,540**	**4,523**	**4,527**	**4,532**	**4,536**
BRUSHY CREEK MUD						
County-Other, Williamson	518	518	518	518	518	518
Brushy Creek MUD (Municipal WUG Demand)	3,986	3,972	3,972	3,972	3,972	3,972
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**4,504**	**4,490**	**4,490**	**4,490**	**4,490**	**4,490**
BRYAN						
Manufacturing, Brazos	95	95	95	95	95	95
Steam-Electric Power, Brazos	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wellborn SUD	2,240	2,240	2,240	2,240	2,240	2,240
Wickson Creek SUD	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Bryan (Municipal WUG Demand)	19,037	22,504	26,658	31,597	39,794	50,101
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**22,873**	**26,340**	**30,494**	**35,433**	**43,630**	**53,937**
BURLESON						
Manufacturing, Johnson	2	2	2	2	2	2
Burleson (Municipal WUG Demand)	8,163	9,476	10,793	11,974	13,298	14,781
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**8,165**	**9,478**	**10,795**	**11,976**	**13,300**	**14,783**
CAMERON						
North Milam WSC	38	38	38	38	38	38
Salem Elm Ridge WSC	125	125	125	125	125	125
Cameron (Municipal WUG Demand)	1,265	1,242	1,200	1,161	1,121	1,079
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,428**	**1,405**	**1,363**	**1,324**	**1,284**	**1,242**
CEDAR PARK						
Block House MUD	1,098	1,098	1,098	1,098	1,098	1,098
County-Other, Williamson	13	13	13	13	13	13
Manufacturing, Williamson	347	347	347	347	347	347
Williamson Travis Counties MUD 1	989	989	989	989	989	989
Cedar Park (Municipal WUG Demand)	21,451	21,679	21,797	21,797	21,797	21,797
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**23,898**	**24,126**	**24,244**	**24,244**	**24,244**	**24,244**
CHATT WSC						
Manufacturing, Hill	50	55	60	65	70	70
Chatt WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	220	225	229	233	238	244
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**270**	**280**	**289**	**298**	**308**	**314**
CHILDRESS CREEK WSC						
Manufacturing, Bosque	1	1	1	1	1	1
Childress Creek WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	338	332	323	316	307	299
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**339**	**333**	**324**	**317**	**308**	**300**

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CISCO						
County-Other, Eastland	147	147	147	147	147	147
Cisco (Municipal WUG Demand)	730	742	762	769	778	791
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**877**	**889**	**909**	**916**	**925**	**938**
CLEBURNE						
Manufacturing, Johnson	2,714	3,105	3,455	3,801	4,182	4,182
Steam-Electric Power, Johnson	1,344	1,344	1,344	1,344	1,344	1,344
Cleburne (Municipal WUG Demand)	7,557	8,493	9,453	10,310	11,273	12,355
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**11,615**	**12,942**	**14,252**	**15,455**	**16,799**	**17,881**
CLIFTON						
Manufacturing, Bosque	1	1	1	1	1	1
Meridian	112	112	105	88	70	53
Clifton (Municipal WUG Demand)	772	827	890	957	1,029	1,107
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**885**	**940**	**996**	**1,046**	**1,100**	**1,161**
CLYDE						
Callahan County WSC	190	192	195	199	202	205
Eula WSC	221	221	221	221	221	221
Clyde (Municipal WUG Demand)	407	407	410	413	416	419
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**818**	**820**	**826**	**833**	**839**	**845**
COLLEGE STATION						
Manufacturing, Brazos	6	6	6	6	6	6
College Station (Municipal WUG Demand)	23,940	27,047	31,819	37,404	36,735	36,155
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**23,946**	**27,053**	**31,825**	**37,410**	**36,741**	**36,161**
COMANCHE						
Manufacturing, Comanche	20	20	20	20	20	21
Comanche (Municipal WUG Demand)	522	514	505	502	499	497
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**542**	**534**	**525**	**522**	**519**	**518**
COOLIDGE						
Manufacturing, Limestone	19	19	19	19	19	19
Coolidge (Municipal WUG Demand)	140	135	130	125	119	113
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**159**	**154**	**149**	**144**	**138**	**132**
COPPERAS COVE						
Central Texas College District	132	129	126	125	125	125
Copperas Cove (Municipal WUG Demand)	6,387	8,457	9,760	10,624	10,901	10,541
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**6,519**	**8,586**	**9,886**	**10,749**	**11,026**	**10,666**
COUNTY-OTHER, ERATH						
Manufacturing, Erath	1	1	1	1	2	2
County-Other, Erath (Municipal WUG Demand)	2,475	2,671	2,915	3,203	3,526	3,890
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**2,476**	**2,672**	**2,916**	**3,204**	**3,528**	**3,892**
COUNTY-OTHER, LIMESTONE						

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation, Limestone	14	14	14	14	14	14
Mining, Limestone	7	7	7	7	7	7
County-Other, Limestone (Municipal WUG Demand)	251	242	234	226	218	210
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**272**	**263**	**255**	**247**	**239**	**231**
COUNTY-OTHER, MCLENNAN						
Manufacturing, McLennan	3	3	3	3	3	3
Riesel	125	125	125	125	125	125
Steam-Electric Power, McLennan	1	1	1	1	1	1
County-Other, McLennan (Municipal WUG Demand)	734	953	1,003	1,026	1,073	1,175
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**863**	**1,082**	**1,132**	**1,155**	**1,202**	**1,304**
COUNTY-OTHER, NOLAN						
Manufacturing, Nolan	1	1	1	1	1	1
County-Other, Nolan (Municipal WUG Demand)	135	122	105	87	64	36
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**136**	**123**	**106**	**88**	**65**	**37**
COUNTY-OTHER, PALO PINTO						
Mining, Palo Pinto	1	1	1	1	1	1
Steam-Electric Power, Palo Pinto	1	1	1	1	1	1
County-Other, Palo Pinto (Municipal WUG Demand)	272	271	268	266	265	263
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**274**	**273**	**270**	**268**	**267**	**265**
COUNTY-OTHER, YOUNG						
Manufacturing, Young	62	67	70	77	85	85
County-Other, Young (Municipal WUG Demand)	470	471	475	481	485	489
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**532**	**538**	**545**	**558**	**570**	**574**
CRAWFORD						
Mining, McLennan	3	3	3	3	3	3
Crawford (Municipal WUG Demand)	202	229	253	280	310	343
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**205**	**232**	**256**	**283**	**313**	**346**
DUBLIN						
County-Other, Erath	72	72	72	72	72	72
Manufacturing, Erath	5	7	8	9	10	12
Dublin (Municipal WUG Demand)	323	288	259	225	196	171
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**400**	**367**	**339**	**306**	**278**	**255**
EASTLAND						
County-Other, Eastland	120	120	120	120	120	120
Staff WSC	30	30	30	30	30	30
Westbound WSC	280	280	280	280	280	280
Eastland (Municipal WUG Demand)	610	550	502	463	432	407
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,040**	**980**	**932**	**893**	**862**	**837**
FILES VALLEY WSC						
Parker WSC	336	336	336	336	336	336

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Files Valley WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	872	925	975	1,027	1,084	1,147
County-Other, Ellis (Region C)	84	84	84	84	84	84
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,292**	**1,345**	**1,395**	**1,447**	**1,504**	**1,567**
GATESVILLE						
Coryell City Water Supply District	1,044	1,171	1,287	1,413	1,542	1,542
Flat WSC	102	102	102	102	102	102
Fort Gates WSC	340	340	340	340	340	340
Manufacturing, Coryell	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mountain WSC	280	280	280	280	280	280
The Grove WSC	203	211	239	269	299	330
Gatesville (Municipal WUG Demand)	4,228	4,301	4,372	4,378	4,390	4,408
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**6,202**	**6,410**	**6,625**	**6,787**	**6,958**	**7,007**
GEORGETOWN						
Manufacturing, Williamson	163	163	163	163	163	163
Georgetown (Municipal WUG Demand)	47,761	82,915	113,595	139,829	170,451	197,815
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**47,924**	**83,078**	**113,758**	**139,992**	**170,614**	**197,978**
GIDDINGS						
Manufacturing, Lee	14	15	16	17	18	18
Giddings (Municipal WUG Demand)	1,129	1,141	1,124	1,103	1,080	1,053
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,143**	**1,156**	**1,140**	**1,120**	**1,098**	**1,071**
GORDON						
County-Other, Erath	50	50	50	50	50	50
Gordon (Municipal WUG Demand)	166	166	164	164	163	161
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**216**	**216**	**214**	**214**	**213**	**211**
GRAHAM						
County-Other, Young	134	131	130	130	131	132
Fort Belknap WSC	419	419	419	419	419	419
Manufacturing, Young	2	2	2	2	2	2
Steam-Electric Power, Young	248	248	248	248	248	248
Graham (Municipal WUG Demand)	2,470	2,442	2,338	2,322	2,302	2,278
County-Other, Jack (Region C)	545	560	566	568	574	580
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,818**	**3,802**	**3,703**	**3,689**	**3,676**	**3,659**
H & H WSC						
County-Other, McLennan	84	87	92	97	102	102
H & H WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	199	205	210	213	217	222
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**283**	**292**	**302**	**310**	**319**	**324**
HAMILTON						
Manufacturing, Bosque	5	5	5	5	5	5
Manufacturing, Hamilton	1	1	1	1	1	1
Multi County WSC	245	245	245	245	245	245

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Hamilton (Municipal WUG Demand)	527	523	523	516	507	498
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**778**	**774**	**774**	**767**	**758**	**749**
HAMLIN						
Manufacturing, Fisher	2	2	2	2	2	2
Hamlin (Municipal WUG Demand)	315	275	241	211	188	170
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**317**	**277**	**243**	**213**	**190**	**172**
HEARNE						
Manufacturing, Robertson	1	1	1	1	1	1
Hearne (Municipal WUG Demand)	867	841	813	779	744	706
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**868**	**842**	**814**	**780**	**745**	**707**
HILLSBORO						
Manufacturing, Johnson	7	9	10	11	12	12
Hillsboro (Municipal WUG Demand)	3,465	3,558	3,623	3,693	3,770	3,858
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,472**	**3,567**	**3,633**	**3,704**	**3,782**	**3,870**
JARRELL-SCHWERTNER						
County-Other, Williamson	560	560	560	560	560	560
Jarrell-Schwertner (Municipal WUG Demand)	9,184	9,908	10,353	10,809	11,288	11,790
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**9,744**	**10,468**	**10,913**	**11,369**	**11,848**	**12,350**
JOHNSON COUNTY SUD						
Alvarado	2,241	2,241	2,241	2,241	2,241	2,241
Bethany SUD	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
County-Other, Johnson	616	616	616	616	616	616
Keene	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
Mining, Johnson	20	20	20	20	20	20
Johnson County SUD (Municipal WUG Demand)	9,650	12,114	13,474	14,685	16,047	17,579
Mountain Peak SUD (Region C)	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**16,447**	**18,911**	**20,271**	**21,482**	**22,844**	**24,376**
KEMPNER WSC						
County-Other, Lampasas	209	225	240	254	267	267
Lampasas	1,281	1,281	1,281	1,281	1,281	1,281
Mining, Lampasas	25	25	25	25	25	25
Salado WSC	183	183	183	183	183	183
Kempner WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	3,379	3,487	3,515	3,486	3,455	3,417
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**5,077**	**5,201**	**5,244**	**5,229**	**5,211**	**5,173**
KILLEEN						
Manufacturing, Bell	7	7	7	7	7	7
Killeen (Municipal WUG Demand)	23,409	26,702	29,783	33,208	36,579	39,951
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**23,416**	**26,709**	**29,790**	**33,215**	**36,586**	**39,958**
LAMPASAS						
Manufacturing, Lampasas	137	151	165	178	195	213

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Lampasas (Municipal WUG Demand)	1,562	1,720	1,881	2,019	2,076	2,045
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,699**	**1,871**	**2,046**	**2,197**	**2,271**	**2,258**
LEANDER						
Georgetown	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Liberty Hill	600	600	600	600	600	600
Leander (Municipal WUG Demand)	23,455	29,716	31,236	31,252	31,252	31,252
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**25,255**	**31,516**	**33,036**	**33,052**	**33,052**	**33,052**
MCGREGOR						
Central Bosque WSC	135	140	147	156	164	164
Manufacturing, McLennan	4	4	4	4	4	4
McGregor (Municipal WUG Demand)	2,602	2,741	2,867	2,985	3,121	3,276
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**2,741**	**2,885**	**3,018**	**3,145**	**3,289**	**3,444**
MEXIA						
County-Other, Limestone	254	254	254	254	254	254
Manufacturing, Limestone	43	44	44	44	45	45
White Rock Water SUD	487	487	487	487	487	487
Mexia (Municipal WUG Demand)	1,026	997	960	926	890	852
Wortham (Region C)	157	157	157	157	157	157
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,967**	**1,939**	**1,902**	**1,868**	**1,833**	**1,795**
MINERAL WELLS						
County-Other, Palo Pinto	92	92	92	92	92	92
Manufacturing, Palo Pinto	10	10	10	10	10	10
North Rural WSC	515	515	515	515	515	515
Palo Pinto WSC	179	179	179	179	179	179
Santo SUD	331	331	331	331	331	331
Sturdivant Progress WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
Mineral Wells (Municipal WUG Demand)	3,674	3,865	4,066	4,270	4,270	4,270
Parker County SUD (Region C)	448	448	448	448	448	448
County-Other, Parker (Region C)	663	663	663	663	663	663
Manufacturing, Parker (Region C)	25	25	25	25	25	25
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**6,244**	**6,435**	**6,636**	**6,840**	**6,840**	**6,840**
NAVASOTA						
Manufacturing, Grimes	114	114	114	138	183	183
Navasota (Municipal WUG Demand)	1,581	1,641	1,695	1,737	1,784	1,835
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,695**	**1,755**	**1,809**	**1,875**	**1,967**	**2,018**
POST OAK SUD						
Birome WSC	184	189	195	200	205	211
Coolidge	191	202	217	230	239	239
Hubbard	156	157	157	162	167	169
Post Oak SUD (Municipal WUG Demand)	339	336	333	327	320	316

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**870**	**884**	**902**	**919**	**931**	**935**
RANGER						
Staff WSC	232	232	232	232	232	232
Ranger (Municipal WUG Demand)	410	385	366	352	341	335
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**642**	**617**	**598**	**584**	**573**	**567**
ROBERTSON COUNTY WSC						
Steam-Electric Power, Robertson	6	6	6	6	6	6
Robertson County WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	522	508	501	495	493	497
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**528**	**514**	**507**	**501**	**499**	**503**
ROBINSON						
Lorena	560	560	560	560	560	560
Robinson (Municipal WUG Demand)	2,970	3,380	3,857	4,401	5,023	5,733
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,530**	**3,940**	**4,417**	**4,961**	**5,583**	**6,293**
ROTAN						
Manufacturing, Fisher	4	4	4	4	4	4
Rotan (Municipal WUG Demand)	258	248	241	238	234	230
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**262**	**252**	**245**	**242**	**238**	**234**
ROUND ROCK						
County-Other, Williamson	446	551	746	1,008	1,278	1,278
Fern Bluff MUD	1,175	1,168	1,163	1,161	1,161	1,161
Manufacturing, Williamson	642	674	674	674	674	674
Paloma Lake MUD 1	409	403	400	399	399	399
Paloma Lake MUD 2	287	282	280	279	279	279
Vista Oaks MUD	548	541	538	536	536	536
Walsh Ranch MUD	196	195	195	194	194	194
Williamson County MUD 10	722	721	720	719	718	718
Williamson County MUD 11	816	816	817	818	820	820
Round Rock (Municipal WUG Demand)	23,025	28,432	33,780	34,935	35,995	36,935
Mining, Williamson (Region K)	6	6	6	6	6	6
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**28,272**	**33,789**	**39,319**	**40,729**	**42,060**	**43,000**
SALADO WSC						
Jarrell-Schwertner	55	55	55	55	55	55
Salado WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	2,459	2,753	3,086	3,459	3,878	4,349
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**2,514**	**2,808**	**3,141**	**3,514**	**3,933**	**4,404**
SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC						
Thorndale	202	202	202	202	202	202
Southwest Milam WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	1,787	1,870	1,958	2,058	2,173	2,306
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,989**	**2,072**	**2,160**	**2,260**	**2,375**	**2,508**
STAMFORD						
County-Other, Haskell	160	160	160	160	160	160

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
County-Other, Jones	89	89	89	89	89	89
Stamford (Municipal WUG Demand)	728	671	610	545	470	380
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**977**	**920**	**859**	**794**	**719**	**629**
STEAMBOAT MOUNTAIN WSC						
County-Other, Taylor	79	79	79	79	79	79
Steamboat Mountain WSC (Municipal WUG Demand)	960	1,200	1,410	1,665	1,947	2,258
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,039**	**1,279**	**1,489**	**1,744**	**2,026**	**2,337**
STEPHENS REGIONAL SUD						
County-Other, Throckmorton	99	99	99	99	99	99
Stephens Regional SUD (Municipal WUG Demand)	550	558	569	581	608	639
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**649**	**657**	**668**	**680**	**707**	**738**
STEPHENVILLE						
Manufacturing, Erath	29	35	42	48	55	64
Stephenville (Municipal WUG Demand)	3,936	4,305	4,765	5,387	6,075	6,838
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,965**	**4,340**	**4,807**	**5,435**	**6,130**	**6,902**
STRAWN						
Gordon	50	50	50	50	50	50
Strawn (Municipal WUG Demand)	124	124	122	122	121	120
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**174**	**174**	**172**	**172**	**171**	**170**
SWEETWATER						
County-Other, Taylor	187	187	187	187	187	187
Manufacturing, Nolan	358	356	354	354	354	354
Roby	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074
Sweetwater (Municipal WUG Demand)	1,808	1,786	1,762	1,733	1,703	1,672
Bronte (Region F)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,427**	**3,403**	**3,377**	**3,348**	**3,318**	**3,287**
TAYLOR						
County-Other, Williamson	101	111	122	136	151	151
Hutto	336	336	336	336	336	336
Manufacturing, Williamson	5	5	5	5	5	5
Noack WSC	152	156	160	165	170	175
Taylor (Municipal WUG Demand)	3,550	5,083	6,831	8,450	10,270	12,317
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**4,144**	**5,691**	**7,454**	**9,092**	**10,932**	**12,984**
TEMPLE						
Bell County WCID 2	323	323	323	323	323	323
County-Other, Bell	26	26	26	26	26	26
Manufacturing, Bell	481	481	481	481	481	481
Morgans Point Resort	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935	1,935
Troy	968	968	968	968	968	968
Temple (Municipal WUG Demand)	28,782	32,127	34,751	36,542	38,551	40,803

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**32,515**	**35,860**	**38,484**	**40,275**	**42,284**	**44,536**
TROY						
Manufacturing, Bell	9	9	9	9	9	9
Troy (Municipal WUG Demand)	494	527	562	597	632	667
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**503**	**536**	**571**	**606**	**641**	**676**
WACO						
Bellmead	1,344	1,344	1,344	1,344	1,344	1,344
Bold Springs WSC	560	560	560	560	560	560
Central Bosque WSC	112	112	112	112	112	112
FHLM WSC	336	336	336	336	336	336
Hewitt	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352
Hilltop WSC	97	97	97	97	97	97
Lacy Lakeview	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352
Leroy Tours Gerald WSC	224	224	224	224	224	224
Manufacturing, McLennan	6,248	6,609	6,978	7,308	7,763	7,763
Robinson	561	561	561	561	561	561
Ross WSC	336	336	336	336	336	336
Steam-Electric Power, McLennan	16,802	16,802	16,802	16,802	16,802	16,802
Texas State Technical College	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680
West	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
Woodway	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
Waco (Municipal WUG Demand)	38,126	41,590	44,657	47,967	51,680	55,842
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**73,370**	**77,195**	**80,631**	**84,271**	**88,439**	**92,601**
WICKSON CREEK SUD						
Manufacturing, Brazos	5	5	5	5	5	5
Manufacturing, Grimes	3	3	3	4	5	5
Wickson Creek SUD (Municipal WUG Demand)	3,523	3,951	4,570	5,316	6,155	7,097
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,531**	**3,959**	**4,578**	**5,325**	**6,165**	**7,107**
WOODWAY						
Manufacturing, McLennan	2	2	2	2	2	2
Woodway (Municipal WUG Demand)	3,973	3,967	3,967	3,967	3,967	3,967
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**3,975**	**3,969**	**3,969**	**3,969**	**3,969**	**3,969**
OLNEY (REGION B)[4]						
Manufacturing, Young	68	68	68	68	68	68
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**68**	**68**	**68**	**68**	**68**	**68**
ARLINGTON (REGION C)[4]						
Bethesda WSC	1,670	2,043	2,425	2,771	3,159	3,595
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,670**	**2,043**	**2,425**	**2,771**	**3,159**	**3,595**
ARLINGTON (REGION C)[1]						
Bethesda WSC	1,670	2,043	2,425	2,771	3,159	3,595

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,670**	**2,043**	**2,425**	**2,771**	**3,159**	**3,595**
CORSICANA (REGION C)[4]						
County-Other, Hill	235	241	245	250	255	261
Post Oak SUD	870	884	902	919	931	935
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,105**	**1,125**	**1,147**	**1,169**	**1,186**	**1,196**
FORT WORTH (REGION C)[4]						
Bethesda WSC	3,341	4,087	4,851	5,542	6,319	7,191
Burleson	8,163	9,476	10,793	11,974	13,298	14,781
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**11,504**	**13,563**	**15,644**	**17,516**	**19,617**	**21,972**
GRAND PRAIRIE (REGION C)[4]						
County-Other, Johnson	673	1,345	1,345	1,345	1,345	1,345
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**673**	**1,345**	**1,345**	**1,345**	**1,345**	**1,345**
MANSFIELD (REGION C)[4]						
Johnson County SUD	7,215	8,845	8,845	8,845	8,845	8,845
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**7,215**	**8,845**	**8,845**	**8,845**	**8,845**	**8,845**
MIDLOTHIAN (REGION C)[4]						
Venus	442	412	386	358	332	308
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**442**	**412**	**386**	**358**	**332**	**308**
COLORADO RIVER MWD (REGION F)[1]						
Abilene	4,721	4,588	4,456	4,324	4,191	4,059
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**4,721**	**4,588**	**4,456**	**4,324**	**4,191**	**4,059**
SNYDER (REGION F)[4]						
Rotan	258	248	241	238	234	230
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**258**	**248**	**241**	**238**	**234**	**230**
HUNTSVILLE (REGION H)[4]						
Steam-Electric Power, Grimes	6,720	6,720	6,720	6,720	6,720	6,720
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**6,720**	**6,720**	**6,720**	**6,720**	**6,720**	**6,720**
AUSTIN (REGION K)[4]						
County-Other, Williamson	0	369	90	206	735	2,101
Manufacturing, Williamson	14	15	16	17	18	19
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**14**	**384**	**106**	**223**	**753**	**2,120**
LOWER COLORADO RIVER AUTHORITY (REGION K)[4]						
Brazos River Authority	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Cedar Park	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000
Corix Utilities Texas Inc	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140
Leander	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**80,140**	**80,140**	**80,140**	**80,140**	**80,140**	**80,140**
MANVILLE WSC (REGION K)[4]						
Hutto	462	462	462	462	462	462

Water User Group/Wholesale Water Supplier	Contract Demand Year					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Williamson County WSID 3	884	884	884	884	884	884
Total Contracts and WUG Demands	**1,346**	**1,346**	**1,346**	**1,346**	**1,346**	**1,346**

Notes:
LCRA – Lower Colorado River Authority; MUD – municipal utility district; SUD – special utility district; TPWD – Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
(1) Contract represents a priority calls commitment.
(2) Includes municipal supply to portion of Mineral Wells located in Region C.
(3) Only listing Entity's contracts with Region G. Does not list Entity's other contract demands and Entity Demand.
(4) Values represent supplies assigned to Abilene by Region F based on available yield from O.H. Ivie Reservoir, not actual contractual volume.

3.2 Determination of Surface Water Availability

3.2.1 Modified TCEQ Water Availability Model of the Brazos River Basin

Determination of water availability for existing water rights is based on a rather complex function of location, hydrologic conditions, diversion volume, reservoir storage, and priority date. Computer models that are capable of analyzing these complex inter-relationships are typically employed to determine water availability for water rights. Water availability estimates for the Brazos G Area were developed using a computer model of the Brazos River Basin. The Water Rights Analysis Package (WRAP) computer model was developed at Texas A&M University for use as a water resources management tool. The model can be used to evaluate the reliability of existing water rights and to determine unappropriated streamflow potentially available for new water right permits. WRAP simulates the management and use of streamflow and reservoirs over a historical period of record, adhering to the prior appropriation doctrine governing water rights in Texas.

The TCEQ maintains a water availability model (WAM) for the Brazos River Basin that contains information on all water rights in the basin. The TCEQ WAM is the fundamental tool used to determine surface water availability throughout the Brazos River Basin for water rights permitting. Embedded within this model are certain assumptions that the TCEQ specifies when analyzing water right reliabilities. These assumptions are not necessarily the most appropriate to apply to the regional water planning process. For example, the TCEQ WAM uses permitted storage capacities for all reservoirs, whereas water supply planning should be based upon current and future sedimentation conditions in the reservoirs.

The Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) has approved (and the Texas Water Development Board [TWDB] has authorized) several assumptions to be incorporated into the TCEQ WAM for purposes of determining surface water availability. With these modifications, the TCEQ WAM is hereinafter referred to as the "Brazos G WAM." These assumptions include the following items.

- Inclusion of a certain level of current and future return flows by entities located throughout the basin. These return flows are based on historical return flow information as well as projected future rates assuming an aggressive plan for future reuse. Table 3.4 lists the entities and the annual amount of return flows approved for use in the Brazos G WAM. Multiple entries for the same entity indicate multiple discharge locations. Entities operating wastewater treatment plants in the Brazos Basin not shown in the table are excluded for one of two reasons. One, is the entity requested during the development of the 2021 Plan that zero effluent be made available in the WAM because they plan to reuse all future effluent. These same entities are assumed to fully use all future effluent in the 2026

Plan unless otherwise notified by the entity. Two, return flows are included only for those facilities currently permitted to discharge 0.9 million gallons per day (mgd) or greater.

- Inclusion of BRA current contractual demand amounts and locations as provided by the BRA.
- For modeling of the BRA's water sources, the BRA's Little River reservoirs' (i.e., Belton, Georgetown, Granger, Proctor, and Stillhouse) modeled source availabilities have been aggregated and reported as the "BRA Little River System." Additionally, the BRA's main stem reservoirs' (i.e., Granbury, Possum Kingdom, and Whitney) modeled source availabilities as well as the modeled source availabilities of Limestone and Somerville have been aggregated and reported as the "BRA Main Stem System." Lastly, Aquilla Lake has been modeled and reported as the "BRA Aquilla System."
- Modeling of the BRA System Operations permit is reported as the "BRA System Operations Permit Supply." Source availabilities have been modeled and analyzed in a manner consistent with the terms of the water right for both existing supplies and potential water management strategies.
- Incorporation of reservoir system operations rules provided by the BRA to more accurately reflect current operations of BRA reservoirs to meet contract demands.
- For all reservoirs authorized for greater than 5,000 ac-ft storage capacity with available volumetric survey information and an estimated sedimentation rate, the Brazos G WAM uses an estimated Year 2030 and Year 2080 elevation-area-capacity curve.
- The Brazos G WAM includes five subordination agreements, listed below, as approved by the TWDB.
  - Possum Kingdom Reservoir water rights are subordinate to Lake Alan Henry.
  - Possum Kingdom Reservoir water rights are subordinate to the City of Stamford's California Creek pump-back operation into Lake Stamford.
  - Lake Waco is subordinated to the City of Clifton's 1996 priority date water right.
  - Possum Kingdom Reservoir water rights are subordinated to rights held by the West Central Texas MWD in Hubbard Creek Reservoir.
  - Possum Kingdom Reservoir water rights are subordinated to rights held by the City of Abilene to divert flows from the Clear Fork of the Brazos River into Lake Fort Phantom Hill.
- Available source supply for reservoirs are evaluated using a firm yield or safe yield determination, depending upon the location of the reservoir and the preference of the reservoir owner. For reservoirs in which a safe yield is utilized as the basis for supply, Brazos G has also determined and reported the firm yield, as required by TWDB guidance.

These assumptions were used in the analyses to determine surface water availability for existing surface water supply sources. Different assumptions will be used, per TWDB requirements, for determining surface water availability for new water management strategies.

Table 3.4 Return Flows included in the Brazos G WAM (mgd)

Entity[1]	County	Current 2030 Discharge[2]	Estimated 2080 Discharge[3]
Bell County WCID No. 1	Bell	9.032	4.734
Bell County WCID No. 1	Bell	0.359	0.189
Bell County WCID No. 1	Bell	2.724	1.426
City of Bellville	Austin	0.312	0.093
City of Breckenridge	Stephens	0.350	0.088
City of Brenham	Washington	1.739	0.435

Entity[1]	County	Current 2030 Discharge[2]	Estimated 2080 Discharge[3]
City of Cameron	Milam	0.487	0.986
City of Copperas Cove	Coryell	0.449	0.186
City of Copperas Cove	Coryell	0.567	0.235
City of Copperas Cove	Coryell	1.328	0.548
City of Eastland	Eastland	0.208	0.052
City of Freeport	Brazoria	0.611	0.208
City of Freeport	Brazoria	0.005	0.003
City of Gatesville	Coryell	1.287	0.531
City of Gatesville	Coryell	0.709	0.293
City of Georgetown	Williamson	1.284	1.369
City of Georgetown	Williamson	1.344	1.432
City of Georgetown	Williamson	0.706	0.753
City of Georgetown	Williamson	0.203	0.216
City of Graham	Young	0.589	0.148
City of Granbury	Hood	0.394	0.235
City of Harker Heights	Bell	1.670	0.873
City of Hearne	Robertson	0.419	0.104
City of Hillsboro	Hood	0.901	0.277
City of Hutto	Williamson	0.515	0.550
City of Hutto	Williamson	0.408	0.435
City of Lampasas	Lampasas	0.427	0.145
City of Leander	Williamson	1.038	1.106
City of Marlin	Falls	0.539	0.134
City of McGregor	McLennan	0.000	0.000
City of Mineral Wells	Parker	0.830	0.238
City of Mineral Wells	Palo Pinto	0.107	0.164
City of Navasota	Grimes	0.482	0.183
City of Richmond	Fort Bend	1.336	0.890
City of Richmond	Fort Bend	0.266	0.178
City of Richmond	Fort Bend	0.110	0.074
City of Rosenberg	Fort Bend	1.665	1.109
City of Rosenberg	Fort Bend	1.021	0.679
City of Rosenberg	Fort Bend	0.003	0.000
City of Round Rock, City of Cedar Park, and City of Austin	Williamson	15.587	16.613
City of Stephenville	Erath	1.218	0.676
City of Sugarland	Fort Bend	3.923	2.617
City of Sugarland	Fort Bend	4.134	2.757
City of Sugarland	Fort Bend	0.827	0.550

Entity[1]	County	Current 2030 Discharge[2]	Estimated 2080 Discharge[3]
City of Sugarland	Fort Bend	0.997	0.665
City of Taylor	Williamson	1.123	1.196
City of Temple	Bell	1.799	0.942
City of Temple and City of Belton	Bell	6.084	3.187
City of West Columbia	Brazoria	0.430	0.148
Pecan Grove MUD	Fort Bend	0.821	0.548
Prairie View A&M University	Waller	0.430	0.370
Texas A&M University	Brazos	0.041	0.030
Texas A&M University	Brazos	0.022	0.016
Texas A&M University	Brazos	1.385	1.027
Total:		**75**	**53**
Total (ac-ft/yr):		**84,271**	**58,961**

Notes:
(1) Entities operating WWTPs but are not shown are assumed to have zero effluent made available because they plan to reuse all future effluent, or are permitted to discharge less than 0.9 mgd.
(2) Current return flow estimates are based on the minimum annual discharge during 2017-2022 period.
(3) Future estimates assume 25% of Year 2030 discharges will continue and 50% of any growth in wastewater volume will be discharged.

The Brazos G WAM contains 77 primary control points that contain naturalized flow information, and 67 evaporation data sets used to calculate evaporation for the 650 reservoirs included in the model. The period of record for the Brazos G WAM is 1940-2018. Water availability computations are performed at over 3,800 control points located throughout the river basin in the process of analyzing more than 1,700 water right records. The Brazos G WAM contains water right data available from the TCEQ for all water rights in the Brazos Basin as of October 2023. Water right applications submitted or approved after this date are not reflected in the model. A summary of yield data for major reservoirs analyzed in the Brazos G WAM is presented in Section 3.2.3.

3.2.2 Reliability of Surface Water Supplies and New Upper Basin Drought of Record

Hydrologic conditions are a primary factor that affects the reliability of water rights. Severe drought periods have been experienced in all areas of the Brazos River Basin. The drought of record (DOR) for most areas of Brazos G occurred in the 1950s with other less severe drought periods occurring in the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and even recently in the 1990s. In some parts of the upper Brazos Basin, the recent drought of the 1990s has continued past the turn of the century, and in many places streamflow data indicate that its severity is greater than that of the drought that occurred in the 1950s. The region of Texas near Abilene has experienced drought conditions in almost all years from the early 1990s until 2016. Streamflows in the Clear Fork of the Brazos River (Clear Fork) during this period were substantially less compared to the previous DOR which occurred from 1943 through 1956.

Figure 3.7 illustrates this with a comparison of cumulative gaged flows at the Clear Fork at Nugent gage during the drought of the 1950s and the drought beginning in the Summer of 1997 and ending in the Spring of 2016. When the recent drought cumulative streamflows are compared to the 1950s droughts at the 14 years mark from the beginning of the drought, total streamflow is 53 percent of the total

streamflow for the 1950s. Additionally, the duration of the recent drought is more than four years longer than the 1950s drought. The comparison shows that the current drought was much more severe in the Clear Fork watershed. Additional information and comparisons of historic droughts in the Brazos River Basin are included in Chapter 7.



Figure 3.7 Comparison of Cumulative Streamflows for Two Drought Periods for the Clear Fork at Nugent, TX Streamgage (08084000)

3.2.3 Yield Analysis for Large Reservoirs

Water availability estimates for reservoirs were determined using the Brazos G WAM. For each reservoir greater than 5,000 ac-ft yield estimates were determined using the updated 2030 (current) and 2080 (future) elevation-area-capacity information based on projected reservoir sedimentation. For reservoirs with less than 5,000 ac-ft of storage, as-permitted capacities were used to estimate yields. Future reservoir sediment conditions were estimated using available reservoir sedimentation data. Summary of current (2030) and future (2080) sediment estimates for reservoirs with recent surveys are summarized in Table 3.5. Summary of current (2030) and future (2080) sediment estimates for reservoirs without recent surveys are summarized in Table 3.6.

Table 3.5 Summary of Current and Future Sediment Estimates for Reservoirs with Recent Surveys (available as of December 1, 2023)

Reservoir	Year of New Survey	Sedimentation Rate (ac-ft/yr)	2026 Plan Conservation Storage Capacity (ac-ft)	
			2030	2080
Lake Aquilla[1]	2013	209	39,656	29,153
Lake Belton[1]	2013	336	427,675	410,790
Dansby Power Plant/Bryan Utilities Lake	2016	26	13,802	12,892
Fort Phantom Hill Reservoir	1993	78	67,228	63,346
Lake Georgetown[1]	2016	21	37,869	36,708
Gibbons Creek Reservoir	2008	35	38,429	36,372
Graham/Eddleman Reservoir	1998	233	37,913	26,277
Lake Granbury[1]	2015	278	132,112	118,134
Lake Granger[1]	2013	152	49,187	41,549
Hubbard Creek Reservoir	2018	554	311,526	283,826
Lake Limestone[1]	2015	481	196,044	172,353
Mexia Reservoir	2008	22	4,208	3,108
Millers Creek Reservoir	1993	102	25,426	20,343
Palo Pinto Reservoir	2007	42	23,728	19,695
Pat Cleburne Reservoir[4]	2008	NA	NA	NA
Lake Proctor[1]	2014	161	52,173	44,082
Lake Somerville[1]	2012	379	143,377	145,935
Squaw Creek Reservoir	2007	125	148,512	142,262
Stamford Reservoir	1998	125	47,646	41,396
Lake Stillhouse Hollow[1]	2015	119	228,146	222,166
Possum Kingdom Reservoir[1]	2016	298	552,293	537,318
Waco Lake	2011	334	183,536	166,837
Lake Whitney	2019	565	610,786	582,378
Lake Leon[3]	2015	NA	NA	NA
Lake Mineral Wells (Region C)[4]	2015	6	5,376	5,076

Notes:
(1) Sedimentation rate provided by BRA.
(2) Sedimentation rate calculated using 2017 Draft TWDB survey.
(3) Due to differences in survey methodologies, the 2015 survey was not comparable to previous surveys and cannot be used to determine a new sedimentation rate. Therefore, the 2026 Plan sedimentation rate was maintained at the same level as that used in the 2021 Plan to estimate current and future sediment conditions.
(4) Volumetric surveys and sedimentation rates were inconclusive

Table 3.6 Summary of Current and Future Sediment Estimates for Reservoirs without Recent Surveys

Reservoir	Year of Impoundment	Sed. Rate (ac-ft/yr)	2026 Plan Conservation Storage Capacity (ac-ft)	
			2030	2080
Abilene	1923	78	3,601	0
Alcoa	1953	5	15,266	15,011
Cisco	1974	22	27,158	26,053
Daniel	1948	29	9,076	7,648

Reservoir	Year of Impoundment	Sed. Rate (ac-ft/yr)	2026 Plan Conservation Storage Capacity (ac-ft)	
			2030	2080
Kirby	1928	40	4,215	2,400
Lake Creek	1953	14	7,375	6,794
Lake Davis	1959	33	3,139	1,503
Sweetwater	1974	45	10,654	8,436
Tradinghouse	1968	33	35,759	34,101
Twin Oak	1982	38	28,855	27,006

Yields were limited to authorized diversions. Yields also were determined for smaller reservoirs that serve as the sole water supply for a municipal entity. Yield estimates for BRA reservoirs were estimated as a stand-alone yield without system operations. The stand-alone yields for the BRA reservoirs assume all diversions from BRA reservoirs are made lakeside.

Firm yield estimates were determined for all reservoirs and safe yield estimates were also determined for reservoirs located upstream of Possum Kingdom Reservoir and Lake Palo Pinto. Utilization of safe yield in lieu of firm yield is a common practice in west Texas where droughts are frequent and severe, and water managers are acutely aware that a drought more severe than recent recorded history could occur. Safe yield provides additional assurance of supply in an area where water resource alternatives are limited. All reservoirs upstream of Possum Kingdom Reservoir (Upper Basin Reservoirs) were evaluated on a one-year safe yield basis. A one-year safe yield is defined as the amount of water that can be diverted from a reservoir during a repeat of the worst DOR while still maintaining a reserve storage equal to a one-year supply volume. Two-year safe yields were calculated for Hubbard Creek Reservoir as approved by the TWDB. A two-year safe yield is used to provide greater assurance to reservoir owners that supplies are not overestimated when considering droughts worse than the DOR. A six-month safe yield is used for Lake Palo Pinto and is the only reservoir located in a watershed downstream of Possum Kingdom Reservoir for which a safe yield is used.

A summary of firm and safe yield estimates for major reservoirs and minor reservoirs used for municipal supply is presented in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7 Yields for Reservoirs in the Brazos G Area (acre-feet/year)

Water Right ID	Reservoir Name	Firm Yield		Safe Yield	
		2030	2080	2030	2080
BRA Reservoirs					
C5155	Possum Kingdom	151,330	147,010		
C5156	Granbury	58,822	53,942		
C5157	Whitney	18,336	18,336		
C5158	Aquilla	12,856	10,396		
C5159	Proctor	14,468	11,698		
C5160	Belton[1]	100,257	100,257		
C5161	Stillhouse Hollow	65,568	64,138		
C5162	Georgetown	11,610	11,490		
C5163	Granger	17,400	15,140		
C5164	Somerville	42,000	40,080		
C5165	Limestone	65,074	65,074		

Water Right ID	Reservoir Name	Firm Yield		Safe Yield	
		2030	2080	2030	2080
Large Non-BRA Reservoirs					
C3758, C5272	Alcoa	14,000	14,000		
P5551	Clifton	400	340		
C5268	Dansbury (Bryan Utilities)	85	85		
C5311, C5307	Gibbons Creek	9,740	9,740		
C4345	Lake Creek	9,786	8,900		
C34403	Davis	0	0		
C3470	Leon	4,160	4,080		
C4039	Mineral Wells (Region C)	1,940	1,940		
C5287	Mexia	1,002	502		
C4031	Palo Pinto[2]	8,880	7,710	6,236	5,318
C4106	Pat Cleburne	5,590	5,590		
C4097	Squaw Creek	8,050	7,720		
C4342	Tradinghouse	4,900	4,840		
C5298	Twin Oaks	2,860	2,700		
P5551, P5899	Waco	74,630	71,520		
C3693	White River	80	80		
Minor Reservoirs					
P4135	Crawford	0	0		
C3465	Eastland	510	500		
C4024	Gordon	0	0		
C4355	Marlin	1,760	1,700		
P5000	Mart	0	0		
P5085	Robinson	3,621	3,421		
P5744	Wheeler Branch	1,848	1,838		
C4019	Strawn	160	160		
C3450	Throckmorton	50	50		
Upper Basin Reservoirs					
C4142	Abilene[3]	725	0	374	0
C4211	Cisco	1,227	1,227	997	926
C4214	Daniel	50	0	21	0
C4151, C4161, C4139, C4165	Fort Phantom Hill[6]	7,833	7,833	5,339	5,310
C3458	Graham-Eddleman	1,800	1,420	789	366
C4213	Hubbard Creek[4]	26,380	24,810	16,879	15,196
C4150	Kirby[5]	270	260	95	77
C4179	Stamford	3,900	3,440	2,060	1,569
C4130	Sweetwater[3]	680	610	488	417
C4128	Sweetwater_Trammel_RC4128[3]	300	300	200	200
C4152	Lytle Lake	230	230	230	230
C4180	City of Hamlin Lake	40	40	24	24
C4181	Anson North	32	32	22	21
C4194	Woodson	0	0	0	0

Water Right ID	Reservoir Name	Firm Yield		Safe Yield	
		2030	2080	2030	2080
C4202	Baird	30	30	20	20
C4208	McCarty	110	110	80	80
C4207	Moran	90	90	57	57
C3462	Bryson	0	0	0	0
C3444	Millers Creek Reservoir	400	180	227	93

Notes:
(1) BRA portion of Lake Belton stand-alone yield excludes 12,000 ac-ft/yr of water rights held by the Department of the Army.
(2) Safe yield estimates for Lake Palo Pinto are based on 6-month safe yield calculation.
(3) Reservoir not used for supply by owning entity or is not considered a reliable supply.
(4) Safe yield estimates for Hubbard Creek Reservoir are based on a two-year safe yield calculation.
(5) Lake Kirby is utilized as part of the City's reuse system and not for raw water supply. Yield estimates for Lake Kirby do not include effluent inflows.
(6) Safe yield estimate for Fort Phantom Hill Reservoir is based on a 2-year safe yield calculation. The City of Abilene plans to manage current and future supplies from Fort Phantom Hill Reservoir using the minimum of 1) the 2-year safe yield estimates, and 2) the yield estimates included in the purpose and need analysis of the Abilene water system as part of the 404 permitting process for the Cedar Ridge Reservoir project.

3.2.4 Reliability of Run-of-the-River and Small Reservoir Water Rights

The results of the Brazos G WAM simulations include water availability estimates for each water right located in the Brazos Basin. Summaries of water available to run-of-the-river water rights (including rights with small reservoirs) are presented in Appendix F. If the supply for a water right was determined by a firm or safe yield analysis, then this number is shown in the appendix. Water availability for other rights is expressed in terms of the minimum annual supply, which is defined as the water available during the most severe drought year over the 76-year simulation period of 1940 to 2018. Water right reliabilities were calculated simulating both current and future reservoir sedimentation conditions. The minimum annual supplies for run-of-river water rights (based on minimum monthly diversions) were used to determine the supplies available by type of use and county for comparison with demands.

3.2.5 Reliability of BRA System Operations Permit

The BRA has been granted water right permit No. 12-5851 authorizing the additional appropriation of water made available through system operation of the BRA's existing water rights and reservoirs. The system operations permit authorizes a new supply of water in addition to the authorized diversions of BRA's existing reservoir water rights. This new supply is used in conjunction with water stored in BRA reservoirs to meet future customer needs.

The Brazos G WAM prioritizes meeting the demands of the existing BRA contracts from the BRA system of reservoirs (BRA System) before making any system operations water available to meet future demands. The remaining water available from the BRA System is then determined at the Brazos River near Rosharon control point, at the lower end of the Brazos Basin. Under this hypothetical operation (diverting all additional "system" supply from the lowest reach of the Brazos Basin), unregulated flows originating downstream of the BRA reservoirs are diverted during wet times and firmed up by releases from storage in the upstream BRA reservoirs during dry times. In this fashion, a total "system" yield can be developed in addition to the sum of the individual reservoir firm yields.

For this analysis, the system yield was determined to be the sum of the minimum annual volume of water delivered to the existing contracts and remaining available water near the Rosharon control point. The

difference between the system yield and the sum of the individual reservoir firm yields is considered to be the additional system operations reliable supply. Table 3.8 summarizes the BRA reservoir firm yields, system yield and system operations reliable supply.

The BRA currently holds multiple contracts to supply water to cities, districts, irrigators and industry throughout the Brazos River Basin. Many of these contracts are supplied proximate to the BRA's reservoirs, or through lakeside diversions. Because the additional system supply is dependent upon unregulated flows below the existing BRA reservoirs, the additional supply from system operations is considered to be available for diversion only at locations along the main stem of the Brazos River.

Table 3.8 Summary of BRA Reservoir Firm Yields and System Operations Reliable Supply

BRA Reservoir	Stand-Alone Firm Yield (ac-ft/yr)	
	2030	2080
Possum Kingdom	151,330	147,010
Granbury	58,822	53,942
Whitney	18,336	18,336
Aquilla	12,856	10,396
Proctor	14,468	11,698
Belton(1)	100,257	100,257
Stillhouse Hollow	65,568	64,138
Georgetown	11,610	11,490
Granger	17,400	15,140
Somerville	42,000	40,080
Limestone	65,074	65,074
Total Reservoir Firm Yields	**557,721**	**537,561**
System Yield	**689,105**	**617,393**
System Operations Reliable Supply(2)	**131,384**	**79,832**

Notes:
(1) BRA portion of Lake Belton stand-alone yield excludes 12,000 ac-ft/yr of water rights held by the Department of the Army.
(2) The system operations reliable supply is assumed to be available to meet demands located on the main-stem of the Brazos River as infrastructure does not exist to transport the supply to the demands located in the Little River or Aquilla sub-systems.

BRA reports a total system yield of 744,942 ac-ft/yr, based on the BRA's modeling of its system, operations, and contractual obligations. This amount is 55,837 ac-ft/yr more than the results developed utilizing the Brazos G WAM, from which an estimated system yield for 2030 is estimated as 55,837 ac-ft/yr lower, and by 2080 projects a lower yield by approximately 127,549 ac-ft/yr. A comparison of these modeled system yield results is presented in Figure 3.8.



Figure 3.8 Comparison of modeled BRA System Yield from BRA Water Conservation Plan and from Brazos G WAM Projections

The BRA's reported system yield is based on a very specific model of the BRA reservoir system that accounts for their specific operational rules to meet the needs of their customers. For the development of the Brazos G Regional Water Plan, as noted elsewhere in the report (see Hydrologic Variance Request Appendix N), the Brazos G RWPG must use the State's official model for determining water availability, a model that has its own built-in assumptions for conservatively calculating water availability over a modeled hydrologic period that includes the DOR for watersheds throughout the Brazos River Basin. Such assumptions relate to quantifying the amount of firm water supply that would be available if there were a repeat of the DOR, assuming full implementation of all existing water rights and very limited scenarios reflecting the presence of return flows, if at all, for certain modeled water management strategies. Further, the Brazos G model does not include the detailed operational decisions and factors considered every day by water providers, like BRA, that affect source availability for their customers. Additionally, the modeling performed for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan include quantified projections of the impacts of sedimentation on reservoirs, further differentiating present source availability from the projections of future source availability presented herein.

3.2.6 Unappropriated Flows in the Brazos River Basin

The Brazos G WAM calculates unappropriated flow each month for the 1940 - 2018 period at each modeled location in the basin. Unappropriated flow is the excess flow that is not used by existing water rights and instream flow restrictions in the model simulation. This unappropriated flow is computed assuming SB3 instream flow restrictions and full use of all existing water rights. The quantity of unappropriated flow varies throughout the river basin depending on location. Summaries of unappropriated flows from the Brazos G WAM were developed at the following locations:

- Brazos River at South Bend (BRSB23).
- Brazos River near Glen Rose (BRGR30).
- Brazos River near Aquilla (BRAQ33).
- Bosque River near Waco (BOWA40).
- Little River at Cameron (LRCA58).
- Brazos River near Bryan (BRBR59).
- Brazos River near Hempstead (BRHE68).
- Brazos River at Richmond (BRRI70).

These locations effectively summarize flow conditions throughout the river basin and are located at current or discontinued US Geological Survey streamflow gaging stations, which are also primary control points in the Brazos G WAM. Table 3.9 summarizes the monthly and annual unappropriated flows at these selected locations as represented by WAM Run 3.

Table 3.9 Summary of Unappropriated Flow at Selected Brazos G WAM Locations

Control Point	Unappropriated Flow Estimates								Max. No. of Consecutive Months with Zero Unappropriated Flow
	Monthly Unappropriated Flows (ac-ft)				Annual Unappropriated Flows (ac-ft)				
	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Median	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Median	
BRSB23	1,211,125	0	14,038	0	2,193,800	0	168,453	11,161	70
BRGR30	2,433,663	0	26,485	0	2,986,473	0	317,814	98,216	51
BRAQ33	2,545,437	0	40,413	0	3,432,170	0	484,959	153,117	36
BOWA40	525,042	0	18,896	0	947,531	0	226,746	124,441	35
LRCA58	1,366,894	0	64,652	0	3,867,515	0	775,829	557,698	43
BRBR59	3,961,707	0	160,470	0	9,099,618	0	1,925,644	1,292,516	33
BRHE68	4,620,571	0	208,906	0	11,056,133	0	2,506,874	1,930,394	33
BRRI70	4,975,936	0	235,123	0	11,918,357	0	2,821,479	2,135,995	33

Figure 3.9 provides a comparison of median annual unappropriated flows at the selected location to those calculated in the 2021 Brazos G Plan. The comparison shows that the median unappropriated flow at the selected locations has decreased at five of the eight selected locations since the 2021 Plan. These changes in unappropriated flow are largely attributable to the update to the official Brazos WAM extending the modeled hydrologic period through 2018.



Figure 3.9 Comparison of Simulated Median Annual Unappropriated Flow to 2026 Brazos G Plan

Figure 3.10 through Figure 3.17 illustrate the annual time series of unappropriated flows at each location. As Table 3.9 and Figure 3.10 through Figure 3.17 demonstrate, locations further downstream on major streams tend to have more unappropriated flow than those upstream with less contributing drainage area. As shown in these figures, unappropriated flow is present at the South Bend gage location in 46 out of 79 years of the model simulation. Conversely, unappropriated flow is present in all but 10 years at Richmond in the lower basin, and often in large quantities. Unappropriated flow is not available at Richmond for four years during the severe drought of the 1950s, which is the lowest flow period during the 1940 to 2018 simulation period at this gage.



Figure 3.10 Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River at South Bend (BRSB23)



Figure 3.11 Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Glen Rose (BRGR30)



Figure 3.12 Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Aquilla (BRAQ33)



Figure 3.13 Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Waco (BOWA40)



Figure 3.14 Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Little River at Cameron (LRCA58)



Figure 3.15 Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Bryan (BRBR59)



Figure 3.16 Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River near Hempstead (BRHE68)



Figure 3.17 Simulated Annual Unappropriated Flow at Brazos River at Richmond (BRRI70)

3.2.7 Local Surface Water Supplies

The local surface water supplies are used for livestock supplies in the Brazos G area. The Brazos G RWPG acknowledges that the local supplies listed below are confirmed "firm" under DOR. By utilizing the max. historical water use (2011-2021), the RWPG has accounted for availability during droughts. Table 3.10 below lists each local surface water supply with: a) an explanation for the basis of the supply itself, and b) the basis for the volume of supply.

Table 3.10 Local Surface Water Supply Methodology (ac-ft/yr)

Source Name	County	Basin	Salinity[1]	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Methodology
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Bell	Brazos	Fresh	1,222	1,222	1,222	1,222	1,222	1,222	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Bosque	Brazos	Fresh	976	976	976	976	976	976	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Brazos	Brazos	Fresh	902	902	902	902	902	902	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Burleson	Brazos	Fresh	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Callahan	Brazos	Fresh	388	388	388	388	388	388	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Comanche	Brazos	Fresh	2,648	2,648	2,648	2,648	2,648	2,648	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Coryell	Brazos	Fresh	1,044	1,044	1,044	1,044	1,044	1,044	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Eastland	Brazos	Fresh	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Erath	Brazos	Fresh	4,397	4,397	4,397	4,397	4,397	4,397	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Falls	Brazos	Fresh	1,968	1,968	1,968	1,968	1,968	1,968	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Fisher	Brazos	Fresh	542	542	542	542	542	542	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Grimes	Brazos	Fresh	1,168	1,168	1,168	1,168	1,168	1,168	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Hamilton	Brazos	Fresh	1,415	1,415	1,415	1,415	1,415	1,415	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)

Source Name	County	Basin	Salinity[1]	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Methodology
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Haskell	Brazos	Fresh	436	436	436	436	436	436	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Hill	Brazos	Fresh	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Hood	Brazos	Fresh	318	318	318	318	318	318	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Johnson	Brazos	Fresh	690	690	690	690	690	690	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Jones	Brazos	Fresh	436	436	436	436	436	436	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Kent	Brazos	Fresh	31	31	31	31	31	31	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Knox	Brazos	Fresh	360	360	360	360	360	360	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Lampasas	Brazos	Fresh	464	464	464	464	464	464	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Lee	Brazos	Fresh	811	811	811	811	811	811	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Limestone	Brazos	Fresh	1,525	1,525	1,525	1,525	1,525	1,525	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	McLennan	Brazos	Fresh	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	1,781	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Milam	Brazos	Fresh	2,127	2,127	2,127	2,127	2,127	2,127	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Nolan	Brazos	Fresh	107	107	107	107	107	107	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Palo Pinto	Brazos	Fresh	1,848	1,848	1,848	1,848	1,848	1,848	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)

Source Name	County	Basin	Salinity[1]	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Methodology
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Robertson	Brazos	Fresh	2,583	2,583	2,583	2,583	2,583	2,583	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Shackelford	Brazos	Fresh	591	591	591	591	591	591	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Somervell	Brazos	Fresh	130	130	130	130	130	130	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Stephens	Brazos	Fresh	550	550	550	550	550	550	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Stonewall	Brazos	Fresh	88	88	88	88	88	88	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Taylor	Brazos	Fresh	590	590	590	590	590	590	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Throckmorton	Brazos	Fresh	734	734	734	734	734	734	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Washington	Brazos	Fresh	1,579	1,579	1,579	1,579	1,579	1,579	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Williamson	Brazos	Fresh	1,561	1,561	1,561	1,561	1,561	1,561	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Brazos Livestock Local Supply	Young	Brazos	Fresh	523	523	523	523	523	523	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Colorado Livestock Local Supply	Callahan	Colorado	Fresh	497	497	497	497	497	497	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Colorado Livestock Local Supply	Comanche	Colorado	Fresh	4	4	4	4	4	4	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Colorado Livestock Local Supply	Eastland	Colorado	Fresh	63	63	63	63	63	63	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Colorado Livestock Local Supply	Lampasas	Colorado	Fresh	103	103	103	103	103	103	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)

Source Name	County	Basin	Salinity(1)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Methodology
Colorado Livestock Local Supply	Lee	Colorado	Fresh	172	172	172	172	172	172	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Colorado Livestock Local Supply	Nolan	Colorado	Fresh	30	30	30	30	30	30	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Colorado Livestock Local Supply	Taylor	Colorado	Fresh	325	325	325	325	325	325	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Colorado Livestock Local Supply	Washington	Colorado	Fresh	9	9	9	9	9	9	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Red Livestock Local Supply	Knox	Red	Fresh	149	149	149	149	149	149	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
San Jacinto Livestock Local Supply	Grimes	San Jacinto	Fresh	398	398	398	398	398	398	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Grimes	Trinity	Fresh	346	346	346	346	346	346	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Hill	Trinity	Fresh	534	534	534	534	534	534	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Hood	Trinity	Fresh	3	3	3	3	3	3	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Johnson	Trinity	Fresh	463	463	463	463	463	463	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Limestone	Trinity	Fresh	205	205	205	205	205	205	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Young	Trinity	Fresh	95	95	95	95	95	95	Supply data was derived from TWDB Historical Water Use Estimates; Volume of supply was derived by taking the max 11-year historical water use (2011-2021)
Region G Total Livestock Local Supply				**43,943**	**43,943**	**43,943**	**43,943**	**43,943**	**43,943**	

Notes:

(1) Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 milligrams per liter [mg/L]), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

3.3 Water Quality Considerations Affecting Supply

The Brazos G WAM addresses the quantity of water available to existing water rights. However, water quality from some sources of water for existing water rights and contracts may limit the availability of water for certain beneficial uses. Water quality that does not meet criteria for designated uses such as public water supply, contact recreation, and aquatic life support is important to water supply considerations.

3.3.1 Point and Non-Point Source Pollution Water Quality

A number of stream segments and lakes in the Brazos G Area do not meet water quality standards due to point and/or nonpoint source pollution. The total maximum daily loads (TMDL) and individual water quality-based effluent limitations defined in 40 CFR 130.7 give TCEQ and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) the responsibility to identify water bodies that do not meet or are not expected to meet applicable water quality standards for designated uses.

As required under Sections 303(d) and 304(a) of the federal Clean Water Act, the 303(d) list identifies the water bodies in or bordering Texas for which effluent limitations are not stringent enough to implement water quality standards, and for which the associated pollutants are suitable for measurement by maximum daily load. Texas' 303(d) list is included as part of the Texas Integrated Report of Surface Water Quality.[1]

One of three subcategories is assigned to each impaired parameter to provide information about water quality status and management activities on that water body. The categories are defined as:

- **Category 5**: The water body does not meet applicable water quality standards or is threatened for one or more designated uses by one or more pollutants.
- **Category 5a:** TMDLs are underway, scheduled, or will be scheduled for one or more parameters.
- **Category 5b:** A review of the standards for one or more parameters will be conducted before a management strategy is selected, including the possible revision to the water quality standards.
- **Category 5c:** Additional data or information will be collected and/or evaluated for one or more parameters before a management strategy is selected.

The Brazos G Area stream segments and lakes identified in Texas' 303(d) list are summarized in Table 3.11.[2]

Table 3.11 2024 Draft Texas 303(d) List (June 26, 2024) Brazos G Regional Planning Area

Segment Number	Segment Name	County	Category	Parameter of Concern	Year First Listed
1204A	Camp Creek	Johnson	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2010
1208	Brazos River Above Possum Kingdom Lake	Young / Stonewall	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2008
1209A	Country Club Lake	Brazos	5c	Toxicity in sediment	1999

[1] 2018, TCEQ. 2018 Draft Texas Integrated Report of Surface Water Quality

[2] Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, 2024 Texas 303(d) List (June 26, 2024).

Segment Number	Segment Name	County	Category	Parameter of Concern	Year First Listed
1209B	Fin Feather Lake	Brazos	5c	Toxicity in sediment	2000
1209E	Wickson Creek	Brazos	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1209H	Duck Creek	Robertson	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1209H	Duck Creek	Robertson	5r	Depressed dissolved oxygen in water	2012
1209I	Gibbons Creek	Grimes	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1209I	Gibbons Creek	Grimes	5r	Depressed dissolved oxygen in water	2016
1209K	Steele Creek	Limestone	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1210A	Navasota River Above Lake Mexia	Hill	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1211A	Davidson Creek	Burleson	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1211A	Davidson Creek	Burleson	5c	Depressed dissolved oxygen in water	2010
1212	Somerville Lake	Burleson / Washington	5c	pH	2002
1212A	Middle Yegua Creek	Lee / Williamson	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2010
1213A	Big Elm Creek	Milam	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2010
1217	Lampasas River Above Stillhouse Hollow Lake	Bell / Hamilton / Lampasas	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1218	Nolan Creek/ South Nolan Creek	Bell	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	1996
1218C	Little Nolan Creek	Bell	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2010
1221	Leon River Below Proctor Lake	Comanche / Coryell	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	1996
1221A	Resley Creek	Comanche	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2004
1221A	Resley Creek	Comanche	5r	Depressed dissolved oxygen in water	2006
1221B	South Leon River	Comanche	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1221C	Pecan Creek	Hamilton	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1221D	Indian Creek	Comanche	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006

Segment Number	Segment Name	County	Category	Parameter of Concern	Year First Listed
1221G	Coryell Creek	Coryell	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2020
1222A	Duncan Creek	Comanche	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	1999
1222B	Rush-Copperas Creek	Comanche	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1222C	Sabana River	Comanche / Eastland	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1222E	Sweetwater Creek	Comanche	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1223	Leon River Below Leon Reservoir	Comanche / Eastland	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1223	Leon River Below Leon Reservoir	Comanche / Eastland	5c	Depressed dissolved oxygen in water	2008
1226B	Green Creek	Erath	5c	Depressed dissolved oxygen in water	2006
1226G	Spring Creek	Hamilton	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2018
1226K	Little Duffau Creek	Erath	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1227	Nolan River	Hill / Johnson	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2018
1227	Nolan River	Hill / Johnson	5b	Chloride in water	2006
1227	Nolan River	Hill / Johnson	5b	Sulfate in water	2002
1227	Nolan River	Hill / Johnson	5b	Total dissolved solids in water	2006
1228	Lake Pat Cleburne	Johnson	5c	Excessive algal growth in water	2022
1231	Lake Graham	Young	5c	Excessive algal growth in water	2022
1232	Clear Fork Brazos River	Fisher	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2018
1232A	California Creek	Haskell / Jones	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2010
1232A	California Creek	Haskell / Jones	5c	Impaired fish community in water	2016
1237	Lake Sweetwater	Nolan	5c	Chloride in water	2022
1237	Lake Sweetwater	Nolan	5c	Sulfate in water	2022
1237	Lake Sweetwater	Nolan	5c	Total dissolved solids in water	2022
1238	Salt Fork Brazos River	Kent / Crosby	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2020
1238	Salt Fork Brazos River	Kent / Crosby	5c	Chloride in water	2002

Segment Number	Segment Name	County	Category	Parameter of Concern	Year First Listed
1241	Double Mountain Fork Brazos River	Stonewall / Kent	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2010
1241B	Lake Alan Henry	Garza / Kent	5c	Mercury in edible tissue	2010
1242B	Cottonwood Branch	Brazos	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1242C	Still Creek	Brazos	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1242D	Thompsons Creek	Brazos	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1242D	Thompsons Creek	Brazos	5b	Depressed dissolved oxygen in water	2006
1242F	Pond Creek	Falls	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2010
1242I	Campbells Creek	Falls	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1242J	Deer Creek	Falls	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1242K	Mud Creek	Robertson	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1242L	Pin Oak Creek	Robertson	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1242M	Spring Creek	Robertson	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1242N	Tehuacana Creek	Hill / McLennan	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1242O	Walnut Creek	Robertson	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1242P	Big Creek	Falls	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1244	Brushy Creek	Milam / Williamson	5r	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2006
1246E	Wasp Creek	Coryell / McLennan	5b	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1247A	Willis Creek	Williamson	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1248	San Gabriel/North Fork San Gabriel River	Williamson	5c	Chloride in water	2010
1248C	Mankins Branch	Williamson	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2004
1250	South Fork San Gabriel River	Burnet / Williamson	5c	Total dissolved solids in water	2024
1255	Upper North Bosque River	Erath	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	1996

Segment Number	Segment Name	County	Category	Parameter of Concern	Year First Listed
1255	Upper North Bosque River	Erath	5c	Depressed dissolved oxygen in water	2008
1255A	Goose Branch	Erath	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1255C	Scarborough Creek	Erath	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1255D	South Fork Upper North Bosque River	Erath	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2010
1255E	Unnamed Tributary of Goose Branch	Erath	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002
1255G	Woodhollow Branch	Erath	5c	Bacteria in water (Recreation Use)	2002

The TCEQ has the responsibility to identify and prioritize water bodies that may require a TMDL allocation to address the cause and source of water quality impairment.

These water quality issues are beyond the scope of regional water planning activities. The Brazos G RWPG encourages TCEQ and EPA to take responsibility and pursue their obligation to restore water quality to meet intended uses.

A substantial part of the salt load in the Brazos River is contributed by Croton Creek and Salt Croton Creek. The natural salt pollution producing area is a semi-arid region of salt and gypsum encrusted hills and canyon-like stream valleys. The area is studded with salt springs and seeps. Wherever there is a joint or fracture in the stream bedrock material, the highly mineralized water seeps to the surface under artesian pressure. Massive salt flats, often 400 to 500 acres in size, are formed by this process. Salt and other minerals are also leached out of the adjacent floodplain material that surrounds the salt flats and streams. The Brazos River receives a tremendous salt load when local rainfall is sufficient to dissolve the deposited salt and wash it out of the salt flats. Naturally occurring salinity, commonly measured as total dissolved solids (TDS), has long been recognized as an issue in the Brazos Basin.

The TCEQ has issued a secondary standard for TDS of 1,000 mg/L. Water sources with TDS concentrations exceeding this standard are generally considered as low quality and may require higher cost advanced treatment methods for use as a municipal or industrial supply. This concentration is routinely exceeded in the upper Brazos Basin, but tributary inflows of relatively low TDS water gradually reduces TDS concentrations in a downstream direction. TDS concentrations at the Seymour gage equal or exceed the TDS limit in 99.7 percent of the period of record, with a mean concentration of 3,356 mg/L. Further downstream, TDS concentrations average 1,512 mg/L at Possum Kingdom Lake and 928 mg/L at Lake Whitney, exceeding the secondary standard in 93.6 percent of the months and in 40.0 percent of the months, respectively. At College Station, concentrations equal or exceed the TDS limit in 2.2 percent of the months, with an average concentration of 438 mg/L.

Finally, at the Richmond gage, the downstream-most gage with available data (92 river miles above the Gulf of Mexico), TDS concentrations do not exceed the secondary standard and have an average concentration of 339 mg/L.

3.3.2 Comparison of Supplies with Water Quality Standards

Numerous stream segments within the Brazos G Area are listed on the State's 303(d) list for bacteria levels that exceed the standards for contact recreation; however, bacteria, unlike salts, are easily managed through required conventional water treatment to meet drinking water standards.

3.3.3 Special Water Quality Studies and Activities in the Brazos River Basin

There are several special water quality studies that are on-going in the Brazos River Basin as described in the BRA's 2022 Basin Summary Report. A list of special studies by basin is provided below.

3.3.3.1 Upper Basin Region

- Biological Assessments of California Creek.

3.3.3.2 Upper Central Basin Activity Region

- Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Improvement Project, a partnership initiated in 2016 between BRA and the TPWD to perform habitat improvement projects on Possum Kingdom Lake, Lake Granbury, Lake Proctor, Lake Aquilla, Lake Whitney, Lake Belton, Stillhouse Hollow Lake, Lake Georgetown, Lake Granger, Lake Limestone, and Lake Somerville.
- Brazos Basin Instream Flow Monitoring Program to Inform on Environmental Flow Standards, initiated by the BRA in 2012 to perform extensive environmental studies at select locations in the Brazos River basin to gather data related to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality's adopted Senate Bill 3 environmental flow baseline.
- A Total Maximum Daily Load for Atrazine in Aquilla Reservoir.
- Two Total Maximum Daily Loads for Phosphorus in the North Bosque River.
- Biological Assessments initiated by BRA for long-term aquatic life monitoring on the North Bosque River at Cooper's Crossing in 2008.
- A Watershed Protection Plan for the Leon River developed by stakeholders and approved by the EPA in early 2015 and presently in the implementation phase.
- A Watershed Protection Plan for Nolan Creek/South Nolan Creek developed by the Nolan Creek Watershed Partnership and accepted by the EPA in February 2019.
- Belton Lake, Proctor Lake, and Stillhouse Hollow Lake are part of a Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Improvement project.
- Biological Assessments in Resley Creek (an unclassified tributary of the Leon River) and the Leon River above Belton Lake.
- The Lampasas River Watershed Protection Plan to address bacteria issues in the watershed was approved by the EPA in May 2013 and by a Steering Committee in September 2013 and is in the implementation phase.

3.3.3.3 Lower Central Basin Activity Region

- Big Elm Watershed Protection Plan.
- Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances for the Balcones Spike and Texas Fawnsfoot in the Brazos River Basin.
- The USACE Sustainable Rivers Program presently underway to bring projects to the Little River System which will evaluate reservoir release strategies using the lower fraction of the USACE controlled reservoir flood pools, including Lake Georgetown, Lake Granger, Stillhouse Hollow Lake, and Lake Belton.
- Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Improvement Project
- Characterization of Middle Yegua, Davidson, and Deer Creeks project.
- Watershed Characterization of the Thompsons Creek Watershed.
- TPWD Tehuacana Creek water quality reporting.
- Navasota River Below Lake Limestone Watershed Protection Plan.
- Three Total Maximum Daily Loads for Indicator Bacteria in the Carters Creek Watershed.
- Brazos Basin Instream Flow Monitoring Program to Inform on Environmental Flow Standards.
- Biological Assessments on Duck Creek.

3.3.3.4 Lower Basin Activity Region

- Characterization of Middle Yegua, Davidson, and Deer Creeks.
- Reservoir Fisheries Habitat Improvement.

3.4 Groundwater Availability

Seventeen aquifers underlie parts of the Brazos G Area, including six of the major and 11 of the minor aquifers in Texas[3]. The locations of the major and minor aquifers are shown in Chapter 1 of this report.

3.4.1 Method of Determination

When available, the amount of groundwater available for development is based on the TWDB's determination of modeled available groundwater (MAG), which is based on desired future conditions (DFC), as established by members of groundwater conservation districts within a groundwater management area (GMA). If a groundwater availability model (GAM) is available for an aquifer, it is to be used by the TWDB in making the MAG determination. Otherwise, the TWDB uses analytical methods.

In the Brazos G Area, an official MAG has been determined by the TWDB at the county and river basin level for each of the delineated aquifers. The GMAs are shown in Figure 3.18.

In general terms, the MAG represents the annual volume of groundwater available which may be developed and, according to modeling, will still maintain aquifer parameters within the criteria established in the aquifer DFCs. When evaluating proposed pumping for regulatory approval, the MAG serves as a guideline and may be one of multiple guidelines referenced. However, for planning purposes, the MAGs are considered hard caps of which annual groundwater production cannot exceed.

[3] TWDB, Water for Texas, 2019.

The MAG determination is based upon drought-of-record conditions which would occur simultaneously with increased, dry-year demands.

For aquifers without an adopted MAG, the TWDB provided "total availability" estimates that are based on results from groundwater modeling during the development of the MAGs for other aquifers. For other aquifers, Brazos G utilized the groundwater availability estimate carried forward from the 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan; these were determined based on a variety of sources, predominately information from historical TWDB groundwater reports and the TWDB groundwater database. Table 3.12 presents the methodology used in determining availability for aquifers for which MAG volumes have not been assigned.

Table 3.12 Groundwater Availability Methodology for Non-MAG Aquifers in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

Aquifer Name	County	Source Availability Methodology
Blaine Aquifer	Jones	New source. Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. All values are zero. Re: GAM Run: GR21-011_MAG
Blaine Aquifer	Kent	New source. Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. All values are zero. Re: GAM Run: GR21-011_MAG
Blaine Aquifer	Knox	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Blaine Aquifer	Knox	New source. Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. All values are zero. Re: GAM Run: GR21-011_MAG
Blaine Aquifer	Nolan	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 7. Total availability values of 100 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with no source description.
Blaine Aquifer	Stonewall	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer	Bosque	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. Total availability values of 830 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with no source description.
Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer	Falls	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. Total availability values of 5,112 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with no source description.
Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer	Hill	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. Total availability values of 632 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with no source description.
Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer	McLennan	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. Total availability values of 15,023 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with no source description.
Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer	Washington	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. Total availability values of 5,770 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with no source description.
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. Total availability values of 3 to 8 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on "NR DFC-Compatible amounts".
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. Total availability values of 1 to 4 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on "NR DFC-Compatible amounts".
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Callahan	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. All values are zero.

Aquifer Name	County	Source Availability Methodology
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Callahan	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Comanche	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Eastland	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Eastland	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Erath	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Haskell	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Hood	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6 nor GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Jones	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Lampasas	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Palo Pinto	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6 nor GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Shackelford	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6. Total availability values of 712 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on the 99 wells in the Cross Timbers Aquifer in the TWDB Groundwater Database.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Stephens	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6. Total availability values of 620 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on the 334 wells in the Cross Timbers Aquifer in the TWDB Groundwater Database.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Throckmorton	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6. Total availability values of 364 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on Cross Timbers Aquifer comprising 45 percent of wells in this split.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Young	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6. Total availability values of 799 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on Cross Timbers Aquifer comprising the majority of wells in this split.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Young	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 6. Total availability values of 219 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on Cross Timbers Aquifer comprising the majority of wells in this split.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Taylor	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 7 nor GMA 8. All values are zero.
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Taylor	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 7 nor GMA 8. All values are zero.
Dockum Aquifer	Kent	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Dockum Aquifer	Nolan	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Dockum Aquifer	Nolan	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Edwards-Trinity-Plateau, Pecos Valley, and Trinity Aquifers	Nolan	Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. Re: GAM Run: GR21-012_MAG
Edwards-Trinity-Plateau, Pecos Valley, and Trinity Aquifers	Nolan	Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. Re: GAM Run: GR21-012_MAG

Aquifer Name	County	Source Availability Methodology
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Brazos	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 12. Total availability values of 1,189 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with no source description.
Hickory Aquifer	Williamson	Reactivated source. Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. All values are zero. Re: GAM Run: GR21-013_MAG
Hickory Aquifer	Williamson	Reactivated source. Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. All values are zero. Re: GAM Run: GR21-013_MAG
Navasota River Alluvium Aquifer	Grimes	Not an official TWDB aquifer and not modeled. Total availability values of 2,216 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with no source description.
Other Aquifer	Shackelford	Not an official TWDB aquifer and not modeled. Total availability values of 97 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on Cenozoic Quaternary deposits and Paleozoic Permian and Pennsylvanian deposits.
Other Aquifer	Stephens	Not an official TWDB aquifer and not modeled. Total availability values of 85 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on Quaternary deposits, Mesozoic Cretaceous deposits, and Paleozoic Permian and Pennsylvanian deposits.
Other Aquifer	Williamson	Not an official TWDB aquifer and not modeled. Total availability values of 665 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on Cenozoic Quaternary and Tertiary deposits and Mesozoic Cretaceous deposits.
Queen City Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Queen City Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Queen City Aquifer	Washington	Reactivated source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Seymour Aquifer	Taylor	New source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 7. All values are zero.
Seymour Aquifer	Throckmorton	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Seymour Aquifer	Young	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Seymour Aquifer	Kent	Recommended update to availability. See Appendix L of Tech Memo.
Seymour Aquifer	Jones	Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values for GMA 6 Seymour Pod 11, Pod 12, Pod 13, Pod 14, and Pod 15. Re: GAM Run: GR21-011_MAG
Seymour Aquifer	Stonewall	Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values for GMA 6 Seymour Pod 7, Pod 9, Pod 10, and Pod 11. Re: GAM Run: GR21-011_MAG
Sparta Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Sparta Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Sparta Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Sparta Aquifer	Washington	Reactivated source. Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Trinity Aquifer	Lee	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 12. All values are zero.
Trinity Aquifer	Lee	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 12. All values are zero.

Aquifer Name	County	Source Availability Methodology
Trinity Aquifer	Palo Pinto	Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. Re: GAM Run: GR21-013_MAG
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. Total availability values of 479 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on "NR DFC-Compatible amounts".
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Grimes	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. Total availability values of 308 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on "NR DFC-Compatible amounts".
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Lee	Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. Re: GAM Run: GR21-017_MAG
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Lee	Non-relevant DFC-compatible modeled pumping values. Re: GAM Run: GR21-017_MAG
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Washington	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. All values are zero.
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Washington	Non-relevant and not modeled for GMA 14. Total availability values of 157 acre-feet/year are from 2022 State Water Plan database with source description based on "NR modeled value".

Table 3.13 summarizes groundwater availability by county and aquifer. The sources of the estimates are described in Appendix B. The distribution of groundwater availability is summarized into western, central and southeastern areas. As tabulated in Table 3.14 and shown in Figure 3.18, the groundwater in the Brazos G Area is not uniformly distributed, with about 15 percent occurring in the western area, about 33 percent in the central area, and about 52 percent in the eastern area.



Figure 3.18 Groundwater Management Areas in Brazos G

Table 3.13 Groundwater Availability Used in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

County	Aquifer	Availability (acre-feet/year)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Bell	Edwards-BFZ (N. Segment)	6,469	6,469	6,469	6,469	6,469	6,469
Bell	Trinity	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275
Bell	**Subtotal**	**15,744**	**15,744**	**15,744**	**15,744**	**15,744**	**15,744**
Bosque	Brazos River Alluvium[1]	830	830	830	830	830	830
Bosque	Trinity	8,769	8,769	8,769	8,769	8,769	8,769
Bosque	**Subtotal**	**9,599**	**9,599**	**9,599**	**9,599**	**9,599**	**9,599**
Brazos	Brazos River Alluvium	76,978	76,393	76,195	76,100	76,039	76,039
Brazos	Carrizo-Wilcox	44,153	50,160	56,168	62,176	68,184	68,184
Brazos	Gulf Coast[1]	1,189	1,189	1,189	1,189	1,189	1,189
Brazos	Queen City	245	357	469	582	694	694
Brazos	Sparta	6,014	7,545	9,076	10,607	12,138	12,138

County	Aquifer	Availability (acre-feet/year)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Brazos	Yegua-Jackson	6,270	7,092	7,091	7,091	7,091	7,091
Brazos	**Subtotal[2]**	**134,849**	**142,736**	**150,188**	**157,745**	**165,335**	**165,335**
Burleson	Brazos River Alluvium	32,207	32,207	32,206	32,206	32,206	32,206
Burleson	Carrizo-Wilcox	56,468	65,638	69,407	69,579	69,750	69,750
Burleson	Queen City	3,090	3,467	3,883	4,344	4,863	4,863
Burleson	Sparta	2,840	3,131	3,437	3,760	4,105	4,105
Burleson	Yegua-Jackson	5,315	7,004	7,004	7,000	6,058	6,058
Burleson	**Subtotal**	**99,920**	**111,447**	**115,937**	**116,889**	**116,982**	**116,982**
Callahan	Trinity	1,726	1,726	1,726	1,726	1,726	1,726
Callahan	**Subtotal**	**1,726**	**1,726**	**1,726**	**1,726**	**1,726**	**1,726**
Comanche	Trinity	12,047	12,047	12,047	12,047	12,047	12,047
Comanche	**Subtotal**	**12,047**	**12,047**	**12,047**	**12,047**	**12,047**	**12,047**
Coryell	Trinity	4,494	4,494	4,494	4,494	4,494	4,494
Coryell	**Subtotal**	**4,494**	**4,494**	**4,494**	**4,494**	**4,494**	**4,494**
Eastland	Trinity	5,736	5,736	5,736	5,736	5,736	5,736
Eastland	**Subtotal**	**5,736**	**5,736**	**5,736**	**5,736**	**5,736**	**5,736**
Erath	Trinity	20,607	20,607	20,607	20,607	20,607	20,607
Erath	**Subtotal**	**20,607**	**20,607**	**20,607**	**20,607**	**20,607**	**20,607**
Falls	Brazos River Alluvium	16,684	16,684	16,684	16,684	16,684	16,684
Falls	Carrizo-Wilcox	46	50	56	62	69	69
Falls	Trinity	1,435	1,435	1,435	1,435	1,435	1,435
Falls	**Subtotal**	**18,165**	**18,169**	**18,175**	**18,181**	**18,188**	**18,188**
Fisher	Blaine	12,820	12,820	12,820	12,820	12,820	12,820
Fisher	Dockum	79	79	79	79	79	79
Fisher	Seymour	6,132	6,132	6,472	6,473	6,131	5,900
Fisher	**Subtotal**	**19,031**	**19,031**	**19,371**	**19,372**	**19,030**	**18,799**
Grimes	Brazos River Alluvium[1]	5,112	5,112	5,112	5,112	5,112	5,112
Grimes	Carrizo-Wilcox[1]	4	4	4	4	12	4
Grimes	Gulf Coast	51,487	51,487	51,487	51,487	51,487	51,487
Grimes	Navasota River Alluvium[1]	2,216	2,216	2,216	2,216	2,216	2,216
Grimes	Queen City[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grimes	Sparta[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grimes	Yegua-Jackson[1]	787	787	787	787	787	787
Grimes	**Subtotal**	**59,606**	**59,606**	**59,606**	**59,606**	**59,614**	**59,606**
Hamilton	Trinity	2,427	2,427	2,427	2,427	2,427	2,427
Hamilton	**Subtotal**	**2,427**	**2,427**	**2,427**	**2,427**	**2,427**	**2,427**
Haskell	Seymour	41,638	41,752	41,638	41,752	41,638	41,752

County	Aquifer	Availability (acre-feet/year)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Haskell	**Subtotal**	**41,638**	**41,752**	**41,638**	**41,752**	**41,638**	**41,752**
Hill	Brazos River Alluvium(1)	632	632	632	632	632	632
Hill	Trinity	5,152	5,152	5,152	5,152	5,152	5,152
Hill	Woodbine	586	586	586	586	586	586
Hill	**Subtotal**	**6,370**	**6,370**	**6,370**	**6,370**	**6,370**	**6,370**
Hood	Trinity	16,839	16,839	16,839	16,839	16,839	16,839
Hood	**Subtotal**	**16,839**	**16,839**	**16,839**	**16,839**	**16,839**	**16,839**
Johnson	Trinity	8,825	8,825	8,825	8,825	8,825	8,825
Johnson	Woodbine	1,981	1,981	1,981	1,981	1,981	1,981
Johnson	**Subtotal**	**10,806**	**10,806**	**10,806**	**10,806**	**10,806**	**10,806**
Jones	Seymour(1)	3,552	3,554	3,554	3,557	3,560	3,563
Jones	**Subtotal**	**3,552**	**3,554**	**3,554**	**3,557**	**3,560**	**3,563**
Kent	Dockum(1)	6,250	6,250	6,250	6,250	6,250	6,250
Kent	Seymour(1)	1,180	1,180	1,179	1,179	1,179	1,179
Kent	**Subtotal**	**7,430**	**7,430**	**7,429**	**7,429**	**7,429**	**7,429**
Knox	Blaine(1)	700	700	700	700	700	700
Knox	Seymour	26,640	26,222	26,530	29,157	26,973	26,807
Knox	**Subtotal**	**27,340**	**26,922**	**27,230**	**29,857**	**27,673**	**27,507**
Lampasas	Ellenburger-San Saba	2,595	2,595	2,595	2,595	2,595	2,595
Lampasas	Hickory	113	113	113	113	113	113
Lampasas	Marble Falls	2,839	2,839	2,839	2,839	2,839	2,839
Lampasas	Trinity	1,661	1,661	1,661	1,661	1,661	1,661
Lampasas	**Subtotal**	**7,208**	**7,208**	**7,208**	**7,208**	**7,208**	**7,208**
Lee	Carrizo-Wilcox	29,283	30,948	32,683	34,517	36,187	36,187
Lee	Queen City	700	767	839	917	1,000	1,000
Lee	Sparta	809	975	1,181	1,434	1,751	1,751
Lee	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lee	Yegua-Jackson(1)	662	662	662	662	662	662
Lee	**Subtotal**	**31,454**	**33,352**	**35,365**	**37,530**	**39,600**	**39,600**
Limestone	Carrizo-Wilcox	960	1,059	1,168	1,288	1,422	1,422
Limestone	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limestone	**Subtotal**	**960**	**1,059**	**1,168**	**1,288**	**1,422**	**1,422**
McLennan	Brazos River Alluvium(1)	15,023	15,023	15,023	15,023	15,023	15,023
McLennan	Trinity	20,649	20,649	20,649	20,649	20,649	20,649
McLennan	Woodbine	0	0	0	0	0	0
McLennan	**Subtotal**	**35,672**	**35,672**	**35,672**	**35,672**	**35,672**	**35,672**

County	Aquifer	Availability (acre-feet/year)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Milam	Brazos River Alluvium	31,375	31,366	31,362	31,359	31,358	31,358
Milam	Carrizo-Wilcox	31,300	32,246	33,283	34,431	35,710	35,710
Milam	Queen City	1,348	1,643	2,003	2,441	2,976	2,976
Milam	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milam	**Subtotal**	**64,023**	**65,255**	**66,648**	**68,231**	**70,044**	**70,044**
Nolan	Blaine(1)	100	100	100	100	100	100
Nolan	Dockum(1)	5,750	5,750	5,750	5,750	5,750	5,750
Nolan	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) (1)	693	693	693	693	693	693
Nolan	**Subtotal**	**6,543**	**6,543**	**6,543**	**6,543**	**6,543**	**6,543**
Palo Pinto	Trinity(1)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Palo Pinto	**Subtotal**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**
Robertson	Brazos River Alluvium	55,424	55,157	54,839	54,723	54,618	54,618
Robertson	Carrizo-Wilcox	49,164	58,979	68,795	78,609	88,424	88,424
Robertson	Queen City	144	252	359	467	575	575
Robertson	Sparta	338	509	680	851	1,022	1,022
Robertson	**Subtotal**	**105,070**	**114,897**	**124,673**	**134,650**	**144,639**	**144,639**
Shackelford	Cross Timbers(1)	712	712	712	712	712	712
Shackelford	Other (Local) Aquifer(1)	97	97	97	97	97	97
Shackelford	**Subtotal**	**809**	**809**	**809**	**809**	**809**	**809**
Somervell	Trinity	1,988	1,988	1,988	1,988	1,988	1,988
Somervell	**Subtotal**	**1,988**	**1,988**	**1,988**	**1,988**	**1,988**	**1,988**
Stephens	Cross Timbers(1)	620	620	620	620	620	620
Stephens	Other (Local) Aquifer(1)	85	85	85	85	85	85
Stephens	**Subtotal**	**705**	**705**	**705**	**705**	**705**	**705**
Stonewall	Blaine(1)	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700
Stonewall	Seymour(1)	254	254	253	254	253	254
Stonewall	**Subtotal**	**8,954**	**8,954**	**8,953**	**8,954**	**8,953**	**8,954**
Taylor	Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)(1)	489	489	489	489	489	489
Taylor	Trinity	14	14	14	14	14	14
Taylor	**Subtotal**	**503**	**503**	**503**	**503**	**503**	**503**
Throckmorton	Seymour(1)	115	115	115	115	115	115
Throckmorton	Cross Timbers(1)	364	364	364	364	364	364
Throckmorton	**Subtotal**	**479**	**479**	**479**	**479**	**479**	**479**
Washington	Brazos River Alluvium(1)	5,770	5,770	5,770	5,770	5,770	5,770
Washington	Gulf Coast	40,397	40,397	40,397	40,397	40,397	40,397

County	Aquifer	Availability (acre-feet/year)					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Washington	Yegua-Jackson(1)	157	157	157	157	157	157
Washington	**Subtotal**	**46,324**	**46,324**	**46,324**	**46,324**	**46,324**	**46,324**
Williamson	Carrizo-Wilcox	140	155	171	189	208	208
Williamson	Edwards-BFZ	3,462	3,462	3,462	3,462	3,462	3,462
Williamson	Hickory	0	0	0	0	0	0
Williamson	Trinity	3,698	3,698	3,698	3,698	3,698	3,698
Williamson	Other (Local) Aquifer(1)	665	665	665	665	665	665
Williamson	**Subtotal**	**7,965**	**7,980**	**7,996**	**8,014**	**8,033**	**8,033**
Young	Seymour(1)	258	258	258	258	258	258
Young	Cross Timbers(1)	1,718	1,718	1,718	1,718	1,718	1,718
Young	**Subtotal**	**1,976**	**1,976**	**1,976**	**1,976**	**1,976**	**1,976**

Notes:
BFZ – Balcones Fault Zone
(1) Indicates Non-MAG availability estimate.
(2) Values calculated using MAG Peak Factor for the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Brazos County.

Table 3.14 Groundwater Availability from the Brazos G Area Aquifers

Aquifer	2080 Groundwater Availability (ac-ft/yr)	Typical Range in Well Yields (gpm)
Western Area		
Blaine	22,320	less than 25
Cross Timbers	3,414	5 to 300
Dockum	12,079	100 to 400
Other (Local) Aquifers	182	5 to 300
Edwards-Trinity-Plateau(1)	1,182	5 to 300
Seymour	79,828	100 to 1,000
Subtotal: 119,005		
Central Area		
Edwards-BFZ(2)	9,931	200 to 2,000
Ellenburger-San Saba	2,595	Unknown
Hickory	113	Unknown
Marble Falls	2,839	less than 100
Trinity	125,343	50 to 500
Woodbine	2,567	50 to 150
Subtotal: 143,388		
Southeastern Area		
Brazos River Alluvium	238,272	250 to 500
Carrizo-Wilcox	299,958	100 to 3,000
Gulf Coast	93,073	300 to 800

Aquifer	2080 Groundwater Availability (ac-ft/yr)	Typical Range in Well Yields (gpm)
Navasota River Alluvium	2,216	Unknown
Other (Local) Aquifers	665	5 to 300
Queen City	10,108	200 to 500
Sparta	19,016	200 to 600
Yegua-Jackson	14,755	50 to 300
Subtotal: 678,063		
Total: 940,456		

Notes:
(1) Includes supply from Pecos Valley Aquifer and part of Trinity Aquifer.



Figure 3.19 Distribution of Groundwater by Area within Brazos G

3.4.2 Western Area

As shown in Figure 3.20 and Figure 3.21, the aquifers underlaying the Western Area of the Brazos G Planning Region are Blaine, Cross Timbers, Dockum, Edwards-Trinity (Plateau), and Seymour. Together, the five aquifers, as well as other (local) aquifers, can supply up to 119,005 ac-ft/yr. Of the five aquifers, the Seymour Aquifer has about 67 percent (Figure 3.22) of the supplies and is scattered in nine counties; however, about 86 percent of the supply is in Knox and Haskell Counties. The Blaine Aquifer contributes the second-most amount of supplies in the area, or 19 percent. The Dockum Aquifer exists only on the western fringe and can contribute about 10 percent of the groundwater supply in the area. The Cross

Timbers and Edwards-Trinity-Plateau Aquifers contribute three and one percent of the groundwater supply in the area, respectively. Undifferentiated aquifers underlie some of the area, including in Shackelford and Stephens Counties. At best, the undifferentiated aquifers can provide only meager supplies for livestock and domestic uses.



Figure 3.20 Major Aquifers in the Western Area



Figure 3.21 Minor Aquifers in the Western Area



Figure 3.22 Groundwater Availability in the Western Area

3.4.3 Central Area

As seen in Figure 3.23 and Figure 3.24, major and minor aquifers exist the central area of the Brazos G Planning Region. Together, the six aquifers (Edwards-BFZ, Ellenburger-San Saba, Hickory, Marble Falls, Trinity, and Woodbine) can provide up to 143,388 ac-ft/yr. Of these aquifers, the Trinity Aquifer is most extensive and has about 87 percent of the supplies (Figure 3.25). Although the Trinity Aquifer as a whole can provide 125,343 ac-ft/yr, local areas have experienced very substantial drawdowns and probably will require many wells to be replaced with larger and deeper ones. The Edwards-BFZ exists only in parts of Bell and Williamson Counties and has about seven percent of the area's groundwater supply.



Figure 3.23 Major Aquifers in the Central Area



Figure 3.24 Minor Aquifers in the Central Area



Figure 3.25 Groundwater Availability in the Central Area

3.4.4 Southeastern Area

As seen in Figure 3.26 and Figure 3.27, major and minor aquifers exist throughout the southeastern area in the Brazos G Planning Region. Together, the seven aquifers (Brazos River Alluvium, Carrizo-Wilcox, Gulf Coast, Navasota River Alluvium, Queen City, Sparta, and Yegua-Jackson), as well as other (local) aquifers, can provide up to 678,063 ac-ft/yr. Of these aquifers, the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and Brazos River Alluvium Aquifers are most extensive and represent 44 and 35 percent of the supplies, respectively (Figure 3.28).

3.5 Existing Reuse Water Availability

Water reuse is the practice of using treated wastewater for a beneficial purpose. The Texas Administrative Code defines reclaimed water as "domestic or municipal wastewater that has been treated to a quality suitable for a beneficial use". Reuse water can be broadly characterized as one of two types: (1) direct reuse, or wastewater that is reused without first being discharged into a stream or watercourse, and (2) indirect reuse, in which wastewater is discharged to a stream or other watercourse prior to being diverted for use. Reuse water supplies available to the individual WUGs described below were determined through an extensive survey process, where entities were asked not only to provide population growth patterns, but also water use and water supply. Each WUG was asked to identify their water supply source and supply volume.

Region G demonstrates a well-established portfolio of reuse water sources, totaling over 41,914 ac-ft/yr of consistent supply through 2080. Both direct and indirect reuse sources are actively contributing to municipal, industrial, and agricultural demands, with varying treatment requirements and long-term stability across the planning horizon. The reuse is classified as follows:

1. **Indirect Potable Reuse:** Applied mainly in municipal settings such as Abilene and County-other, Johnson, with conventional treatment in place. Supplies remain stable through 2080, with Abilene alone accounting for 7,840 ac-ft/yr.
2. **Direct Potable Reuse:** Limited in application, with only Rotan currently utilizing this method. Supply is minimal, declining from nine ac-ft/yr to six ac-ft/yr by 2080 and treated conventionally.
3. **Direct Non-Potable Reuse:** The most prominent category, supporting irrigation, municipal non-potable, and steam-electric operations. Major contributors include:
    a. Round Rock WWTP with over 4,320 ac-ft/yr (advanced treatment).
    b. Steam-Electric power in Bell, Johnson, and McLennan counties, totaling over 26,424 ac-ft/yr.
    c. Abilene- supplied irrigation users across Taylor, Jones, and Shackelford counties, totaling over 1,016 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning period.

3.6 Supplies from Other Regions

Multiple entities within the Brazos G Area obtain water from sources owned by entities located outside of the Region. These other sources include the Edwards Trinity Plateau Aquifer, Lake Benbrook, Brownwood Reservoir, Navarro Mills Reservoir, the Colorado River MWD System, Lake Livingston (Trinity River Authority), Lake Corsicana, Halbert Lake, OH Ivie Lake, the Cross Timbers Aquifer, Richland Chambers and/or Cedar Creek Reservoirs (Tarrant Regional Water District [TRWD]), and the Highland Lakes System (LCRA). Table 3.15 summarizes the current supplies from other regions to the Brazos G Area.



Document Path: \\dalctxsrv01\Texas_GIS_Projects\10029705_036_Brazos_G_2021_Plan\Map_Docs\MXDs\Chapter3\BrazosG_Major_Aquifers_East.mxd

Figure 3.26 Major Aquifers in the Eastern Area



Document Path: \\dalctxsrv01\Texas_GIS_Projects\10029705_036_Brazos_G_2021_Plan\Map_Docs\MXDs\Chapter3\BrazosG_MinorAquifers_East.mxd

Figure 3.27 Minor Aquifers in the Eastern Area



Figure 3.28 Groundwater Availability in the Southeastern Area

Table 3.15 Water Supplies from Other Regions

Receiving Entity	Supplier	Source[1]	Source Region	Contract Amount or Amount Supplied in 2030 (ac-ft)
Abilene	Colorado River MWD	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	4721
Baird	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	77
Baylor SUD	Self-supplied	Seymour Aquifer | Baylor County	B	28
Bethesda WSC	Arlington	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	1362
Bethesda WSC	Fort Worth	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	2896
Bethesda WSC	Self-supplied	Trinity Aquifer | Tarrant County	C	1736
Birome WSC	Post Oak SUD	Corsicana Richland Chambers-Halbert Lake/Reservoir System & Navarro Mills lake	C	147
Block House MUD	Cedar Park	Highland Lakes Lake/Reservoir System	K	1098
Burleson	Fort Worth	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	7076
Cedar Park	LCRA	Highland Lakes Lake/Reservoir System	K	21451
Clyde	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	407
Coleman County SUD	Brookesmith SUD	Brownwood Lake/Reservoir	F	718

Receiving Entity	Supplier	Source[1]	Source Region	Contract Amount or Amount Supplied in 2030 (ac-ft)
Coleman County SUD	Coleman	Coleman Lake/Reservoir & Hords Creek Lake	F	0
Coolidge	Post Oak SUD	Corsicana Richland Chambers-Halbert Lake/Reservoir System & Navarro Mills Lake	C	183
County-Other, Hill	Corsicana	Corsicana Richland Chambers-Halbert Lake/Reservoir System & Navarro Mills Lake	C	235
County-Other, Johnson	Grand Prairie	Fork Lake/Reservoir, Ray Hubbard Lake, Ray Roberts-Lewisville-Grapevine Lake/Reservoir System, Tawakoni Lake	D & C	628
County-Other, Johnson	Johnson County SUD	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	2290
County-Other, Taylor	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	165
County-Other, Williamson	Cedar Park	Highland Lakes Lake/Reservoir System	K	13
County-Other, Young	Self-supplied	Cross Timbers Aquifer	B	41
Crowley	Fort Worth	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	2798
Eula WSC	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	61
Fort Worth	Tarrant Regional WD	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	254652
Hamby WSC	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	176
Hawley WSC	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	307
Hubbard	Post Oak SUD	Corsicana Richland Chambers-Halbert Lake/Reservoir System & Navarro Mills lake	C	149
Hutto	Manville WSC	Colorado River Alluvium Aquifer & Edwards-BFZ Aquifer	K	462
Johnson County SUD	Mansfield	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	6255
Lakeside MUD 3	Manville WSC	Highland Lakes Lake/Reservoir System	K	345
Lawn	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	47
Leander	LCRA	Highland Lakes Lake/Reservoir System	K	24000
Mansfield	Tarrant Regional WD	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	39544
Manufacturing, Fisher	Rotan	Edwards-Trinity-Plateau and Pecos Valley Aquifers	F	4
Manufacturing, Johnson	Burleson	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	2
Manufacturing, Taylor	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	671
Manufacturing, Williamson	Cedar Park	Highland Lakes Lake/Reservoir System	K	347

Receiving Entity	Supplier	Source[1]	Source Region	Contract Amount or Amount Supplied in 2030 (ac-ft)
Manufacturing, Young	Olney	Olney-Cooper Lake/Reservoir System	B	68
Manville WSC	Self-supplied	Trinity Aquifer	K	280
Merkel	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	329
MSEC Enterprises	Self-supplied	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	H	44
Navarro Mills WSC	Corsicana	Navarro Mills Lake/Reservoir	C	240
North Runnels WSC	Winters	Winters Lake/Reservoir	F	0
Point Enterprise WSC	Self-supplied	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	C	65
Post Oak SUD	Corsicana	Corsicana Richland Chambers-Halbert Lake/Reservoir System & Navarro Mills lake	C	870
Potosi WSC	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	307
Rotan	Snyder	Colorado River MWD Lake/Reservoir System, Edwards-Trinity-Plateau and Pecos Valley Aquifers & Ogallala and Edwards-Trinity-High Plains Aquifers	F	258
Georgetown, Liberty Hill, and Round Rock	BRA	Highland Lakes Lake/Reservoir System	K	20928
Steamboat Mountain WSC	Abilene	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	307
Steam-Electric Power, Grimes	Huntsville	Livingston-Wallisville Lake/Reservoir System	H	6720
Tye	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	157
Venus	Midlothian	TRWD Lake/Reservoir System	C	1944
View Caps WSC	Abilene (from CRMWD)	OH Ivie Lake/Reservoir Non-System Portion	F	199
West End WSC	Self-supplied	Gulf Coast Aquifer System	H	34
Williamson County WSID 3	Manville WSC	Edwards-BFZ Aquifer	K	884
Williamson Travis Counties MUD 1	Cedar Park	Highland Lakes Lake/Reservoir System	K	989

Notes:
(1) Supplies available from out-of-region sources are as input into DB27 by the source planning area.
(2) The current contract allows 16.54% of the one-year safe yield of O.H. Ivie Reservoir. Supply shown is 2030 supply available.

3.7 Methods to Estimate Available Water Supplies in the Brazos G Area

3.7.1 Surface Water Supplies

Surface water in the Region available to meet projected demands consists of firm yield of reservoirs, dependable supply of run-of-river water rights through DOR conditions, and other local sources. Contracts and/or rights to reservoir yields and supplies from run-of-river rights were allocated as supplies to their stated type of use: municipal, industrial (manufacturing, steam-electric, and mining), and irrigation. Additionally, municipal supply was further allocated among cities and other municipal water supply entities. This allocation was done by obtaining water seller information (i.e., which contract/right holders - a wholesaler - are reselling water to other water supply entities) and water purchase contract limits between buyers and sellers. This information was obtained from TWDB files and follow-up queries to water supply entities. All water supply contracts were assumed to be renewed at their existing levels unless otherwise directed by local entities.

It was assumed that all livestock demands would be met from local water sources (e.g., shallow groundwater, stock ponds and riparian use of streams by livestock). These supplies are firm and would be available through a DOR given that they are supported by local, shallow groundwater sources when groundwater- based, and when surface water-based are reflected in the State's water availability models through the underlying streamflow gage data upon which the naturalized streamflows are based.

In certain instances, the entity's available water supply is constrained by lack of infrastructure. For example, an entity may hold a contract to divert water from a reservoir; however, the required pipeline has not been built. In this instance, the contract amount would not be included in the entity's available water supply or would be identified as a constrained supply.

In some instances, specific operational, contractual, or legal constraints required modifications to the general surface water allocation procedure.

3.7.2 Groundwater Allocation

For each county, total available groundwater was allocated among the six WUGs-municipal, manufacturing, steam-electric, mining, irrigation, and livestock-as described below. In some specific instances, these general procedures were modified to more accurately reflect the interactions between water demands, supplies, and needs.

3.7.2.1 Municipal Allocation

Municipal supplies were allocated to users from each aquifer as follows:

- Municipal supply is based upon well capacities. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the total MAG, the supply is prorated downward for every entity using that source.

3.7.2.2 Industrial (Steam-Electric and Manufacturing) Allocation

Industrial supply from groundwater sources is associated with aquifers underlying the river basin portion of the county. The industrial supply is generally calculated as 125 percent of the year 2020 use from each particular aquifer. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the MAG, supply is prorated downwards for every entity using that source.

3.7.2.3 Irrigation Allocation

Irrigation supply from groundwater sources is associated with aquifers underlying the river basin portion of the county. The irrigation supply is calculated as being equal to the projected demand in each decade. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the MAG, supply is prorated downward for every entity using that source.

3.7.2.4 Mining Allocation

Mining supply from groundwater sources is associated with aquifers underlying the river basin portion of the county. The mining supply is calculated as being equal to the projected demand in each decade. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the MAG, supply is prorated downward for every entity using that source.

3.7.3 Constraints on Surface Water Supplies

In determining needs (shortages), an emphasis has been placed not only on a WUG's total raw water supply availability, but also on their infrastructure available to deliver and treat this supply.

Based on TCEQ records, the normal-rated design (NRD) of each surface water treatment plant of public water suppliers located in the Brazos G Area was used to determine the existing peaking capacities to treat and deliver surface water supplies. The average annual capacity (AAC) for the Water Treatment Plant (WTP) was calculated as 50 percent of the NRD to account for peaking. For each WUG for which these data were available in the TCEQ database, the AAC was used to constrain the supply available from surface water sources and was incorporated into the needs analysis for each WUG by using a term referred to as "constrained supply." Constrained supply is defined as the amount of water available to a WUG considering the limiting effects of existing infrastructure. This methodology allows for water management strategies to be identified and developed that specifically address these constraints caused by limited infrastructure capacity. These strategies could include pipelines to existing reservoirs, treatment plant expansions, or other infrastructure required to deliver and treat water for the end user of the WUG. Generally, the only infrastructure constraint data that will be considered for the 2026 Plan is treatment capacity, as data on other types of infrastructure constraints are not readily available. Other constraints may have been added where the planning group was made aware of infrastructure capacity or lack of infrastructure. These infrastructure constraints were applied to the supply available for the WUG and to any contractual demands using that supply. Five municipal WUGs have presently indicated their available supply is constrained by treatment capacity, resulting in supply shortages.

3.7.4 Constraints on Groundwater Supplies

Like surface water availability, the groundwater supplies assume that the wells will be able to continue producing the supply into the foreseeable future. However, some of the MAGs adopted for use would allow substantial drawdown of aquifer levels, which would require that well pumps be lowered or, in some cases, that deeper replacement wells be drilled to continue to use the assumed supply available from the aquifer. This has been identified as a potential issue in the Trinity Aquifer but supplies to WUGs were not adjusted to account for this potential limitation.

3.8 Existing Supplies Allocated to WUGs

A table summarizing the final allocation of existing supplies by WUGs is shown in both the Executive Summary Appendix and Chapter 1 Appendix A as "Region G WUG Existing Water Supply."

3.9 Existing Supplies for Major Water Providers

Existing supplies summarized for Major Water Providers by decade and category of use are shown in Appendix O.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

CHAPTER 4 COMPARISON OF WATER DEMANDS WITH WATER SUPPLIES TO DETERMINE NEEDS

4.1 Introduction

In this section, the demand projections from Chapter 2 and the supply projections from Chapter 3 are brought together to estimate projected water needs in the Brazos G Area through year 2080.

4.2 Water Needs Projected for Water User Groups

If projected demands exceed projected supplies for a water user group (WUG), the difference or shortage, is identified as a "water need." This section contains a summary of the water needs (shortages) for WUGs located in the Brazos G Area. A table in the Executive Summary Appendix presents the water needs for each WUG by county as "Region G WUG Needs/Surplus."

Secondary, or Second-Tier, water needs are those water needs that would remain after implementation of recommended water conservation and reuse strategies. Secondary water needs are presented in the Executive Summary Appendix as "Region G WUG Second-Tier Identified Water Needs" and "Region G WUG Second-Tier Identified Water Needs Summary."

4.2.1 Projected Municipal Needs

Municipal WUGs with projected water shortages are listed in Table 4.1, along with the projected year 2050 and 2080 surplus/shortage volume, and the approximate decade that shortages are expected to begin. Within the table, projected shortages are represented as a negative number. WUGs located in multiple counties are indicated with (P) in Table 4.1, and the shortages identified are for the portion of the WUG located in the county identified. Shortages for portions of WUGs in counties outside of Brazos G for which Brazos G is the primary planning area are shown. For municipal WUGs that are also wholesale water providers (WWPs), supplies are first assigned to contractual customers, and remaining supplies are then assigned to the WUGs' own municipal demands. The shortages shown are for the WUGs' internal municipal demands and not shortages for any wholesale customers. Additional contractual demands associated with strategies recommended for WUGs and WWPs that are recommended to purchase additional water are shown in Chapter 5.

All 37 counties in the Brazos G Area are projected to have at least one municipal WUG shortage. The County-Other category includes water supply corporations, water districts, privately owned utilities, and small towns that generally supply less than 100 acre-feet (ac-ft) of water, in addition to private domestic water use that is not served by a water utility. The County-Other category is projected to experience shortages in 17 counties: Brazos, Comanche, Erath, Falls, Fisher, Grimes, Hill, Hood, Jones, Kent, Lee, McLennan, Milam, Palo Pinto, Robertson, Williamson, and Young.

Table 4.1 Municipal WUGs with Projected Water Needs

WUG	County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
439 WSC	Bell	0	0	-209	-421	-580	-672	2050
Bartlett	Bell	-1	0	0	0	0	0	2030
Bell County WCID 3	Bell	-374	-756	-1351	-1947	-2,092	-2,237	2030
Belton	Bell	0	0	-379	-1341	-2,141	-2,706	2050
Central Texas College District	Bell	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	-160	2030
County-Other, Bell	Bell	-510	-602	-638	-573	-459	-299	2030
Dog Ridge WSC	Bell	-102	-217	-307	-369	-439	-516	2030
Elm Creek WSC	Bell	-73	-93	-114	-136	-158	-181	2030
Georgetown	Bell	-114	-580	-797	-883	-961	-989	2030
Harker Heights	Bell	0	-813	-1957	-2348	-2,396	-2,443	2040
Jarrell-Schwertner	Bell	-141	-175	-198	-218	-242	-265	2030
Kempner WSC	Bell	-123	-117	-119	-132	-145	-158	2030
Killeen	Bell	0	0	0	0	-2,638	-6,217	2070
Salado WSC	Bell	0	0	-150	-523	-942	-1,413	2050
Temple	Bell	0	-210	-3923	-6801	-9,899	-13,239	2040
The Grove WSC	Bell	0	0	-4	-11	-16	-49	2050
Clifton	Bosque	0	-2	-98	-197	-302	-380	2040
Cross Country WSC	Bosque	0	-3	-7	-10	-14	-16	2040
Highland Park WSC	Bosque	-42	-39	-36	-32	-28	-24	2030
Hilco United Services	Bosque	-72	-85	-99	-114	-132	-153	2030
Hog Creek WSC	Bosque	-25	-25	-24	-22	-21	-20	2030
Bryan	Brazos	-12,612	-12,739	-16768	-21595	-29,704	-40,011	2030
College Station	Brazos	-7,548	-8,340	-12720	-18305	-17,636	-17,056	2030
County-Other, Brazos	Brazos	-60	0	0	0	-34	-93	2030
Texas A&M University	Brazos	-4,349	-3,988	-3988	-3988	-3,988	-3,988	2030
Wellborn SUD	Brazos	0	-398	-1533	-2955	-4,571	-6,400	2040
Wickson Creek SUD	Brazos	0	0	-179	-886	-1,677	-2,510	2050
Baird	Callahan	-232	-231	-228	-225	-221	-217	2030
Clyde	Callahan	-100	0	0	0	0	0	2030
Coleman County SUD	Callahan	-4	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5	2030
Eula WSC	Callahan	-136	-140	-144	-149	-153	-159	2030
Potosi WSC	Callahan	-26	-27	-27	-28	-27	-28	2030
County-Other, Comanche	Comanche	-364	-333	-292	-276	-256	-234	2030
Copperas Cove	Coryell	0	-991	-2286	-3150	-3,455	-3,152	2040
Elm Creek WSC	Coryell	-22	-22	-24	-24	-24	-22	2030
Flat WSC	Coryell	-92	-96	-99	-97	-95	-94	2030
Fort Gates WSC	Coryell	-192	-203	-210	-207	-206	-203	2030

WUG	County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Gatesville	Coryell	-1,067	-1,306	-1551	-1744	-1,946	-2,026	2030
Kempner WSC	Coryell	-236	-208	-197	-205	-210	-211	2030
Multi County WSC	Coryell	-126	-128	-128	-123	-118	-116	2030
The Grove WSC	Coryell	0	0	-1	-2	-2	-7	2050
Cisco	Eastland	0	0	0	0	0	-12	2080
Staff WSC	Eastland	0	0	0	0	0	-1	2080
County-Other, Erath	Erath	0	0	0	0	-195	-559	2070
Gordon	Erath	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	2030
Stephenville	Erath	0	0	0	0	-497	-1,260	2070
Bruceville Eddy	Falls	0	-19	-51	-84	-119	-189	2040
Cego-Durango WSC	Falls	0	-27	-58	-84	-118	-167	2040
County-Other, Falls	Falls	-346	-262	-167	-74	0	0	2030
County-Other, Fisher	Fisher	-24	-20	-18	-16	-15	-13	2030
Rotan	Fisher	-4	-23	-50	-69	-83	-94	2030
The Bitter Creek WSC	Fisher	-58	-55	-53	-52	-51	-50	2030
County-Other, Grimes	Grimes	-363	-393	-419	-429	-432	-425	2030
Dobbin Plantersville WSC	Grimes	-63	-90	-118	-143	-172	-204	2030
Wickson Creek SUD	Grimes	0	0	0	-119	-248	-356	2060
Multi County WSC	Hamilton	-19	-16	-10	-12	-14	-14	2030
Haskell	Haskell	-581	-573	-564	-566	-566	-562	2030
Brandon Irene WSC	Hill	-62	-81	-95	-111	-139	-170	2030
Chatt WSC	Hill	-100	-110	-119	-128	-142	-152	2030
County-Other, Hill	Hill	-296	-309	-331	-356	-379	-390	2030
Double Diamond Utilities	Hill	-310	-400	-484	-561	-628	-722	2030
Files Valley WSC	Hill	-116	-154	-186	-218	-252	-286	2030
Hilco United Services	Hill	-256	-292	-321	-350	-387	-425	2030
Hillsboro	Hill	0	0	0	-71	-306	-550	2060
Itasca	Hill	-31	-36	-40	-44	-49	-54	2030
Navarro Mills WSC	Hill	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1	2060
Post Oak SUD	Hill	0	-5	-16	-29	-39	-51	2040
Whitney	Hill	0	-11	-21	-23	-24	-35	2040
Woodrow Osceola WSC	Hill	-444	-459	-469	-480	-492	-506	2030
Acton MUD	Hood	0	0	0	0	-162	-439	2070
County-Other, Hood	Hood	-2,568	-3,050	-3528	-4043	-4,068	-4,203	2030
Granbury	Hood	-767	-1,190	-1630	-2111	-2,651	-3,259	2030
Lipan	Hood	0	0	0	-11	-26	-43	2060
Tolar	Hood	0	0	-20	-52	-89	-130	2050
Bethesda WSC	Johnson	-828	-1,607	-2270	-3091	-3,947	-4,862	2030

WUG	County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Burleson	Johnson	-913	-1,871	-2634	-3572	-4,526	-5,525	2030
Cleburne	Johnson	0	-653	-1963	-3177	-4,749	-6,060	2040
County-Other, Johnson	Johnson	-68	0	0	0	0	0	2030
Crowley	Johnson	-4	-9	-15	-22	-30	-39	2030
Double Diamond Utilities	Johnson	0	-3	-166	-328	-511	-744	2040
Fort Worth	Johnson	0	0	-295	-566	-789	-853	2050
Godley	Johnson	0	-12	-37	-59	-84	-112	2040
Grandview	Johnson	0	0	-6	-42	-83	-128	2050
Johnson County SUD	Johnson	0	-1,212	-3003	-4715	-6,457	-8,275	2040
Mansfield	Johnson	-1,063	-1,602	-2274	-3023	-3,582	-4,195	2030
Mountain Peak SUD	Johnson	-370	-729	-1161	-1715	-2,385	-3,229	2030
Rio Vista	Johnson	0	0	0	0	-34	-77	2070
Venus	Johnson	0	0	-11	-25	-31	-33	2050
County-Other, Jones	Jones	-567	-524	-477	-423	-361	-289	2030
Hawley WSC	Jones	0	0	0	0	0	0	2070
S U N WSC	Jones	-6	-13	-25	-37	-54	-79	2030
County-Other, Kent	Kent	-14	-14	-13	-14	-16	-17	2030
Benjamin	Knox	-26	-29	-23	-30	-17	-35	2030
Knox City	Knox	-237	-238	-240	-241	-241	-241	2030
Munday	Knox	-219	-224	-231	-235	-242	-253	2030
Copperas Cove	Lampasas	0	-35	-88	-135	-155	-145	2040
Corix Utilities Texas Inc	Lampasas	-550	-595	-613	-620	-628	-633	2030
Kempner WSC	Lampasas	-612	-556	-539	-560	-581	-592	2030
Lampasas	Lampasas	-432	-604	-778	-933	-1,008	-977	2030
Aqua WSC	Lee	0	0	0	0	0	0	2040
County-Other, Lee	Lee	-115	-111	-94	-76	-55	-33	2030
Bistone Municipal Water Supply District	Limestone	0	-58	-143	-147	-127	-197	2040
Groesbeck	Limestone	-585	-569	-551	-534	-517	-499	2030
Mexia	Limestone	-987	-942	-890	-855	-826	-785	2030
Point Enterprise WSC	Limestone	0	0	0	0	0	0	2080
Post Oak SUD	Limestone	0	-1	-3	-3	-5	-5	2040
Prairie Hill WSC	Limestone	-138	-134	-128	-123	-117	-112	2030
Axtell WSC	McLennan	-16	-58	-100	-143	-186	-228	2030
Bruceville Eddy	McLennan	-89	-143	-245	-354	-470	-555	2030
Chalk Bluff WSC	McLennan	0	0	-31	-111	-190	-270	2050
County-Other, McLennan	McLennan	-203	-419	-464	-482	-524	-626	2030
Crawford	McLennan	-79	-106	-130	-157	-187	-220	2030
Cross Country WSC	McLennan	0	-41	-105	-180	-264	-359	2040

WUG	County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
East Crawford WSC	McLennan	-116	-133	-148	-162	-179	-197	2030
Elm Creek WSC	McLennan	0	0	-8	-29	-50	-68	2050
Gholson WSC	McLennan	0	0	-49	-121	-199	-287	2050
Hewitt	McLennan	-740	-729	-729	-729	-729	-729	2030
Highland Park WSC	McLennan	-24	-25	-26	-26	-27	-28	2030
Hog Creek WSC	McLennan	-103	-104	-106	-102	-98	-96	2030
Levi WSC	McLennan	0	0	-14	-31	-50	-73	2050
Mart	McLennan	-268	-240	-217	-180	-141	-98	2030
McGregor	McLennan	-253	-411	-558	-698	-856	-1,011	2030
North Bosque WSC	McLennan	0	0	-42	-139	-247	-370	2050
Prairie Hill WSC	McLennan	-139	-161	-180	-203	-228	-255	2030
Robinson	McLennan	0	-190	-681	-1238	-1,874	-2,598	2040
Spring Valley WSC	McLennan	0	-42	-95	-157	-225	-298	2040
Texas State Technical College	McLennan	-336	-335	-335	-335	-335	-335	2030
Waco	McLennan	-5,925	-10,128	-13987	-18040	-22,634	-26,900	2030
Cameron	Milam	-1,265	-1,242	-1200	-1161	-1,121	-1,079	2030
Rockdale	Milam	0	0	0	0	-5	-17	2070
Thorndale	Milam	-63	-78	-96	-115	-136	-157	2030
Roscoe	Nolan	-107	-99	-92	-87	-84	-83	2030
Sweetwater	Nolan	-145	-119	-91	-62	-32	-1	2030
The Bitter Creek WSC	Nolan	-80	-90	-102	-115	-129	-149	2030
County-Other, Palo Pinto	Palo Pinto	-167	-166	-163	-161	-160	-160	2030
Double Diamond Utilities	Palo Pinto	-540	-586	-626	-660	-686	-722	2030
Gordon	Palo Pinto	-164	-164	-162	-162	-161	-159	2030
Mineral Wells	Palo Pinto	-832	-1,126	-1431	-1737	-1,888	-2,093	2030
Strawn	Palo Pinto	-14	-14	-12	-12	-11	-10	2030
County-Other, Robertson	Robertson	-55	-37	-17	0	0	0	2030
Wellborn SUD	Robertson	0	-22	-69	-109	-136	-153	2040
Wickson Creek SUD	Robertson	0	0	0	-1	-9	-10	2060
Glen Rose	Somervell	-211	-229	-237	-234	-230	-226	2030
Somervell County Water District	Somervell	-238	-241	-208	-195	-181	-166	2030
Fort Belknap WSC	Stephens	-2	-3	-4	-5	-7	-10	2030
Fort Griffin SUD	Stephens	0	-3	-11	-18	-2	-2	2040
Staff WSC	Stephens	0	0	0	0	-6	-25	2070
Stephens Regional SUD	Stephens	-38	-97	-99	-101	-107	-114	2030
Aspermont	Stonewall	-37	-28	-19	-8	0	0	2030
Abilene	Taylor	0	0	0	-1460	-6,907	-10,934	2060
Coleman County SUD	Taylor	-4	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5	2030

WUG	County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Lawn	Taylor	0	0	-7	-6	-5	-4	2050
North Runnels WSC	Taylor	-69	-78	-86	-95	-105	-116	2030
Potosi WSC	Taylor	-831	-985	-1122	-1281	-1,458	-1,654	2030
S U N WSC	Taylor	-8	-16	-24	-31	-38	-45	2030
Steamboat Mountain WSC	Taylor	-653	-893	-1103	-1358	-1,641	-1,951	2030
View Caps WSC	Taylor	-120	-143	-164	-186	-211	-238	2030
Fort Belknap WSC	Throckmorton	-3	-3	-3	-4	-4	-4	2030
Fort Griffin SUD	Throckmorton	-11	-9	-9	-8	-6	-4	2030
Stephens Regional SUD	Throckmorton	-4	-9	-8	-8	-7	-7	2030
Throckmorton	Throckmorton	-96	-95	-97	-99	-103	-105	2030
Brenham	Washington	0	0	0	0	-80	-195	2070
Bartlett	Williamson	-1	0	0	0	0	0	2030
Brushy Creek MUD	Williamson	-773	-802	-833	-854	-875	-895	2030
Cedar Park	Williamson	-2,359	-2,534	-2626	-2626	-2,626	-2,626	2030
County-Other, Williamson	Williamson	-5,091	-11,525	-15326	-19455	-24,112	-29,475	2030
Fern Bluff MUD	Williamson	-2	-53	-107	-110	-111	-111	2030
Florence	Williamson	-112	-126	-144	-163	-185	-209	2030
Georgetown	Williamson	-12,881	-47,661	-78284	-104667	-135,446	-163,020	2030
Granger	Williamson	0	0	0	0	-6	-26	2070
Hutto	Williamson	-1,400	-2,457	-3921	-5932	-8,724	-12,601	2030
Jarrell-Schwertner	Williamson	-3,370	-4,102	-4560	-5034	-5,533	-6,043	2030
Jonah Water SUD	Williamson	-2,201	-4,898	-8060	-11480	-15,326	-19,652	2030
Leander	Williamson	-7,773	-12,862	-14286	-14470	-14,588	-14,673	2030
Liberty Hill	Williamson	0	0	0	-352	-853	-1,416	2060
Paloma Lake MUD 1	Williamson	-128	-134	-137	-138	-138	-138	2030
Paloma Lake MUD 2	Williamson	-103	-108	-110	-111	-111	-111	2030
Round Rock	Williamson	0	-2,198	-7847	-9367	-10,797	-11,791	2040
Sonterra MUD	Williamson	-936	-2,267	-3843	-5551	-7,474	-9,638	2030
Taylor	Williamson	-2,090	-3,651	-5425	-7078	-8,929	-10,996	2030
Williamson County MUD 11	Williamson	-106	-505	-974	-1487	-2,064	-2,714	2030
Williamson County WSID 3	Williamson	-107	-367	-692	-1057	-1,470	-1,940	2030
County-Other, Young	Young	-160	-175	-185	-213	-207	-222	2030
Fort Belknap WSC	Young	-121	-164	-219	-268	-275	-321	2030
Graham	Young	-1,565	-1,543	-1445	-1486	-1,593	-1,575	2030

4.2.2 Projected Manufacturing Needs

Sixteen of the 37 counties in the Brazos G Area are projected to have manufacturing shortages. Table 4.2 lists the counties projected to have shortages in the Manufacturing Use category, projected year 2050 and 2080 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected to begin.

Table 4.2 Counties with Projected Water Needs for Manufacturing Use

County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
	Year 2030	Year 2040	Year 2050	Year 2060	Year 2070	Year 2080	
BELL	-467	-503	-540	-579	-619	-661	2030
BURLESON	-28	-33	-38	-44	-50	-56	2030
EASTLAND	826	658	490	322	154	-15	2080
ERATH	-19	-14	-9	-6	-1	6	2030
HAMILTON	-17	-18	-19	-20	-21	-22	2030
LAMPASAS	-59	-63	-68	-73	-76	-68	2030
LIMESTONE	-227	-236	-245	-253	-262	-273	2030
MCLENNAN	-1,111	-964	-817	-717	-500	-747	2030
NOLAN	-32	-54	-76	-98	-119	-142	2030
PALO PINTO	-18	-19	-20	-21	-22	-23	2030
TAYLOR	-49	-76	-775	-804	-834	-865	2030
WASHINGTON	-119	-145	-172	-200	-229	-259	2030
YOUNG	-9	-8	-9	-6	-2	-6	2030

4.2.3 Projected Steam-Electric Needs

Table 4.3 lists the seven counties projected to have shortages in the Steam-Electric Use category, projected year 2050 and 2080 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected begin.

Table 4.3 Counties with Projected Water Needs for Steam-Electric Use

County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
	Year 2030	Year 2040	Year 2050	Year 2060	Year 2070	Year 2080	
BRAZOS	-285	-269	-269	-269	-269	-269	2030
JOHNSON	-571	-571	-571	-571	-571	-571	2030
LIMESTONE	-3,054	-3,171	-3,287	-3,403	-3,517	-3,648	2030
ROBERTSON	-7,967	-8,194	-8,421	-8,647	-8,874	-9,101	2030
SOMERVELL	-14,376	-14,762	-15,148	-15,534	-15,920	-16,238	2030
YOUNG	-610	-633	-659	-633	-596	-628	2030

4.2.4 Projected Mining Needs

Shortages are projected for mining use in most of the counties. Table 4.4 lists the 14 counties projected to have shortages in the Mining Use category, projected year 2050 and 2080 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected to begin.

Table 4.4 Counties with Projected Water Needs for Mining Use

County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
	Year 2030	Year 2040	Year 2050	Year 2060	Year 2070	Year 2080	
BRAZOS	-1,030	-1,058	-1,085	-1,101	-1,125	-1,159	2030
BURLESON	-3,551	-3,551	-3,551	-3,551	-3,551	-3,551	2030
EASTLAND	-313	-313	-314	-314	-314	-314	2030
GRIMES	-92	-92	-92	-92	-93	-93	2030
HASKELL	-4	-4	-4	-4	-4	-4	2030
HOOD	-2,955	-3,345	-3,685	-3,950	-4,156	-4,293	2030
LIMESTONE	-3,029	-3,073	-3,120	-3,146	-2,157	-2,228	2030
MILAM	-768	-772	-767	-765	-766	-767	2030
NOLAN	-4	-4	-4	-4	-5	-5	2030
PALO PINTO	-25	-26	-27	-28	-28	-29	2030
SOMERVELL	-866	-962	-1,037	-1,101	-1,155	-1,198	2030
TAYLOR	-380	-398	-413	-424	-432	-437	2030
THROCKMORTON	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8	2030
WASHINGTON	-650	-650	-650	-650	-650	-650	2030

4.2.5 Projected Irrigation Needs

Table 4.5 lists the 18 counties projected to have shortages in the Irrigation Use category, projected year 2050 and 2080 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected to begin.

Table 4.5 Counties with Projected Water Needs for Irrigation Use

County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
	Year 2030	Year 2040	Year 2050	Year 2060	Year 2070	Year 2080	
BELL	-934	-940	-947	-952	-959	-964	2030
BOSQUE	0	0	0	0	-262	-627	2070
COMANCHE	-9,252	-9,279	-9,322	-9,349	-9,392	-9,426	2030
GRIMES	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	-190	2030
HAMILTON	-276	-278	-281	-284	-286	-286	2030
HASKELL	-8,309	-8,195	-8,309	-8,195	-8,309	-8,309	2030
JOHNSON	-245	-245	-245	-245	-245	-245	2030
KNOX	-10,331	-10,747	-10,441	-7,806	-9,999	-10,212	2030
LAMPASAS	-144	-149	-153	-158	-162	-167	2030
MCLENNAN	-265	-265	-265	-265	-265	-265	2030

County	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
	Year 2030	Year 2040	Year 2050	Year 2060	Year 2070	Year 2080	
NOLAN	-9,634	-9,634	-9,250	-9,008	-8,847	-8,847	2030
PALO PINTO	-1,501	-1,505	-1,509	-1,512	-1,519	-1,534	2030
ROBERTSON	-13,417	-13,405	-13,665	-13,781	-13,886	-13,886	2030
STEPHENS	-122	-122	-122	-122	-122	-122	2030
TAYLOR	-547	-547	-547	-547	-547	-547	2030
WILLIAMSON	-224	-226	-226	-226	-226	-226	2030
YOUNG	-604	-604	-604	-604	-604	-604	2030

4.2.6 Projected Livestock Needs

Table 4.6 lists the 11 counties projected to have shortages in the Livestock Use category, projected year 2050 and 2080 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected to begin.

Table 4.6 Counties with Projected Water Needs for Livestock Use

WUG	Projected Shortages (ac-ft/yr)						Decade of Need
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Comanche	-784	-784	-784	-784	-784	-784	2030
Palo Pinto	-95	-103	-110	-117	-124	-131	2030
Somervell	-21	-21	-21	-21	-21	-21	2030

4.3 Water Needs Projected for WWPs

Needs projected for WWPs that are not also WUGs are shown in Table 4.7. The needs shown are for existing contractual commitments, regardless if the customers' water demands are different from the stated contractual supply. In the case of "needs met" contracts, the contractual demand is assumed to be the customer's water demands, less any other supplies the customer may have available. Additional contractual demands associated with strategies recommended for WUGs and WWPs are shown in Chapter 5.

Table 4.7 Water Needs Projected for WWPs

WWP	Projected Surpluses / (Shortages) (ac-ft/yr)		Decade of Need
	Year 2050	Year 2080	
AQUILLA WSD	0	0	none
BELL COUNTY WCID 1	8,922	9,900	2030
BLUEBONNET WSC	-317	-454	2030
BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY			
Lake Aquilla System	0	1,007	2060
Little River System	44,752	48,420	2030
Main Stem/Lower Basin System[1]	39,492	46,164	2030
Highland Lakes Supply (HB 1437)[2]	0	0	none

WWP	Projected Surpluses / (Shortages) (ac-ft/yr)		Decade of Need
	Year 2050	Year 2080	
System Operations Permit[3]	0	13,254	2070
CENTRAL TEXAS WSC	-6,280	-6,469	2030
EASTLAND COUNTY WSD	-1,080	-1,170	2030
FHLM WSC	0	0	none
NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS MUNICIPAL WATER AUTHORITY	-1,541	-1,629	2030
PALO PINTO COUNTY MWD 1	-4,037	-4,588	2030
UPPER LEON MWD	0	1	2080
WEST CENTRAL TEXAS MWD	0	0	2030

Notes:
(1) Includes contract demands in both Brazos G and Region H.
(2) 25,000 ac-ft/yr is available per HB 1437, of which BRA has contracted 1,200 ac-ft/yr (Liberty Hill) and 20,928 ac-ft/yr (Round Rock). Surplus shown represents the remaining uncontracted supply.
(3) Assumes all current and pending contracts for sales of System Operations Supply are firm.

4.4 Water Needs Projected for Major Water Providers

Water needs for major water providers (MWPs) summarized by decade and category of use and secondary water needs are presented in Appendix O. MWP sales to WUGs from all regions are accounted therein. For WWPs which are also WUGs, demands, needs, and surpluses as shown represent their contractual commitments in addition to their own projected uses. A further description of the methods used to calculate secondary needs is included in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5 COUNTY AND WHOLESALE WATER PROVIDER PLANS

5.1 Bell County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.1-1 lists each water user group in Bell County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections. Bell County Water Control and Improvements District (WCID) No. 1 and additional water user groups within the county are seeking to form a new Regional Water Authority, at this time it is unknown who the members of the proposed water authority will be.

Table 5.1-1 Bell County Surplus (Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus (Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
439 WSC	304	(672)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Armstrong WSC	1,063	813	Projected surplus
City of Bartlett			See Williamson County
Bell County WCID No. 1			See WWP (Chapter 5.38)
Bell County WCID No. 2	110	46	Projected surplus
Bell County WCID No. 3	(374)	(2,237)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Bell-Milam-Falls WSC	1,754	1,687	Projected surplus
City of Belton	1,715	(2,706)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Central Texas College District			See Coryell County
Dog Ridge WSC	(102)	(516)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
East Bell WSC	819	925	Projected surplus
Elm Creek WSC	(64)	(271)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Fort Cavazos (Hood)	3,467	1,795	Projected surplus
City of Georgetown			See Williamson County
City of Harker Heights	313	(2,443)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Holland	195	185	Projected surplus
Jarrell-Schwertner WSC			See Williamson County
Kempner WSC			See Lampasas County
City of Killeen	11,349	(6,217)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Little Elm Valley WSC	289	145	Projected surplus
Moffat WSC	722	871	Projected surplus
Morgan's Point Resort	1,161	801	Projected surplus
Pendleton WSC	177	61	Projected surplus
City of Rogers	322	349	Projected surplus
Salado WSC	477	(1,413)	Projected shortage - see plan below.

Water User Group	Surplus (Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Temple	6,576	(10,887)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
The Grove WSC	12	(56)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Troy	547	374	Projected surplus
West Bell County WSC	877	691	Projected surplus
County-Other	(510)	(299)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Manufacturing	(467)	(661)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	5,366	5,366	Projected surplus
Mining	772	523	Projected surplus
Irrigation	(934)	(964)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	719	719	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.1.1 439 WSC

5.1.1.1 Description of Supply

The 439 WSC holds a contract for 1,409 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority (BRA). However, under the constraints of RWP supply modeling, this contract can provide 1,174 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 1,137 ac-ft/yr in 2080, as determined by water availability analyses prescribed by water planning guidelines. Additionally, 439 WSC contracts with Bell County WCID No. 1 for 750 ac-ft/yr, which supplies 647 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 626 ac-ft/yr in 2080. This contract allows Bell County WCID No. 1 to divert, treat, and deliver raw water purchased under the agreement with the BRA. The treated water supply available to 439 WSC is further limited based on the proportionate availability of source supplies from wholesale water providers.

5.1.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended for 439 WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 172 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gallons per capita per day (gpcd).

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Capital Cost: maximum of $268,812 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Purchase Additional Diversion, Treatment, and Delivery of Supply from Bell County WCID No. 1:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $248,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,000/ac-ft.

3. Purchase Raw Water Supply from Fort Cavazos via Bell County WCID No. 1:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2080.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $62,600.
    d. Unit Cost: $100/ac-ft.
4. Reuse from Bell County WCID No. 1 – South:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $ 422,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,282/ac-ft.
5. Alternative: Lake Granger Augmentation – Ph 2 (Groundwater):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Costs borne by BRA.
    d. Unit Cost: Costs borne by BRA.

Table 5.1-2 Bell County Surplus (Shortage)

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	304	41	(209)	(421)	(580)	(672)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	113	286	324	356	381	393
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$77,292	$195,624	$221,616	$243,504	$260,604	$268,812
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	417	327	115	(65)	(199)	(279)
Purchase Additional Diversion, Treatment, and Delivery from Bell County WCID No. 1						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	248	247	245	243	242	240
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$248,000	$247,000	$245,000	$243,000	$242,000	$240,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
Purchase Raw Water Supply from Fort Cavazos						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	626
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	$62,600
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	$100
Reuse from Bell County WCID No. 1 - South						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	32	185	185	0	20	20
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$73,000	$422,000	$71,000	$0	$7,700	$7,700
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,282	$2,282	$382	$0	$382	$382
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	697	759	545	178	63	607

5.1.2 Armstrong WSC

5.1.2.1 Description of Supply

Armstrong WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at six ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 41 ac-ft/yr in 2080. They also have a contract for surface water from Central Texas WSC at 1,564 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected and no change in water supply is recommended.

5.1.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Armstrong WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 159 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $49,932 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.

Table 5.1-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Armstrong WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,063	990	937	900	859	813
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	52	57	62	65	69	73
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$35,568	$38,988	$ 42,408	$44,460	$47,196	$49,932
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,115	1,047	999	965	928	886

5.1.3 Bell County WCID No. 2

5.1.3.1 Description of Supply

Bell County WCID No. 2 obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 130 ac-ft/yr. This entity also had a contract for treated surface water from the City of Temple at 323 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for Bell County WCID No. 2.

5.1.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Bell County WCID No. 2. The entities' water usage utilized for

demand projections is 175 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Project Cost: maximum of $49,248 in 2080.
   d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2060.
   c. Project Cost: $1,523,000.
   d. Unit Cost: maximum of $2,421/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County WCID No. 2

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	110	91	75	67	57	46
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	64	67	68	70	72
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$17,100	$43,776	$45,828	$46,512	$47,880	$49,248
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	135	155	142	135	127	118
Groundwater Development - Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	57	57	57
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$138,000	$138,000	$31,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$2,421	$2,421	$544
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	135	155	142	192	184	175

5.1.4 Bell County WCID No. 3

5.1.4.1 Description of Supply

Bell County WCID No. 3 purchases its water supply from Bell County WCID No. 1 and intends to increase its contract with WCID No. 1 to meet demands, current contract is for 1,490 ac-ft/yr, which supplies 1,285 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 1,244 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Bell County WCID No. 3 has projected shortages throughout the planning period.

5.1.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Bell County WCID No. 3. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 22 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 161 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:

a. Cost Source: Volume II.
b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
c. Annual Cost: maximum of $244,188 in 2080.
d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.

2. Water Loss Mitigation:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $75,300 in 2080.
   d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.

Table 5.1-5. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County WCID No. 3

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(374)	(756)	(1,351)	(1,947)	(2,092)	(2,237)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	122	208	268	328	342	357
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$83,448	$142,272	$183,312	$224,352	$233,928	$244,188
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	120	147	189	232	241	251
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$58,325	$66,425	$56,700	$69,600	$72,300	$75,300
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(132)	(401)	(894)	(1,387)	(1,509)	(1,629)
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(132)	(401)	(894)	(1,387)	(1,509)	(1,629)

5.1.5 Bell-Milam-Falls WSC

5.1.5.1 Description of Supply

Bell-Milam Falls WSC is located in multiple counties (Bell, Falls, Milam and Williamson) and obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 360 ac-ft/yr. This entity also has a contract for surface water from Lake Stillhouse Hollow from Central Texas WSC at 2,327 ac-ft/yr. Totals shown in both Table 5.1-1 and Table 5.1-6 represent cumulative totals for Bell-Milam Falls WSC. No shortages are projected for Bell-Milam Falls WSC.

5.1.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 162 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 31 percent and recommends water loss mitigation.

1. Conservation:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $73,872 in 2080.

d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.

2. Water Loss Reduction:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $719,397 in 2040.
   d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.

Table 5.1-6. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell-Milam-Falls WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,754	1,735	1,721	1,711	1,701	1,687
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	67	102	103	106	107	108
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$45,828	$69,768	$70,452	$72,504	$73,188	$73,872
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	152	155	158	158	160	163
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$718,198	$719,397	$63,170	$63,170	$63,969	$65,169
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	1,973	1,992	1,982	1,975	1,968	1,958

5.1.6 City of Belton

5.1.6.1 Description of Supply

The City of Belton has a contract to purchase water from the BRA from Lake Belton. City of Belton has contracted for 2,500 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 2,084 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 2,500 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Belton contracts with Bell County WCID No. 1 to divert, treat, and deliver water from Lake Belton to the City at 5,966 ac-ft/yr, which supplies 5,144 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 5,966 ac-ft/yr in 2080. The City also has a contract with Central Texas WSC for 125 ac-ft/yr. A shortage is projected for the City of Belton in 2050.

5.1.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Belton. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 157 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The remaining unmet needs resulting from contracts not being fully allocated is a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. Contract supplies from the BRA are firm supplies.

1. Conservation:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $493,848 in 2080.
   d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.

2. Lake Granger Aquifer Storage and Recovery:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2050.
    c. Project Cost: Costs borne by BRA.
    d. Unit Cost: Assumed $77/ac-ft raw water purchase from BRA.
3. Water Treatment Plant Expansion:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2060.
    c. Project Cost: $14,148,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $2,814/ac-ft.
4. Lake Granger Augmentation – Ph 2 (Groundwater):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2070.
    c. Project Cost: Cost borne by BRA.
    d. Unit Cost: Assumed $77/ac-ft raw water purchase from BRA.

Table 5.1-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Belton

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,715	671	(379)	(1,341)	(2,141)	(2,706)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	402	466	546	619	680	722
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$274,968	$318,744	$373,464	$423,396	$465,120	$493,848
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	2,117	1,137	167	(722)	(1,461)	(1,984)
Lake Granger ASR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	390	466	491	491
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$30,030	$35,882	$37,807	$37,807
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$77	$77	$77	$77
Water Treatment Plant Expansion[1]						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	676	676	676
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$1,902,000	$1,902,000	$907,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$2,814	$2,814	$1,342
Lake Granger Augmentation – Ph 2 (Groundwater)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	45	45	45	45	45
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	2,162	1,182	602	465	(249)	(772)

Notes:
(1) Quantity represents increase in treatment capacity required to develop existing supplies currently constrained by treatment capacity.

5.1.7 Dog Ridge WSC

5.1.7.1 Description of Supply

Dog Ridge WSC has a surface water contract with Central Texas WSC. Dog Ridge WSC has projected shortages in all planning decades. Dog Ridge WSC had a contract for 1,500 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA which has been transferred to Central Texas WSC. The contract with Central Texas WSC is for 840 ac-ft/yr according to data found within the Central Texas WSC's master water plan.

5.1.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Dog Ridge WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 172 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 35 percent and recommends water loss mitigation.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $151,164 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $177,564 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $872/ac-ft.
3. Increase Contract with Central Texas WSC – Contingent on WWP WMSs:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2080.
    c. Annual Cost: Cost of water purchase.
    d. Unit Cost: Contract Rate set by WWP.

Table 5.1-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Dog Ridge WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(102)	(217)	(307)	(369)	(439)	(516)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	71	172	187	197	209	221
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$48,564	$117,648	$127,908	$134,748	$142,956	$151,164
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	192	216	234	247	261	276
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$167,501	$177,564	$98,120	$103,572	$109,442	$115,732
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$872	$822	$419	$419	$419	$419

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	161	171	114	75	31	(19)
Increase Contract with Central Texas WSC						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	20
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	$20,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	$1,000
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	161	171	114	75	31	1

5.1.8 East Bell WSC

5.1.8.1 Description of Supply

East Bell WSC is split between Bell and Falls counties, yet the majority of demand lies within Bell County. The quantity shown in Table 5.1-1 and Table 5.1-9 represents the cumulative totals for East Bell WSC. The WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 383 ac-ft/yr and treated surface water from Central Texas WSC at 847 ac-ft/yr. Supplies are projected to be adequate to meet future demands across the entire service area.

5.1.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for East Bell WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 155 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $19,836 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for East Bell WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	819	845	864	883	903	925
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	29	25	23	22	21	21
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$19,836	$17,100	$15,732	$15,048	$14,364	$14,364
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	848	870	887	905	924	946

5.1.9 Elm Creek WSC

5.1.9.1 Description of Supply

Elm Creek WSC service area includes portions of Bell, Coryell, and McLennan Counties, yet the majority of demand lies within Bell County. The quantity shown in Table 5.1-1 and Table 5.1-10 represents the

cumulative totals for the WSC. Elm Creek WSC has a contract to purchase water from Bluebonnet WSC from Lake Belton at 654 ac-ft/yr, which supplies 633 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 612 ac-ft/yr in 2080. The surpluses and shortages shown in Table 5.1-10 represent the cumulative totals for Elm Creek WSC across all counties it serves.

5.1.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Elm Creek WSC. Conservation is not recommended although the entity's usage is 143 gpcd, which is above the selected goal of 140 gpcd, the identified conservation savings were negligible.The remaining unmet need resulting in 2070 from contracts not being fully allocated is a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes.

1. Bluebonnet WSC to Firm Up Contracted Supply:
    a. Bluebonnet WSC provides this supply under contract to entity. Bluebonnet WSC to develop any combinations of strategies as described in Section 5.38 to firm up this amount.
    b. Cost Source: Volume II.
    c. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    d. Project Cost: associated project costs to be borne by Bluebonnet WSC.
    e. Unit Cost: supply already under contract.
2. Reallocation of Supply from Moffat WSC:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $150,612.
    d. Unit Cost: $978/ac-ft (reimbursement of cost under Moffat's take-or-pay contract with Bluebonnet WSC).

Table 5.1-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Elm Creek WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(64)	(104)	(146)	(189)	(232)	(271)
Bluebonnet WSC to Firm Up Contracted Supply						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	33	37	42	42
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$2,550	$2,850	$3,240	$3,240
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$77	$77	$77	$77
Reallocation of Supply from Moffat WSC						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	14	84	154	154
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$13,692	$82,152	$150,612	$150,612
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$978	$978	$978	$978
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(64)	(104)	(132)	(105)	(78)	(117)

5.1.10 Fort Hood (Fort Cavazos)

5.1.10.1 Description of Supply

The US Department of the Army (Fort Cavasos, formerly Fort Hood) has a water right to store and divert 12,000 ac-ft/yr in Lake Belton within BRA. The Fort Cavasos service area includes portions of Bell and Coryell Counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.1-1 and Table 5.1-11 represents the cumulative totals for Fort Cavazos. Bell County WCID No. 1 and City of Gatesville divert, treat and deliver its Lake Belton supply to the Army base. No shortages are projected for Fort Cavasos.

5.1.10.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Fort Cavasos. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 215 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Fort Cavazos also uses Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) to ensure water during droughts or emergencies. Treated water from Lake Belton is stored in an existing aquifer via pipelines. During shortages, stored water is withdrawn, disinfected, and delivered back through the same infrastructure, providing a redundant, on-post drinking water source.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $2,316,024 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Aquifer Storage and Recovery:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $36,674,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,513/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fort Hood

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	3,467	3,156	2,816	2,475	2,135	1,795
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	661	1,585	2,565	3,161	3,274	3,386
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$452,124	$1,084,140	$1,754,460	$2,162,124	$2,239,416	$2,316,024
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	4,128	4,741	5,381	5,636	5,409	5,181
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Provide raw supply to 439 WSC (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	(32)	(324)	(626)
Provide raw supply to Harker Heights (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	(500)	(500)	(500)	(500)
Provide raw supply to Copperas Cove (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	—	(125)	(1,285)

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Total Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	4,128	4,741	4,881	5,104	4,460	2,770
Aquifer Storage and Recovery						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	934	934	934	934	934
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	$3,281,000	$3,281,000	$703,000	$703,000	$703,000
Unit Cost ($/yr)	-	$3,513	$3,513	$753	$753	$753
Total Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	4,128	5,675	5,815	6,038	5,394	3,704

5.1.11 City of Harker Heights

5.1.11.1 Description of Supply

The City of Harker Heights has a contract to purchase water from the BRA Little River System from Lake Stillhouse Hollow and Lake Belton. City of Harker Heights has contracted for 3,535 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 2,946 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 2,853 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Harker Heights also contracts with Bell County WCID No. 1 at 3,535 ac-ft/yr, which supplies 4,540 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 4,397 ac-ft/yr in 2080 to divert, treat, and deliver water from Lake Belton to the City. This entity has projected shortages starting 2040.

5.1.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Harker Heights. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 178 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $1,266,768 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Purchase Raw Water Supply from Fort Cavazos:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $500,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $100/ac-ft.
3. Purchase Additional Diversion, Treatment, and Delivery from Bell County WCID No. 1:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2070.
    c. Annual Cost: $185,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,000/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-12 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Harker Heights

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	313	(813)	(1,957)	(2,348)	(2,396)	(2,443)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	563	1,577	1,786	1,852	1,852	1,852
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$385,092	$1,078,668	$1,221,624	$1,266,768	$1,266,768	$1,266,768
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	876	764	(171)	(496)	(544)	(591)
Purchase Raw Water Supply from Fort Cavazos						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	500	500	500	500
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$100	$100	$100	$100
Purchase Additional Diversion, Treatment, and Delivery from Bell County WCID No. 1						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	185	185	185
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$185,000	$185,000	$185,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
Total Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	876	764	329	189	141	94

5.1.12 City of Holland

The City of Holland has a contract to purchase water from the Central Texas WSC from Lake Stillhouse Hollow for 331 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City of Holland and no changes in the water supply is recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 105 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.1.13 City of Killeen

5.1.13.1 Description of Supply

The City of Killeen has a contract to purchase water from Bell County WCID No. 1 to divert, treat, and deliver water from Lake Belton to the City. Killeen provides supply for Bell County manufacturing entities. City of Killeen has contract for 39,964 ac-ft/yr of water supplies from the Bell County WCID No. 1, which can supply 32,525 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 31,501 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines.

5.1.13.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Kileen. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 125 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. The remaining unmet need in 2070 and 2080 is resulting from contracts not being fully allocated and is a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes.

1. Bell County WCID No. 1 North Reuse:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $1,018,640.
   d. Unit Cost: $1,590/ac-ft.
2. Bell County WCID No. 1 South Reuse:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $1,018,640.
   d. Unit Cost: $2,282/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-13 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Killeen

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	11,349	7,851	4,566	937	(2,638)	(6,217)
Reuse from Bell County WCID No. 1 – North						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,773	1,773	1,773	1,773	1,773	1,773
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,819,000	$2,819,000	$665,000	$665,000	$665,000	$665,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,590	$1,590	$375	$375	$375	$375
Reuse from Bell County WCID No. 1 – South						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	716	563	563	563	543	543
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,633,900	$1,284,800	$215,100	$215,100	$207,400	$207,400
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,282	$2,282	$382	$382	$382	$382
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Reuse	13,838	10,187	6,902	3,273	(322)	(3,901)

5.1.14 Little Elm Valley WSC

5.1.14.1 Description of Supply

Little Elm Valley WSC lies within both Bell and Falls Counties. The WSC relies on the Trinity Aquifer for a groundwater supply of 92 ac-ft/yr and has a contractual agreement with Central Texas WSC for treated water supplies. Under this contract, Little Elm Valley WSC is allocated 547 ac-ft/yr of water from Central Texas WSC. No shortages are projected for Little Elm Valley WSC. The quantity shown in Table 5.1-1 and Table 5.1-14 represents the cumulative totals for the WSC.

5.1.14.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Little Elm Valley WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 171 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 26 percent and recommends water loss mitigation.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $53,352 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $91,264 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,246/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-14 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Little Elm Valley WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	289	251	220	198	173	145
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	27	62	66	70	75	78
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$18,468	$42,408	$45,144	$47,880	$51,300	$53,352
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	40	44	48	51	53	57
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$89,828	$91,264	$17,228	$18,305	$19,023	$20,459
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,246	$2,074	$359	$359	$359	$359
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	356	357	334	319	301	280

5.1.15 Moffat WSC

5.1.15.1 Description of Supply

Moffat WSC has a contract to purchase water from Bluebonnet WSC from Lake Belton, as well as supplemental wells in the Trinity Aquifer that supply 361 ac-ft/yr. Moffat WSC has contracted for 869 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Bluebonnet WSC, which can supply 841 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 814 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. No shortages are projected for Moffat WSC and no changes in the water supply are recommended.

5.1.15.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Moffat WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 167 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 28 percent and recommends water loss mitigation.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $30,780 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $102,883 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,187/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-15 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Moffat WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	722	760	793	821	846	871
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	29	45	40	36	31	29
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$19,836	$30,780	$27,360	$24,624	$21,204	$19,836
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	52	46	41	37	33	29
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$102,883	$100,589	$15,679	$14,149	$12,620	$11,090
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,976	$2,187	$382	$382	$382	$382
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	803	851	874	894	910	929

5.1.16 Morgan's Point Resort

Morgan's Point Resort contracts with the City of Temple for all its water supply for 1,935 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for Morgan's Point Resort and no changes in the water supply is recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 135 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.1.17 Pendleton WSC

5.1.17.1 Description of Supply

Pendleton WSC relies on the Trinity Aquifer for a groundwater supply of 146 ac-ft/yr and a contract to purchase water from Bluebonnet WSC from Lake Belton. No shortages are projected for Pendleton WSC and no changes in the water supply is recommended. Pendleton WSC has contracted for 461 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Bluebonnet WSC, which can supply 446 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 432 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines.

5.1.17.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Pendleton WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 169 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $51,984 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-16 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Pendleton WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	177	144	117	100	80	61
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	31	66	69	70	73	76
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$21,204	$45,144	$47,196	$47,880	$49,932	$51,984
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	208	210	186	170	153	137

5.1.18 City of Rogers

5.1.18.1 Description of Supply

The City of Rogers purchases treated surface water from Central Texas WSC. Rogers has contracted for 486 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Central Texas WSC. No shortages are projected for the City of Rogers and no changes in the water supply is recommended.

5.1.18.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Rogers. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 164 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 38 percent and recommends water loss mitigation.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $12,312 in 2040 and 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $50,828 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,362/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-17 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Rogers

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	322	328	332	337	343	349
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	12	18	18	17	16	16
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,208	$12,312	$12,312	$11,628	$10,944	$10,944
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	38	37	36	35	34	32
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$50,828	$50,399	$15,456	$15,027	$14,598	$13,739
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,338	$1,362	$429	$429	$429	$429
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	372	383	386	389	393	397

5.1.19 Salado WSC

5.1.19.1 Description of Supply

Salado WSC currently obtains water from the Edwards Aquifer at 2,108 ac-ft/yr and through purchases of treated supply from Kempner WSC at 193 ac-ft/yr. The entity also has a contract with the BRA. Salado WSC has contracted for 1,600 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 1,333 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 1, 292 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Shortages are projected by 2050 of 150 ac-ft/yr; increasing to 1,413 by 2080.

5.1.19.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Salado WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 296 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum $1,543,788 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Lake Granger Augmentation – Ph 2 (Groundwater):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Borne by Brazos River Authority.
    d. Unit Cost: $77/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-18 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Salado WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(273)	(567)	(900)	(1,273)	(1,692)	(2,163)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	216	512	892	1,344	1,906	2,257

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$147,744	$350,208	$610,128	$919,296	$1,303,704	$1,543,788
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(57)	(55)	(8)	71	214	94
ALTERNATIVE Lake Granger Augmentation – Ph 2 (Groundwater)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	45	45	45	45	45
Annual cost ($/yr)	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500
Unit cost ($/ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Total Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	(57)	(55)	(8)	71	214	94

5.1.20 City of Temple

5.1.20.1 Description of Supply

The City of Temple obtains its water supply from Brazos run-of-the river water rights. City of Temple has contracted for 30,453 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 25,380 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 24,582 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The City supplies several neighboring communities with treated water. The City is projected to have supply shortages beginning in 2050 of 1,571 ac-ft/yr; increasing to 10,887 by 2080.

5.1.20.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Temple. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 227 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum $10,290,780 in 2080.
   d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Expand Water Treatment Plant Capacity:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $21,081,000.
   d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,142.
3. Lake Granger ASR:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: 2030
   c. Project Cost: Cost borne by BRA.
   d. Unit Cost: $77
4. (Alternative) Lake Granger Augmentation- Ph 2:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: 2030

c. Project Cost: Cost borne by BRA.
d. Unit Cost: $77.

5. Temple ASR of surface water and DPR:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $165,633,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $2,605.
6. Temple Aquifer Development- Temple North:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $15,436,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $1,599.
7. Temple Aquifer Development- Temple South:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $8,880,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $969.
8. Temple Aquifer Development- Temple Trinity Oasis:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $24,885,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $2,446.

Table 5.1-19 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Temple

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	4,224	(210)	(3,923)	(6,801)	(9,899)	(13,239)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,375	5,762	9,836	13,473	14,215	15,045
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,624,500	$3,941,208	$6,727,824	$9,215,532	$9,723,060	$10,290,780
Water Loss Reduction						
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	6,599	5,552	5,913	6,672	4,316	1,806
Lake Granger ASR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,759	3,323	5,264	5,264	4,504	4,504
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$289,400	$255,900	$405,300	$405,300	$346,800	$346,800
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Lake Granger Augmentation-Ph 2 (Groundwater) - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	45	45	45	45	45
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Temple WTP Expansion						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352	2,352
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,685,000	$2,685,000	$2,685,000	$2,685,000	$2,685,000	$2,685,000

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,142	$1,142	$1,142	$1,142	$1,142	$1,142
Temple ASR of surface water and DPR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$20,430,000	$20,430,000	$20,430,000	$20,430,000	$20,430,000	$20,430,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,605	$2,605	$2,605	$2,605	$2,605	$2,605
Trinity Aquifer Development - Temple - North						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	807	807	807	807	807	807
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,290,000	$1,290,000	$1,290,000	$1,290,000	$1,290,000	$1,290,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,599	$1,599	$1,599	$1,599	$1,599	$1,599
Trinity Aquifer Development - Temple - South						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	807	807	807	807	807	807
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$782,000	$782,000	$782,000	$782,000	$782,000	$782,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$969	$969	$969	$969	$969	$969
Trinity Aquifer Development - Temple Trinity Oasis						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,600	1,600	1,508	1,451	1,451	1,451
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,913,000	$3,913,000	$3,913,000	$3,913,000	$3,913,000	$3,913,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,446	$2,446	$2,446	$2,446	$2,446	$2,446
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	23,766	22,283	24,493	25,177	22,079	19,569

5.1.21 The Grove WSC

5.1.21.1 Description of Supply

The Grove WSC services entities in Bell and Coryell Counties, with the majority of demand lying within Bell County. The WSC purchases treated surface water from the City of Gatesville and raw surface water from the BRA Little River System. The Grove WSC has a contract for 400 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 333 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 323 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The quantity shown in Table 5.1-1 and Table 5.1-20 represents the cumulative totals for the Grove WSC.

5.1.21.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for The Grove WSC. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 139 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. The City's contractual supply is sufficient to meet demands in all decades. The remaining unmet need reported, results from contracts not being fully allocated as a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes.

Table 5.1-20 Projected Surplus/Shortage by Decade for The Grove WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	12	3	(5)	(13)	(18)	(56)

5.1.22 City of Troy

The City of Troy obtains its water from a contract with the City of Temple for 968 ac-ft/yr and wells located in the Trinity Aquifer which supply 82 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City of Troy and no changes in the water supply is recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 119 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.1.23 West Bell County WSC

5.1.23.1 Description of Supply

West Bell County WSC obtains its water through a contract with the Central Texas WSC. West Bell County WSC has contracted for 1,660 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Central Texas WSC. No shortages are projected for West Bell County WSC.

5.1.23.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for West Bell County WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 166 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum $85,500 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-21 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for West Bell County WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	877	823	780	754	725	691
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	59	108	113	117	120	125
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$40,356	$73,872	$77,292	$80,028	$82,080	$85,500
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	936	931	893	871	845	816

5.1.24 Bell County-Other

5.1.24.1 Description of Supply

Bell County-Other entities obtain water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer and treated surface water from Bell County WCID No. 1, Central Texas WSC, and City of Temple. Shortages are projected for County Other by 2030.

5.1.24.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Bell County-Other. Conservation is recommended to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum $24,191 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $560/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-22 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County - Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(510)	(602)	(638)	(573)	(459)	(299)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	37	38	40	37	32	24
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$25,308	$25,992	$27,360	$25,308	$21,888	$16,416
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(473)	(564)	(598)	(536)	(427)	(275)

5.1.25 Manufacturing

5.1.25.1 Description of Supply

Water supply for manufacturing in Bell County is obtained by purchase from the cities of Killeen, Temple, and Troy, and from wells within the Trinity Aquifer. Bell County Manufacturing is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030.

5.1.25.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Bell County Manufacturing. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Not determined.
2. Edwards Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $769,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $133/ac-ft.
3. Reuse Supplies from Bell County WCID No. 1 (North):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.

c. Annual Cost: Costs to be borne by Bell County WCID No. 1.
d. Unit Cost: $1,590/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-23 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County - Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(467)	(503)	(540)	(579)	(619)	(661)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	29	50	73	75	78	81
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(438)	(453)	(467)	(504)	(541)	(580)
Edwards Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	525	525	525	525	525	525
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$70,000	$70,000	$16,000	$16,000	$16,000	$16,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$133	$133	$30	$30	$30	$30
Purchase Reuse Supplies from Bell County WCID No. 1 (North)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	152	152	152	152	152	152
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$241,680	$241,680	$57,000	$57,000	$57,000	$57,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,590	$1,590	$375	$375	$375	$375
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	239	224	210	173	136	97

Notes:
ND – Not Determined.
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.1.26 Steam-Electric

Steam-Electric operations in Bell County obtain reuse water supply from the City of Temple. Steam-Electric has a projected surplus throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.1.27 Mining

5.1.27.1 Description of Supply

Mining in Bell County obtains water supply from wells within the Trinity Aquifer and has a projected surplus throughout the planning period. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.1.28 Irrigation

5.1.28.1 Description of Supply

Bell County Irrigation is supplied by groundwater from the Trinity and the Edwards (Balcones Fault Zone [BFZ]) Aquifers, and surface water from the BRA Little River System. Bell County Irrigation has contracted for 308 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 257 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and

249 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Irrigation is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030.

5.1.28.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Bell County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $1,618/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Edwards BFZ Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,109,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $125/ac-ft.

Table 5.1-24 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County - Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(934)	(940)	(947)	(952)	(959)	(964)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	93	155	218	218	218	218
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$ 150,441	$ 250,735	$ 352,647	$ 352,647	$ 352,647	$ 352,647
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(841)	(785)	(729)	(734)	(741)	(746)
Groundwater Development – Edwards BFZ Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	810	810	810	810	810	810
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$101,000	$101,000	$23,000	$23,000	$23,000	$23,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$125	$125	$28	$28	$28	$28
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(31)	25	81	76	69	64

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement irrigation conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.1.29 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.2 Bosque County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.2-1 lists each water user group in Bosque County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.2-1 Bosque County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Childress Creek WSC	174	213	Projected surplus
City of Clifton	96	(380)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Cross Country WSC			See McLennan County
Highland Park WSC	(66)	(52)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
HILCO United Services			See Hill County
Hog Creek WSC			See McLennan County
City of Meridian	211	200	Projected surplus
Mustang Valley WSC	50	127	Projected surplus
Smith Bend WSC	197	200	Projected surplus
City of Valley Mills	81	62	Projected surplus
County-Other	5	601	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	241	241	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	3,006	2,811	Projected surplus
Mining	282	195	Projected surplus
Irrigation	1,200	(627)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	458	458	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.2.1 Childress Creek WSC

5.2.1.1 Description of Supply

Childress Creek WSC lies within both Bosque and McLennan Counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.2-1 and Table 5.2-2 represents the cumulative totals for Childress Creek WSC. This entity obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer. No shortages are projected for the Childress Creek WSC.

5.2.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet additional regional needs. Associated Childress Creek WSC costs are included for the Bosque County Regional Project. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of

approximately 42 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 230 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $81,396 in 2060
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $424,571 in 2030.
3. Bosque County Regional Project:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $13,715,000 for Childress Creek WSC portion.
    d. Unit Cost: $5,571/ac-ft.

Table 5.2-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Childress Creek WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	174	180	189	196	205	213
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	2	31	29	30
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$1,368	$21,204	$19,836	$20,520
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	94	93	90	88	86	83
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$424,571	$424,132	$39,587	$38,707	$37,827	$36,508
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	268	273	281	315	320	326
Bosque County Regional Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	203	203	203	203	203
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$1,130,900	$1,130,900	$238,900	$238,900	$238,900
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$5,571	$5,571	$1,177	$1,177	$1,177
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	268	476	484	518	523	529

Notes
WMS – water management strategies

5.2.2 City of Clifton

5.2.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Clifton obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer and from surface water from the North Bosque River. The City of Clifton owns water rights on the North Bosque River and diverts water into a 500 ac-ft off-channel reservoir. Based on the estimated availability of groundwater and surface water to the City, shortages are projected for the City beginning in 2040.

5.2.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet projected water supply shortages. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 201 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $215,460 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Bosque County Regional Project – includes expansion of the Clifton OCR and water treatment plant (WTP):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $26,820,000 for the City's portion.
    d. Unit Cost: $5,572/ac-ft.

Table 5.2-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Clifton

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	96	(2)	(98)	(197)	(302)	(380)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	60	146	253	272	292	315
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$41,040	$99,864	$173,052	$186,048	$199,728	$215,460
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	156	144	155	75	(10)	(65)
Bosque County Regional Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	397	397	397	397	397
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$2,212,100	$2,212,100	$468,100	$468,100	$468,100
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$5,572	$5,572	$1,179	$1,179	$1,179
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	156	541	552	472	387	332

5.2.3 Highland Park WSC

5.2.3.1 Description of Supply

Highland Park WSC lies within both Bosque and McLennan Counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.2-1 represents the cumulative totals for this entity. Highland Park WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer, and has a projected shortage from 2030 through 2080.

5.2.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet projected water supply shortages. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 264 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $43,092 in 2070; Unit Cost of $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,609,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,909/ac-ft.

Table 5.2-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Highland Park WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(66)	(64)	(62)	(58)	(55)	(52)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	12	27	42	55	63	63
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,208	$18,468	$28,728	$37,620	$43,092	$43,092
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(54)	(37)	(20)	(3)	8	11
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	77	77	77	77	77	77
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$301,000	$301,000	$47,000	$47,000	$47,000	$47,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$3,909	$3,909	$610	$610	$610	$610
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	23	40	57	74	85	88

5.2.4 City of Meridian

5.2.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Meridian obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer and has a contract to purchase treated water from the City of Clifton. No shortages are projected for the City of Meridian.

5.2.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet any unforeseen water needs that may arise. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Bosque County Regional Project – includes expansion of the Clifton OCR and WTP:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $15,133,000 for the City's portion.
    d. Unit Cost: $5,576/ac-ft.

Table 5.2-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Meridian

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/ (Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	211	211	205	196	189	200
Bosque County Regional Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	224	224	224	224	224
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$1,249,000	$1,249,000	$265,000	$265,000	$265,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$5,576	$5,576	$1,183	$1,183	$1,183
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	211	435	429	420	413	424

5.2.5 Mustang Valley WSC

5.2.5.1 Description of Supply

The Mustang Valley WSC service area is primarily in Bosque County but also serves a small portion of Coryell County. The WSC obtains all of its water supply from Trinity Aquifer groundwater. No shortages are projected, the surpluses shown in both Table 5.2-1 and Table 5.2-6 represent the cumulative totals for Mustang Valley WSC.

5.2.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, conservation is the recommended water management strategy to meet water needs for Mustang Valley WSC. Associated costs are included below. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 215 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $90,972 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost of $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.2-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Mustang Valley WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	50	62	77	92	108	127
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	34	77	116	133	127	121
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$23,256	$52,668	$79,344	$90,972	$86,868	$82,764
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	84	139	193	225	235	248

5.2.6 Smith Bend WSC

5.2.6.1 Description of Supply

Smith Bend WSC obtains all of its water supply from Trinity Aquifer groundwater. No shortages are projected for the WSC throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.2.7 City of Valley Mills

5.2.7.1 Description of Supply

The City of Valley Mills service area is primarily in Bosque County but also serves a small portion of McLennan County. The City obtains all of its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer. No shortages are projected for the City of Valley Mills throughout the planning period. The surpluses shown in both Table 5.2-1 and Table 5.2-7 represent the cumulative totals for the City of Valley Mills (including Bosque and McLennan Counties).

5.2.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to improve the City's water system reliability. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 179 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $35,568 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost of $684/ac-ft.

2. Bosque County Regional Project:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
   c. Project Cost: $12,294,000 for the City's portion.
   d. Unit Cost: $5,571/ac-ft.

Table 5.2-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Valley Mills

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	81	78	74	70	65	62
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	18	48	49	50	52	51
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$12,312	$32,832	$33,516	$34,200	$35,568	$34,884
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	99	126	123	120	117	113
Bosque County Regional Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	182	182	182	182	182
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$1,013,900	$1,013,900	$214,000	$214,000	$214,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$5,571	$5,571	$1,176	$1,176	$1,176
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	99	308	305	302	299	295

5.2.8 County-Other

5.2.8.1 Description of Supply

Bosque County-Other entities obtain water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer. No shortages are projected for County-Other throughout the planning period.

5.2.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the Bosque County Regional Project is the recommended water management strategy to improve County-Other water system reliability. Associated costs are included below. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's 125 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Bosque County Regional Project:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
   c. Project Cost: $4,323,000 for the County-Other portion.
   d. Unit Cost: $5,563/ac-ft.

Table 5.2-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	5	100	218	334	461	601
Bosque County Regional Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	64	64	64	64	64
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$356,000	$356,000	$75,000	$75,000	$75,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$5,563	$5,563	$1,172	$1,172	$1,172
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	5	164	282	398	525	665

5.2.9 Manufacturing

Water supply for manufacturing in Bosque County is obtained by purchase from a city or water supply corporation, from private Trinity Aquifer wells operated by the manufacturing entity, or by limited surface water supplies. Childress Creek WSC, the City of Clifton, and the City of Hamilton sell groundwater to Bosque County manufacturing entities. No shortages are projected for manufacturing in Bosque County and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.2.10 Steam-Electric

The water supply for Steam-Electric use in Bosque County consists of surface water contracts with the Brazos River Authority. No shortages are projected for Steam-Electric from the year 2030 through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.2.11 Mining

5.2.11.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Bosque County are supplied by the Trinity Aquifer. No shortages are projected for Bosque County-Mining beginning in 2030 through 2080.

5.2.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, conservation is the only recommended water management strategy for Bosque County-Mining. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.

Table 5.2-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bosque County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	282	245	222	207	198	195
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	59	104	132	131	128	127
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	341	349	354	338	326	322

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.2.12 Irrigation

5.2.12.1 Description of Supply

Bosque County Irrigation is supplied by the Trinity Aquifer and run of the river water rights. Irrigation is projected to have shortages beginning in 2070.

5.2.12.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Bosque County-Irrigation. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The use of groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer and conservation are recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $299,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,196/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,944,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $308.

Table 5.2-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bosque County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,200	835	469	104	(262)	(627)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	107	179	250	250	250	250
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$128,000	$214,100	$299,000	$299,000	$299,000	$299,000
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,307	1,014	719	354	(12)	(377)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,175	1,175	1,175	1,175	1,175	1,175
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$362,000	$362,000	$83,000	$83,000	$83,000	$83,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$308	$308	$71	$71	$71	$71
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	2,482	2,189	1,894	1,529	1,163	798

5.2.13 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Trinity Aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Bosque County Livestock water supply are recommended.

5.3 Brazos County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.3-1 lists each water user group in Brazos County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.3-1 Brazos County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Bryan	(5,612)	(33,011)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of College Station	(7,548)	(17,056)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Texas A&M University	(4,349)	(3,988)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Wellborn SUD	239	(6,553)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Wickson Creek SUD	1,150	(2,876)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
County-Other	(60)	(93)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Manufacturing	486	289	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	(285)	(269)	Projected shortage– see plan below.
Mining	(1,030)	(1,159)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Irrigation	9,959	10,015	Projected surplus
Livestock	290	290	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/year – acre-feet per year; SUD – special utility district

5.3.1 City of Bryan

5.3.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Bryan obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox and Sparta Aquifers. The City also provides water supply for Brazos County Manufacturing, Brazos County Steam-Electric, Wellborn SUD, and Wickson Creek SUD. Shortages are projected beginning in year 2030 for the City of Bryan.

5.3.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Bryan. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 169 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The city has

requested a recommended strategy for redrilling and lowering the pumps of their existing wells as well production capacity is anticipated to be lost due to increased future groundwater use in the region.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $4,954,212 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Wellfield Expansion in Brazos County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2050.
    c. Project Cost: $40,369,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $550/ac-ft.
3. Bryan Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR(– Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $110,082,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $699/ac-ft.
4. Direct Non-Potable Reuse – Option 1:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $21,892,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $4,060/ac-ft.
    e. This supply is allocated to Steam Electric.
5. Alternative: Indirect Potable Reuse – Option 2:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $59,800,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,274/ac-ft.
6. Wellfield Expansion in Robertson County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $297,302,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,697/ac-ft.
7. Alternative: Bryan ASR of Still Creek WWTP Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $105,485,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,873/ac-ft.

8. Bryan Well Enhancement:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $36,546,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $405/ac-ft.

Table 5.3-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bryan

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(12,612)	(12,739)	(16,768)	(21,595)	(29,704)	(40,011)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,410	3,253	3,853	4,568	5,753	7,243
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$964,440	$2,225,052	$2,635,452	$3,124,512	$3,935,052	$4,954,212
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(11,202)	(9,486)	(12,915)	(17,027)	(23,951)	(32,768)
Wellfield Expansion in Brazos County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	3,352	6,939	7,501	7,501
Annual Cost ($/yr)	0	0	$4,123,000	$4,123,000	$1,286,000	$1,286,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)(1)	0	0	$550	$550	$171	$171
Bryan ASR – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	6,000	6,000	6,000	8,500	10,500	14,626
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$10,225,000	$10,225,000	$2,490,000	$2,490,000	$2,490,000	$2,490,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$699	$699	$170	$170	$170	$170
Wellfield Expansion in Robertson County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,557	2,943	4,329	5,715	7,102	7,102
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$26,894,000	$26,894,000	$6,029,000	$6,029,000	$6,029,000	$6,029,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)(2)	$2,697	$2,697	$605	$605	$605	$605
Bryan Well Enhancement						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,833,000	$2,833,000	$261,000	$261,000	$261,000	$261,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$405	$405	$37	$37	$37	$37
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	3,355	6,457	7,766	11,127	8,152	3,461

Notes:
(1) Unit cost based on strategy yield of 7,501 ac ft/yr, actual yield limited by MAG.
(2) Unit cost based on strategy yield of 9,973 ac ft/yr, actual yield limited by MAG.

Table 5.3-3 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bryan

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Wellfield Expansion in Brazos County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7,501	7,501	7,501	7,501	7,501	7,501
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,123,000	$4,123,000	$1,286,000	$1,286,000	$1,286,000	$1,286,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$550	$550	$171	$171	$171	$171
Wellfield Expansion in Robertson County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	9,973	9,973	9,973	9,973	9,973	9,973
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$26,894,000	$26,894,000	$6,029,000	$6,029,000	$6,029,000	$6,029,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,697	$2,697	$605	$605	$605	$605
Indirect Potable Reuse – Option 2						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,419	2,419	2,419	2,419	2,419	2,419
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$7,920,000	$7,920,000	$3,718,000	$3,718,000	$3,718,000	$3,718,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$3,274	$3,274	$1,537	$1,537	$1,537	$1,537
Bryan ASR of Still Creek WWTP IPR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	4,856	4,856	4,856	4,856	4,856
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	$13,952,000	$13,952,000	$6,541,000	$6,541,000	$6,541,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	$2,873	$2,873	$1,347	$1,347	$1,347

5.3.2 City of College Station

5.3.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of College Station obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox and Sparta Aquifers. The City provides water supply for Brazos County Manufacturing. Shortages are projected beginning by 2030 for the City of College Station.

5.3.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of College Station. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 177 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $4,722,336 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. College Station ASR of direct potable reuse (DPR):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.

c. Project Cost: $157,786,000.
d. Unit Cost: $2,524/ac-ft.

3. Groundwater Development in Brazos County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2050.
   c. Project Cost: $16,700,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $303/ac-ft.
4. Groundwater Development in Robertson County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $87,938,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $800/ac-ft.
5. Direct Potable Reuse:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $127,755,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $2,022/ac-ft.
6. Groundwater Desal – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2070.
   c. Project Cost: $110,083,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $2,703/ac-ft.

Table 5.3-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of College Station

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(7,548)	(8,340)	(12,720)	(18,305)	(17,636)	(17,056)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,837	4,993	5,873	6,904	6,781	6,673
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,256,508	$3,415,212	$4,017,132	$4,722,336	$4,638,204	$4,564,332
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(5,711)	(3,347)	(6,847)	(11,401)	(10,855)	(10,383)
College Station ASR of DPR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$19,790,000	$19,790,000	$8,697,000	$8,697,000	$8,697,000	$8,697,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,524	$2,524	$1,109	$1,109	$1,109	$1,109
Groundwater Development in Brazos County: Carrizo-Wilcox						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	2,264	4,685	5,065	5,065
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$ 0	$ 0	$1,533,000	$1,533,000	$358,000	$358,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$ 0	$ 0	$303	$303	$71	$71

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development in Robertson County: Carrizo-Wilcox						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,423	2,690	3,957	5,224	6,491	6,491
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$7,288,000	$7,288,000	$1,108,000	$1,108,000	$1,108,000	$1,108,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$800	$800	$122	$122	$122	$122
Groundwater Desal: Carrizo-Wilcox						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	5,066	5,066
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$18,166,000	$18,166,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,703	$2,703
Additional Demands from Strategies Recommended for Others						
Supply to Texas A&M University (ac-ft/yr)	(3,400)	(3,400)	0	0	0	0
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	154	3,785	7,216	6,350	13,619	14,081

Table 5.3-5 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of College Station

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development in Brazos County: Carrizo-Wilcox						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5,065	5,065	5,065	5,065	5,065	5,065
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,533,000	$1,533,000	$358,000	$358,000	$358,000	$358,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$303	$303	$71	$71	$71	$71
Groundwater Development in Robertson County: Carrizo-Wilcox						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	9,115	9,115	9,115	9,115	9,115	9,115
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$7,288,000	$7,288,000	$1,108,000	$1,108,000	$1,108,000	$1,108,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$800	$800	$122	$122	$122	$122
Direct Potable Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$15,860,000	$15,860,000	$6,884,000	$6,884,000	$6,884,000	$6,884,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,022	$2,022	$878	$878	$878	$878

5.3.3 Texas A&M University

5.3.3.1 Description of Supply

Texas A&M University obtains utilizes groundwater from the Sparta and Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers. They are projected to have an available supply from the Sparta Aquifer of 5,146 ac-ft/yr in 2030 increasing to 5,397 ac-ft/yr in 2080. The Universities available supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer is 920 ac-ft/yr in 2030 increasing to 1,015 ac-ft/yr in 2080. A shortage is projected to begin in 2030 at 4,349 ac-ft/yr, decreasing to 3,988 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.3.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Texas A&M University. Associated costs are included. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 477 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $4,233,276 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development - Sparta Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $9,165,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $772/ac-ft.
3. Purchase from College Station:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $0 existing emergency connection.
    d. Unit Cost: $684.

Table 5.3-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Texas A&M University

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(4,349)	(3,988)	(3,988)	(3,988)	(3,988)	(3,988)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	957	1,979	3,037	4,095	5,131	6,189
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$654,588	$1,353,636	$2,077,308	$2,800,980	$3,509,604	$4,233,276
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(3,392)	(2,009)	(951)	107	1,143	2,201
Groundwater Development – Sparta Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	923	951	951	951	951
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$ 0	$734,000	$734,000	$89,000	$89,000	$89,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$ 0	$772	$772	$94	$94	$94
Purchase from College Station						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,400	3,400	0	0	0	0
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,325,600	$2,325,600	$0	$0	$0	$0
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$684	$684	$0	$0	$0	$0
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	8	2,297	0	1,058	2,094	3,152

5.3.4 Wellborn SUD

5.3.4.1 Description of Supply

Wellborn SUD is located in Brazos and Robertson Counties and currently obtains water from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer (2,284 ac-ft/yr) and through contracts with BRA (4,000 ac-ft/yr) and the City of Bryan (2,240 ac-ft/yr). Wellborn SUD has sufficient supplies but is constrained by its treatment plant capacity resulting in a shortage beginning in 2040. The quantity shown in Table 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-7 represents the cumulative totals for Wellborn SUD.

5.3.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Wellborn SUD. Associated costs are included. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 188 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $2,119,032 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Surface Water Treatment Plant Expansion to 6 million gallons per day (mgd):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $17,137,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,333/ac-ft.
3. Surface Water Treatment Plant Expansion to 12 mgd:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $27,081,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,000/ac-ft.
4. Groundwater Development in Brazos County – Yegua-Jackson Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2070.
    c. Project Cost: $26,367,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $912/ac-ft.
5. Groundwater Development in Robertson County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $35,204,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $546/ac-ft.

Table 5.3-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	239	(420)	(1,602)	(3,064)	(4,707)	(6,553)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	504	1,264	1,919	2,268	2,659	3,098
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$344,736	$864,576	$1,312,596	$1,551,312	$1,818,756	$2,119,032
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	743	844	317	(796)	(2,048)	(3,455)
Surface Water Treatment Plant Expansion to 6mgd						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,239,000	$2,239,000	$1,033,000	$1,033,000	$1,033,000	$1,033,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,333	$1,333	$615	$615	$615	$615
Surface Water Treatment Plant Expansion to 12mgd						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	798	774	750	726	660
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$3,360,000	$3,360,000	$1,455,000	$1,455,000	$1,455,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)(1)	—	$1,000	$1,000	$433	$433	$433
Groundwater Development in Brazos County – Yegua-Jackson Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	—	1,000	2,036
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	$2,129,000	$2,129,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	$912	$912
Groundwater Development in Robertson County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,015	1,918	2,822	3,725	4,628	4,628
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,546,000	$3,546,000	$1,069,000	$1,069,000	$1,069,000	$1,069,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$3,494	$1,849	$379	$287	$231	$231
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	3,438	5,240	5,593	5,359	5,986	5,549

Notes:
(1) Unit cost based on strategy yield of 3,360 ac ft/yr, actual yield limited by surface water source supply.

Table 5.3-8 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development in Brazos County – Yegua-Jackson Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	—	2,335	2,335
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	$2,129,000	$2,129,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	$912	$912
Groundwater Development in Robertson County – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,546,000	$3,546,000	$1,069,000	$3,546,000	$3,546,000	$1,069,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$546	$546	$164	$164	$164	$164

5.3.5 Wickson Creek SUD

5.3.5.1 Description of Supply

Wickson Creek SUD is located in multiple counties (Grimes, Robertson, and Brazos). The balances shown in Table 5.3-1 and Table 5.3-9 represent the cumulative totals for Wickson Creek SUD. Supplies are obtained from the Sparta, Carrizo-Wilcox, and Yegua-Jackson Aquifers and purchases 1,500 ac-ft/yr from the City of Bryan. The entity also provides supply to Brazos and Grimes County Manufacturing. Wickson Creek SUD is projected to experience water supply shortages beginning in 2050 at 147 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 2,876 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.3.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Wickson Creek SUD. Associated costs are included. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 139 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Sparta Aquifer Development – Brazos County:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2050.
    c. Project Cost: $16,135,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $482/ac-ft.

Table 5.3-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,150	597	(147)	(1,006)	(1,934)	(2,876)
Sparta Aquifer Development – Brazos County						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	250	1,250	2,000	2,900
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$1,398,000	$1,398,000	$263,000	$263,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$482	$482	$91	$91
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,150	597	103	244	66	24

5.3.6 County-Other

5.3.6.1 Description of Supply

Brazos County-Other entities obtain water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City and Yegua-Jackson Aquifers. Shortages are projected for County Other by 2030.

5.3.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Brazos County-Other. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Yegua-Jackson Aquifer Development – Brazos County:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,351,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $848/ac-ft.

Table 5.3-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(60)	42	33	9	(34)	(93)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer Development – Brazos County						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	125	125	125	125	125	125
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$106,000	$106,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$848	$848	$88	$88	$88	$88
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	65	167	158	134	91	32

5.3.7 Manufacturing

Water supply for manufacturing in Brazos County is obtained from nearby WUGs and wells within the Carrizo-Wilcox and Sparta Aquifers. Manufacturing is projected to have a surplus in water supply throughout the planning period.

5.3.8 Steam-Electric

5.3.8.1 Description of Supply

Supplies for Steam-Electric demand in Brazos County are obtained through groundwater from the Sparta and the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers and from Bryan Utilities Lake. Brazos County Steam-Electric is projected to have a shortage in year 2030.

5.3.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Brazos County Steam-Electric.

1. City of Bryan Direct Non-Potable Reuse – Option 1:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $21,892,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $4,060/ac-ft.

Table 5.3-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Brazos County – Steam-Electric

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(285)	(269)	(269)	(269)	(269)	(269)
City of Bryan Direct Non-Potable Reuse – Option 1						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	605	605	605	605	605	605
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,456,000	$2,456,000	$916,000	$916,000	$916,000	$916,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$4,060	$4,060	$1,514	$1,514	$1,514	$1,514
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	320	336	336	336	336	336

5.3.9 Mining

5.3.9.1 Description of Supply

Brazos County Mining operations obtain supply from the Yegua-Jackson Aquifer. Brazos County Mining is projected to have a shortage in year 2030.

5.3.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Brazos County Mining. Conservation is recommended to reduce usage.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Not determined.
2. Sparta Aquifer Development – Brazos County:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2080.
    c. Project Cost: $1,448,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $373/ac-ft.
3. Yegua-Jackson Aquifer Development – Brazos County:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $4,530,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $292/ac-ft.

Table 5.3-12 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Wellborn SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(1,030)	(1,058)	(1,085)	(1,101)	(1,125)	(1,159)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	80	135	191	192	194	196
Annual Cost ($/yr)(1)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(950)	(923)	(894)	(909)	(931)	(963)
Sparta Aquifer Development – Brazos County						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	300
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	$112,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	$373
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer Development – Brazos County						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$350,000	$350,000	$31,000	$31,000	$31,000	$31,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$292	$292	$26	$26	$26	$26
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	250	277	306	291	269	537

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.3.10 Irrigation

Brazos County Irrigation is supplied by Sparta, Carrizo-Wilcox, Yegua-Jackson Aquifers, and Brazos River Alluvium groundwater and from run-of-river diversion rights from the Brazos River and contracts with BRA. Surpluses of 9,959 ac-ft/yr are projected for irrigation beginning in year 2030 and increasing to 10,015 ac-ft/yr by 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.3.11 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.4 Burleson County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.4-1 lists each water user group in Burleson County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the water users are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.4-1 Burleson County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Cade Lakes WSC	55	58	Projected surplus
City of Caldwell	1,329	1,373	Projected surplus
Deanville WSC	284	302	Projected surplus
Milano WSC			See Milam County
City of Snook	84	94	Projected surplus
City of Somerville	575	582	Projected surplus
Southwest Milam WSC			See Milam County
County-Other	659	720	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	(28)	(56)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	–	–	No projected demand
Mining	(3,551)	(3,551)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Irrigation	4,335	4,339	Projected surplus
Livestock	670	670	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.4.1 Cade Lakes WSC

5.4.1.1 Description of Supply

The Cade Lakes WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. The supply is projected to be sufficient throughout the planning period.

5.4.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management plan is recommended for the Cade Lakes WSC. Associated costs are included. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 61 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 230 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $28,044 in 2060 and 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $91,339 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,791/ac-ft.

Table 5.4-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Cade Lakes WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	55	54	55	56	57	58
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	9	21	31	41	41	40
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,156	$14,364	$21,204	$28,044	$28,044	$27,360
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	51	51	51	50	50	49
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$91,339	$91,339	$23,562	$23,100	$23,100	$22,638
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,791	$1,791	$462	$462	$462	$462
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	115	126	137	147	148	147

5.4.2 City of Caldwell

5.4.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Caldwell obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. The supply is projected to be 2,248 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 2,276 ac-ft/yr in 2080 and is projected to be sufficient through the planning period.

5.4.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management plan is recommended for the City of Caldwell. Associated costs are included. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 196 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $166,896 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.4-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Caldwell

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,329	1,353	1,356	1,361	1,367	1,373
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	73	162	244	243	241	239
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$49,932	$110,808	$166,896	$166,212	$164,844	$163,476
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,402	1,515	1,600	1,604	1,608	1,612

5.4.3 Deanville WSC

5.4.3.1 Description of Supply

The Deanville WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. The supply is projected to be 651 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 659 ac-ft/yr in 2080. The water supply is projected to be sufficient throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.4.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management plan is recommended for Deanville WSC. Associated costs are included. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 175 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $43,776 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.4-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Deanville WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	284	291	293	296	299	302
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	26	64	64	63	62	62
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$17,784	$43,776	$43,776	$43,092	$42,408	$42,408
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	310	355	357	359	361	364

5.4.4 City of Snook

5.4.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Snook obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Sparta Aquifer. No shortages are projected through the planning period.

5.4.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management plan is recommended for the City of Snook. Associated costs are included. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 318 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $151,164 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.4-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Snook

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	84	82	84	88	91	94
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	35	77	117	158	198	221
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$23,940	$52,668	$80,028	$108,072	$135,432	$151,164
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	119	159	201	246	289	315

5.4.5 City of Somerville

5.4.5.1 Description of Supply

The City of Somerville obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Sparta Aquifer which is projected to provide an available groundwater supply of 843 ac-ft/yr through the planning period. Water supply is projected to be sufficient throughout the planning period.

5.4.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management plan is recommended for the City of Somerville. Associated costs are included. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 187 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $41,724 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.4-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Somerville

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	575	574	576	577	580	582
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	20	47	60	61	60	60
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$13,680	$32,148	$41,040	$41,724	$41,040	$41,040
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	595	621	636	638	640	642

5.4.6 County-Other

Burleson County-Other entities obtain water supply from groundwater from the Queen City and Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers. The supply is projected to be sufficient throughout the planning period and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.4.7 Manufacturing

5.4.7.1 Description of Supply

Water supply for manufacturing in Burleson County is obtained from Sparta wells operated by the various manufacturing entities. Manufacturing is projected to have a shortage of water beginning in the year 2030 and continuing through 2080.

5.4.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the entity's water needs. Associated costs are included. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $105/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Sparta Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $367,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,160/ac-ft.
3. Groundwater Development – Queen City Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $870,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,400/ac-ft.

Table 5.4-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Burleson County – Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(28)	(33)	(38)	(44)	(50)	(56)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	4	7	10	11	11	12
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$420	$735	$1,050	$1,155	$1,155	$1,260
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(24)	(26)	(28)	(33)	(39)	(44)
Groundwater Development – Sparta Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	25	25	25	25	25
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$29,000	$29,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)(1)	$1,160	$1,160	$120	$120	$120	$120
Groundwater Development – Queen City Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	50	50	50	50	50	50
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$70,000	$70,000	$9,000	$9,000	$9,000	$9,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,400	$1,400	$180	$180	$180	$180
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	51	49	47	42	36	31

Notes:
(1) Unit cost calculated for project yield of 25 ac-ft/yr.
(2) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.4.8 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.4.9 Mining

5.4.9.1 Description of Supply

Burleson County Mining is supplied by Yegua-Jackson groundwater and has a projected water supply shortage beginning in 2030 of 3,551 ac-ft/yr, which is constant throughout the planning period.

5.4.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet a portion of the water needs for Burleson County Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $200/ac-ft.

Table 5.4-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Burleson County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(3,551)	(3,551)	(3,551)	(3,551)	(3,551)	(3,551)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	167	278	390	390	390	390
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$33,400	$55,600	$78,000	$78,000	$78,000	$78,000
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(3,384)	(3,273)	(3,161)	(3,161)	(3,161)	(3,161)

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.4.10 Irrigation

Water supply for irrigation in Burleson County is obtained from the Carrizo-Wilcox, Yegua-Jackson, and Brazos River Alluvium Aquifers. Irrigation has a projected surplus throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.4.11 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.5 Callahan County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.5-1 lists each water user group in Callahan County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2040. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.5-1 Callahan County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Baird	(232)	(217)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Callahan County WSC	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
City of Clyde	(100)	993	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Cross Plains	99	110	Projected surplus
Eula WSC	(136)	(159)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Hamby WSC			See Jones County
Potosi WSC			See Taylor County
Westbound WSC			See Eastland County
County-Other	108	217	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	–	–	No demand projected
Manufacturing	–	–	No demand projected
Mining	78	78	Projected surplus
Irrigation	546	546	Projected surplus
Livestock	24	24	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.5.1 City of Baird

5.5.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Baird obtains its water supply from surface water supplied from Lake Baird and from the City of Abilene. The City's contractual purchase from the City of Abilene is 77 ac-ft/yr, but the City's contract is not capped annually and has the ability to purchase additional supply from Abilene when needed. The total amount of surface water availability from Lake Baird is 20 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning horizon.

5.5.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water supply plan is recommended for the City of Baird. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 196 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $58,824 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene:
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rates.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $0 (Current infrastructure assumed to be adequate).
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.5-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Baird

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(232)	(231)	(228)	(225)	(221)	(217)
Conservation						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	26	58	86	86	84	83
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$17,784	$39,672	$58,824	$58,824	$57,456	$56,772
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(206)	(173)	(142)	(139)	(137)	(134)
Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	206	173	142	139	137	134
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$476,684	$400,322	$328,588	$321,646	$317,018	$310,076
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.5.2 Callahan County WSC

Callahan County WSC obtains its water supply from a contract with Clyde. Supplies are sufficient to meet demands through 2080. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 78 is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.5.3 City of Clyde

The City of Clyde uses surface water from Clyde Lake, however the Brazos G WAM shows the yield of the lake to be zero throughout the planning horizon. Clyde has recently acquired a 1,750 ac-ft/yr water right for supplies from Fort Phantom Hill Reservoir. The City is in the process of building infrastructure to access this supply. Clyde also has a contractual purchase of 307 ac-ft/yr from the City of Abilene that can help in meeting the City's projected demands. No current or future shortages are projected. Clyde has contractual sales to Eula WSC of 221 ac-ft/yr through 2080 and Callahan County WSC from 190 to 205 ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080, respectively.

5.5.3.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended for the City of Clyde. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage of 78 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene:
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rates.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: none.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.5-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Clyde

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(100)	1,401	1,241	1,012	1,002	993
Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	100	–	–	–	–	–
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$231,400	–	–	–	–	–
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,314					
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	1,401	1,241	1,012	1,002	993

5.5.4 City of Cross Plains

5.5.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Cross Plains uses locally available groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 310 ac-ft/yr. The City is projected to have sufficient supplies through the planning period.

5.5.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended for the City of Cross Plains. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 210 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $44,460 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.5-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Cross Plains

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	99	99	102	103	107	110
Conservation						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	37	58	65	64	63
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$10,944	$25,308	$39,672	$44,460	$43,776	$43,092
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	115	136	160	168	171	173

5.5.5 Eula WSC

5.5.5.1 Description of Supply

Eula WSC has a contract with Abilene for 61 ac-ft/yr and Clyde for 221 ac-ft/yr. Eula WSC is projected to have a water supply shortage beginning in 2030 of 136 ac-ft/yr; increasing to 159 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.5.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended for Eula WSC. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 69 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 85 gpcd is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $448,345 in 2040.

Table 5.5-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Eula WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(136)	(140)	(144)	(149)	(153)	(159)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	136	140	144	149	153	159
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$446,477	$448,345	$67,263	$69,599	$71,467	$74,270
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.5.6 County-Other

The water supply entities comprising County-Other mostly rely on groundwater systems in the Trinity Aquifer and show a projected surplus throughout the planning period. No changes in water supply are recommended for Callahan County-Other. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 72 gpcd is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.5.7 Manufacturing

No Manufacturing demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.5.8 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.5.9 Mining

Mining activities are projected to decrease to two ac-ft/yr throughout the planning horizon. Available Trinity Aquifer supplies at 80 ac-ft/yr in Callahan County will be used to meet the projected demands. No changes in water supply are recommended for Mining in Callahan County.

5.5.10 Irrigation

Irrigation activities are expected to remain constant at 546 ac-ft/yr and are fully supplied from local Trinity Aquifer groundwater. Conservation is not needed as there are projected surplus supplies to meet irrigation demands.

5.5.11 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Callahan County Livestock water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.6 Comanche County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.6-1 lists each water user group (WUG) in Comanche County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the WUGs and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.6-1 Comanche County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Comanche	164	189	Projected surplus
City of De Leon	72	42	Projected surplus
County-Other	(364)	(234)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Manufacturing	4	0	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	–	–	No demand projected
Mining	117	104	Projected surplus
Irrigation	(9,252)	(9,426)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	(784)	(784)	Projected shortage – see plan below

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.6.1 City of Comanche

The City of Comanche obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the Upper Leon River Municipal Water District (MWD). The water supplied by the Upper Leon River MWD is diverted from Lake Proctor under contracts with the Brazos River Authority (BRA). The City of Comanche is projected to obtain up to 706 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water supply from the Upper Leon River MWD through the planning period. The City of Comanche is also contracted to sell 20 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water to Manufacturing entities in Comanche County. No shortage is projected for the City of Comanche and no changes in water supply are recommended. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 27 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage is 113 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $44,878 in 2030.

Table 5.6-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Comanche

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	164	172	181	184	187	189
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	67	66	65	65	64	64
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$44,878	$44,503	$24,353	$24,353	$23,979	$23,979
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	231	238	246	249	251	253

5.6.2 City of De Leon

The City of De Leon obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the Upper Leon River MWD. The water supplied by the Upper Leon River MWD is diverted from Lake Proctor under contracts with the BRA. The City of De Leon is projected to obtain up to 307 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water supply from the Upper Leon River MWD through the planning period. No supply shortage is projected for the City of De Leon and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage is 99 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.6.3 County-Other

5.6.1.1 Description of Supply

Entities comprising the Comanche County-Other WUG obtain their water supply primarily through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer. Additionally, Comanche County WSC purchases treated surface water under contract from the Upper Leon MWD. Shortages are projected for each decade within the planning period.

5.6.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for County-Other. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage is 95 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

2. Trinity Aquifer Development, Erath County:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $8,981,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,877/ac-ft.

Table 5.6-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Comanche County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(364)	(333)	(292)	(276)	(256)	(234)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer (Erath County)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	376	394	408	389	398	398
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$706,000	$740,000	$134,000	$128,000	$131,000	$131,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,877	$1,877	$328	$328	$328	$328
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	12	61	116	113	142	164

5.6.4 Manufacturing

Comanche County Manufacturing entities obtain water supply through purchases of treated surface water from the City of Comanche, which is projected to provide up to 21 ac-ft/yr of supply during the planning period. Additionally, local groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer is also used by Manufacturing entities in the County. No shortages are projected and no change in water supply is recommended.

5.6.5 Steam-Electric

There is no projected demand for Comanche County Steam-Electric.

5.6.6 Mining

5.6.1.3 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Comanche County are supplied through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer. Supply projections show no water shortages.

5.6.1.4 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, conservation and development of Trinity Aquifer groundwater to increase supply is recommended for Comanche County-Mining. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.
2. Trinity Aquifer Development, Erath County:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $7,249,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $2,378 /ac-ft.

Table 5.6-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Comanche County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	117	116	112	110	107	104
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	13	26	26	19	13	9
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	130	142	138	129	120	113
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	221	233	241	229	235	235
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$526,000	$554,000	$63,000	$60,000	$61,000	$61,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,378	$2,378	$261	$261	$261	$261
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	351	375	379	358	355	348

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.6.7 Irrigation

5.6.1.5 Description of Supply

Comanche County Irrigation is supplied through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer and through purchases of raw surface water from the BRA. Irrigation is projected to have shortages throughout the planning period. Comanche Irrigation has contracted for 6,652 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 5,544 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 5,370 ac-ft/yr in2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines.

5.6.1.6 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Comanche County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

3. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $3,747,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,667 /ac-ft.
4. Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 (Groundwater):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $3,500, Project Costs borne by BRA.
    d. Unit Cost: $100 /ac-ft.

5. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

Table 5.6-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Comanche County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(9,252)	(9,279)	(9,322)	(9,349)	(9,392)	(9,426)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	964	1,606	2,248	2,248	2,248	2,248
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,607,000	$2,677,000	$3,747,000	$3,747,000	$3,747,000	$3,747,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,667	$1,667	$1,667	$1,667	$1,667	$1,667
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(8,288)	(7,673)	(7,074)	(7,101)	(7,144)	(7,178)
Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	35	35	35	35	35	35
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$100	$100	$100	$100	$100	$100
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(8,253)	(7,638)	(7,039)	(7,066)	(7,109)	(7,143)

5.6.8 Livestock

Comanche County Livestock is obtained from local supplies and groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer. Livestock is projected to have shortages throughout the planning period of 784 ac-ft/yr.

Table 5.6-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Comanche County – Livestock

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(784)	(784)	(784)	(784)	(784)	(784)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(784)	(784)	(784)	(784)	(784)	(784)

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.7 Coryell County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.7-1 lists each water user group in Coryell County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.7-1. Coryell County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Central Texas College District	(151)	(153)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Copperas Cove	1,089	(3,297)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Coryell City WSD	256	700	Projected surplus
Elm Creek WSC			See Bell County
Flat Creek WSC	(92)	(94)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Fort Gates WSC	(192)	(203)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Fort Hood			See Bell County
City of Gatesville	(1,067)	(2,026)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Kempner WSC			See Lampasas County
Mountain WSC	93	90	Projected surplus
Multi-County WSC	(149)	(134)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Mustang Valley WSC			See Bosque County
City of Oglesby	171	171	Projected surplus
The Grove WSC			See Bell County
County-Other	213	336	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
Steam-Electric	—	—	No projected demand
Mining	192	190	Projected surplus
Irrigation	703	625	Projected surplus
Livestock	119	119	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation; WSD – water supply district

5.7.1 Central Texas College District

5.7.1.1 Description of Supply

The service area for the Central Texas College District is within both Coryell and Bell Counties and their sole source of water is through the purchase of treated water from the City of Copperas Cove. The quantities shown in Table 5.7-1 and Table 5.7-2 represent the cumulative totals for the Central Texas College District as a whole. Shortages are projected from 2030 to 2080.

5.7.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategy is recommended for the Central Texas College District. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 283 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Needs remain unmet throughout the planning period. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought.

1. Conservation
    a. Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 2.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $94,392 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-2. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the Central Texas College District

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(151)	(152)	(153)	(153)	(153)	(153)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	52	80	109	138	138
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$17,100	$35,568	$54,720	$74,556	$94,392	$94,392
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(126)	(100)	(73)	(44)	(15)	(15)

5.7.2 City of Copperas Cove

5.7.2.1 Description of Supply

The service area for the City of Copperas Cove is within both Coryell and Lampasas Counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.7-1 and Table 5.7-3 represents the cumulative totals for the City of Copperas Cove as a whole. The City obtains its water supply solely through purchases of treated surface water under contract from Bell County WCID No.1. Bell County WCID No. 1 is projected to provide up to the contracted 8,824 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water sourced from Lake Belton to the City of Copperas Cove at the beginning of the planning period; however, this contracted supply is constrained based on water availability analyses developed under regional water planning assumptions, rules, and guidelines, and will only provide 7,608 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 7,369 ac-ft/yr of supply by 2080. Shortages are projected to begin by 2040. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage of 119 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.7.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Copperas Cove. Needs remain unmet from 2040 to 2080. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought.

1. Purchase Raw Water Supply from Fort Hood:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2060.
    c. Annual Cost: $156,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $121/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-3. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Copperas Cove

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,089	(1,026)	(2,374)	(3,285)	(3,610)	(3,297)
Purchase Raw Water Supply from Fort Hood						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	32	32	1,285
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$4,000	$4,000	$156,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$121	$121	$121
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,089	(1,026)	(2,374)	(3,253)	(3,578)	(2,012)

5.7.3 Coryell City WSD

5.7.3.1 Description of Supply

Coryell City WSD obtains its water supply primarily though purchases of treated surface water under contract from the City of Gatesville; the supply available to the District under this contract is projected to range from 1,044 ac-ft/yr to 1,542 ac-ft/yr. The District also purchases raw surface water under contract from the Brazos River Authority (BRA) in the amount of 300 ac-ft/yr which is treated by the City of Gatesville. This BRA contract for 300 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies 250 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 242 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses developed under regional water planning assumptions, rules, and guidelines. The remainder of the District's water supply is obtained through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer which is projected to provide 83 ac-ft/yr of supply through the planning period. No shortages are projected for Coryell City WSD and no changes in water supply are recommended. This WUG is located in Coryell and McLennan Counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.7-1 and Table 5.7-4 represents the cumulative totals for Coryell City WSD.

5.7.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the Coryell City WSD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 163 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 2.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $93,708 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-4. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Coryell City WSD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	256	355	451	576	703	700
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	85	135	136	135	137	135
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$58,140	$92,340	$93,024	$92,340	$93,708	$92,340
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	341	490	587	711	840	835

5.7.4 Flat Creek WSC

5.7.4.1 Description of Supply

Flat Creek WSC obtains its water supply solely through purchases of treated surface water under contract with the City of Gatesville, which is projected to supply up to 102 ac-ft/yr through the planning period. Shortages are projected for Flat Creek WSC beginning in 2030.

5.7.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Flat Creek WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 258 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $60,192 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

2. Purchase Additional Water from Gatesville:
    a. Cost Source: Gatesville Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: N/A.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,466/ac-ft ($4.50/1000 gallons).
3. Coryell County OCR (Purchase Raw Water Supply from Multi-County WSC; supply would be provided out of the Coryell County OCR):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2050.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $69,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,135/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-5. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Flat Creek WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(92)	(96)	(99)	(97)	(95)	(94)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	17	37	58	77	88	88
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$11,628	$25,308	$39,672	$52,668	$60,192	$60,192
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(75)	(59)	(41)	(20)	(7)	(6)
Purchase Additional Water from Gatesville						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	75	59	38	8	0	0
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$110,000	$86,000	$56,000	$12,000	$0	$0
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,466	$1,466	$1,466	$1,466	$0	$0
Coryell County OCR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	3	12	22	22
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$0	$0	$9,000	$38,000	$69,000	$69,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$0	$0	$3,135	$3,135	$3,135	$3,135
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	15	16

5.7.5 Fort Gates WSC

5.7.5.1 Description of Supply

Fort Gates WSC obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water from the City of Gatesville, which is projected to supply 120 ac-ft/yr during the planning period. The entity also has a contract for purchasing raw surface water from the BRA; however, Fort Gates WSC does not have facilities necessary to treat this water. Fort Gates WSC has contracted 200 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 167 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 161 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Shortages are projected throughout the planning period for Fort Gates WSC.

5.7.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Flat Creek WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 187 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $77,976 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Firm Up BRA Little River Supplies:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Costs borne by BRA.
    d. Unit Cost: Costs borne by BRA.

Table 5.7-6. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fort Gates WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(192)	(203)	(210)	(207)	(206)	(203)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	38	85	114	113	112	111
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$25,992	$58,140	$77,976	$77,292	$76,608	$75,924
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(154)	(118)	(96)	(94)	(94)	(92)
Firm Up BRA Supplies						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	270	280	306	348	390	390
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	116	162	210	254	296	298

5.7.6 City of Gatesville

5.7.6.1 Description of Supply

The City of Gatesville obtains its water supply through purchases of raw water under contract from the BRA. The City of Gatesville has contracted for 5,898 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from BRA, which can supply 4,915 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 4,761 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses developed under regional water planning assumptions, rules, and guidelines. The City of Gatesville also provides treated surface water to several nearby WUGs through wholesale supply contracts.

5.7.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Gatesville. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 30 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 246 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $1,261,296 by 2080.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $477,918 in 2040.
3. Firm Up BRA Little River Supplies:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Costs borne by BRA.
    d. Unit Cost: Costs borne by BRA.
4. Coryell County OCR (Purchase Raw Water Supply from Multi-County WSC; supply would be provided out of the Coryell County OCR):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $4,790,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,135/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-7. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Gatesville

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(1,067)	(1,306)	(1,551)	(1,744)	(1,946)	(2,026)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	354	780	1,247	1,686	1,836	1,844
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$242,136	$533,520	$852,948	$1,153,224	$1,255,824	$1,261,296
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	660	671	682	683	685	688
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$473,564	$477,918	$269,982	$270,378	$271,170	$272,357
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(53)	145	378	625	575	506
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Increase Contract to Flat Creek WSC (ac-ft/yr)	(75)	(59)	(38)	(8)	—	—
Total Surplus/(Shortage) including Recommended Strategies	(128)	86	340	617	575	506
Firm Up BRA Little River Supplies						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,028	1,060	1,093	1,125	1,158	1,158
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Coryell County OCR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	981	1,152	1,528	1,528
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$3,075,000	$3,612,000	$4,790,000	$4,790,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$3,135	$3,135	$3,135	$3,135
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	900	1,146	2,414	2,894	3,261	3,192

5.7.7 Mountain WSC

Mountain WSC obtains its water supply through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer and through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the City of Gatesville which is projected to provide up to 280 ac-ft/yr of supply. Available supply from the Trinity Aquifer is projected at 147 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for Mountain WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 157 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $19,152 in 2050; Unit cost of $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-8. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Mountain WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	93	86	82	84	87	90
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	27	27	28	28	27	27
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$18,468	$18,468	$19,152	$19,152	$18,468	$18,468
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	120	113	110	112	114	117

5.7.8 Multi-County WSC

5.7.8.1 Description of Supply

Multi-County WSC obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the City of Hamilton, which is projected to provide 245 ac-ft/yr of supply through the planning period. This WUG is located in Coryell and Hamilton Counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.7-1 and Table 5.7-9 represents the cumulative totals for Multi-County WSC.

5.7.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Multi-County WSC. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage of 93 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. The Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir was evaluated and recommended as a water management strategy to meet future needs in Coryell County. The project would likely be developed in cooperation with the BRA. The Multi-County WSC has been identified as the current project sponsor. It is also recommended that Multi-County WSC increase their contracted amount with the City of Hamilton to meet any additional shortages until the reservoir comes online.

1. Purchase additional water from City of Hamilton:
    a. Cost Source: Hamilton Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $2,037/ac-ft ($6.25/1000 gallons).
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $354,000.
2. Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    c. Project Cost: $129,699,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $3,187/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Multi-County WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(149)	(149)	(143)	(140)	(137)	(134)
Purchase Additional Supply from the City of Hamilton						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	167	149	115	144	174	174
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$340,000	$304,000	$234,000	$293,000	$354,000	$354,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,037	$2,037	$2,037	$2,037	$2,037	$2,037
Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	843	663	277	277
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$2,687,000	$2,113,000	$883,000	$883,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$3,187	$3,187	$3,187	$3,187
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	18	0	815	667	314	317

5.7.9 City of Oglesby

The City of Oglesby obtains its water supply solely through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer which is projected to provide 211 ac-ft/yr of groundwater supply. No shortages are projected for the City during the planning period and no changes to water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage of 74 gpcd is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.7.10 County-Other

5.7.10.1 Description of Supply

Water supply for County-Other entities is obtained through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer, which is projected to provide 614 ac-ft/yr of groundwater supply. Development of additional Trinity Aquifer groundwater is recommended as a water management strategy to supplement County-Other entity supply in Coryell County.

5.7.10.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for the entities in Coryell County-Other. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage of 106 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $6,858,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $540/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-10. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Coryell County – Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	213	193	201	239	284	336
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	259	525	815	1,107	1,107
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$140,000	$284,000	$85,000	$115,000	$115,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$540	$540	$104	$104	$104
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	213	452	726	1,054	1,391	1,443

5.7.11 Manufacturing

Coryell County Manufacturing obtains water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the City of Gatesville. No shortage is projected and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.7.12 Steam-Electric

Coryell County has no current or projected future demand for Steam-Electric; therefore, no recommendations have been made.

5.7.13 Mining

5.7.13.1 Description of Supply

Mining demand in Coryell County is projected to slowly decrease until 2080. Water supply to meet Mining demands is obtained solely through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer.

5.7.13.2 Recommended Strategy

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the development of Trinity Aquifer groundwater is recommended to supplement water supplies for Coryell County-Mining. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $5,534,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $370/ac-ft.

Table 5.7-11. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Coryell County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	192	191	191	191	190	190
Groundwater Development - Trinity						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$470,000	$470,000	$81,000	$81,000	$81,000	$81,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$370	$370	$64	$64	$64	$64
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,462	1,461	1,461	1,461	1,460	1,460

5.7.14 Irrigation

Coryell County Irrigation obtains water supply through Trinity Aquifer groundwater and Braozs River run-of-river water rights. No shortages are projected and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.7.15 Livestock

Livestock water is obtained through local water supplies and through Trinity Aquifer groundwater. Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.8 Eastland County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.8-1 lists each water user group (WUG) in Eastland County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the WUGs and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsection.

Table 5.8-1 Eastland County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Cisco	120	(12)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Eastland	1,455	1,488	Projected surplus
Fort Griffin SUD			See Stephens County
City of Gorman	58	97	Projected surplus
City of Ranger	1,383	1,458	Projected surplus
City of Rising Star	40	64	Projected surplus
Staff WSC	67	(26)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Stephens Regional SUD			See Stephens County
Westbound WSC	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
County-Other	214	330	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	826	(15)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	—	—	No projected demand
Mining	(313)	(314)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Irrigation	621	621	Projected surplus
Livestock	628	628	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; SUD – special utility district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.8.1 City of Cisco

The City of Cisco obtains its water supply through diversions from Lake Cisco under a water right held by the City, which is projected to provide the City with up to 977 ac-ft/yr of water supply. The City also provides sales of treated surface water to Eastland County-Other users.

5.8.1.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Cisco. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 170 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $80,028.

Table 5.8-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Cisco

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	120	94	60	38	15	(12)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	54	110	114	115	115	117
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$36,936	$75,240	$77,976	$78,660	$78,660	$80,028
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	174	204	174	153	130	105

5.8.2 City of Eastland

The City of Eastland obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract for 3,314 ac-ft/yr with the Eastland County Water Supply District. This contract is projected to provide an annual supply beginning at 2,302 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and decreasing to 2,144 ac-ft/yr by 2080 based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The Eastland County Water Supply District sources raw surface water through diversions Lake Leon under a water right held by the water supply district. The City also provides sales of treated surface water under contract with Staff WSC, Westbound WSC, and entities in the County-Other WUG for Eastland County. No shortages are projected for the City of Eastland and no changes in water supply are recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 160 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $40,356.

Table 5.8-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Eastland

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,455	1,474	1,488	1,496	1,495	1,488
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	59	50	46	42	40	37
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$40,356	$34,200	$31,464	$28,728	$27,360	$25,308
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	1,514	1,524	1,534	1,538	1,535	1,525

5.8.3 City of Gorman

The City of Gorman obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the Upper Leon River Municipal Water District, which is projected to provide up to 169 ac-ft/yr of supply. The water supplied by the Upper Leon River Municipal Water District is diverted from Lake Proctor under contracts with the Brazos River Authority. No shortages are projected for the City of Gorman and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage of 109 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.8.4 City of Ranger

The City of Ranger obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water from the Eastland County Water Supply District, which is projected to provide up to 2,025 ac-ft/yr across the planning period. The Eastland County Water Supply District sources raw surface water through diversions Lake Leon under a water right held by the water supply district. The City also provides sales of treated surface water and groundwater to staff WSC. No shortages are projected for the City of Ranger and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.8.4.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Ranger. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 166 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $32,832.

Table 5.8-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Ranger

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,383	1,408	1,427	1,441	1,452	1,458
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	31	48	46	45	43	43
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$21,204	$32,832	$31,464	$30,780	$29,412	$29,412
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	1,414	1,456	1,473	1,486	1,495	1,501
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Staff WSC – Purchase Additional Supply from Ranger	—	—	—	—	(6)	(26)
Total Surplus/(Shortage) including Recommended Strategies	1,414	1,456	1,473	1,486	1,489	1,475

5.8.5 City of Rising Star

The City of Rising Star obtains its water supply solely through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer, which is projected to provide up to 170 ac-ft/yr of supply. No shortages are projected for the City of Rising Star and no changes in water supply are recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 171 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $12,996.

Table 5.8-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Rising Star

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	40	48	54	59	62	64
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	19	18	17	17	16
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,840	$12,996	$12,312	$11,628	$11,628	$10,944
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	50	67	72	76	79	80

5.8.6 Staff WSC

Staff WSC obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract with the City of Eastland, and purchases of treated surface and groundwater from the City of Ranger. Total supply purchases are projected to provide 262 ac-ft/yr of supply to staff WSC through the planning period.

5.8.6.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Staff WSC. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase Additional Supply from Ranger:
    a. Cost Source: Ranger Water Rates.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2070.
    c. Project Cost: none.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,259/ac-ft ($10/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.8-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Staff WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	67	50	25	11	(6)	(26)
Purchase Additional Supply from Ranger						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	—	6	26
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	$19,554	$84,734
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	67	50	25	11	0	0

5.8.7 Westbound WSC

Westbound WSC obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract for 280 ac-ft/yr with the Eastland County Water Supply District. This contract is projected to provide an annual supply of 87 ac-ft/yr in 2030 up to 99 ac-ft/yr in 2080 based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The Eastland County Water Supply District sources raw surface water through diversions Lake Leon under a water right held by the water supply district. The WSC is also supplied by Trinity Aquifer groundwater. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage of 73 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. No shortages are projected for Westbound WSC and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.8.8 County-Other

The entities comprising Eastland County-Other obtain water supply from multiple sources in the County. The City of Eastland sells treated surface water under contract to the City of Carbon and Olden WSC. Entities comprising Eastland County-Other also rely on groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer to meet demands. Water supply contracts are projected to provide users in Eastland County-Other with up to 267 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water while available groundwater supplies are projected at 202 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 28 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage of 82 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $92,091 in 2030.

Table 5.8-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other, Eastland

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	214	226	256	272	295	330
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	33	31	28	26	22	18
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$92,091	$91,338	$10,535	$9,782	$8,277	$6,772
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction	247	257	284	298	317	348

5.8.9 Manufacturing

Manufacturing in Eastland County is supplied with local water from Brazos run of the river water rights and treated surface water from the Eastland County Water Supply District. The Eastland County Water Supply District sources raw surface water through diversions Lake Leon under a water right held by the water supply district. There is a projected water supply shortage of 15 ac-ft/yr in 2080.

5.8.9.1 Water Supply Plan

The recommended water supply plans is to leave the needs unmet in the 2080 decade. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought.

5.8.10 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the county.

5.8.11 Mining

5.8.11.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Eastland County obtain water supply solely through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer. Current groundwater allocations in the county exceed the modeled available groundwater supply and are not projected to be available for production in the future.

5.8.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Eastland County-Mining. Conservation is recommended. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.

2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer (Eastland and Erath Counties):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $8,783,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $7,424/ac-ft.

Table 5.8-8. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Eastland County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(313)	(313)	(314)	(314)	(314)	(314)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1	2	2	2	1	1
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(312)	(311)	(312)	(312)	(313)	(313)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	90	76	92	77	91	91
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$668,000	$564,000	$65,000	$54,000	$64,000	$64,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$7,424	$7,424	$707	$707	$707	$707
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(222)	(235)	(220)	(235)	(222)	(222)

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.8.12 Irrigation

Irrigation in Eastland County is supplied through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer and local water from Brazos run of the river water rights. No supply shortages are projected throughout the planning period and no change in water supply is recommended.

5.8.13 Livestock

The livestock demand for Eastland County is met with local surface water supplies and Trinity Aquifer groundwater. No supply shortages are projected throughout the planning period and no change in water supply is recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.9 Erath County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.9-1 lists each water user group (WUG) in Erath County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080.

Table 5.9-1 Erath County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Dublin	196	343	Projected surplus
City of Gordon			See Palo Pinto County
City of Stephenville	1,671	(1,260)	Projected shortage – see plan below
County-Other	857	(559)	Projected shortage - see plan below
Manufacturing	(19)	6	Projected shortage – see plan below
Steam-Electric	—	—	No projected demand
Mining	992	987	Projected surplus
Irrigation	404	404	Projected surplus
Livestock	298	298	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year

5.9.1 City of Dublin

The City of Dublin obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the Upper Leon River Municipal Water District (MWD). The water supplied by the Upper Leon River MWD is diverted from Lake Proctor under contracts with the Brazos River Authority. The City of Dublin is projected to obtain up to 598 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water supply from the Upper Leon River MWD through the planning period. The City also provides sales of treated surface water to Manufacturing entities and entities comprising the County-Other WUG in Erath County. No shortages are projected for the City of Dublin and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the City's usage of 105 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.9.2 City of Stephenville

5.9.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Stephenville obtains its water supply through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer and through purchases of treated surface water under contract with the Upper Leon River MWD. The Upper Leon River MWD has contracted with the Brazos River Authority for raw water supply from Lake Proctor. Treated water supply available under contract from the Upper Leon River MWD is projected at 1,862 ac-ft/yr through the planning period while the groundwater supply available to the City is projected at 3,780 ac-ft/yr. The City also provides sales of treated surface water to Manufacturing entities in Erath County. Supply shortages are projected for the City beginning in the 2070 decade.

5.9.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended for the City of Stephenville. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage of 136 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Trinity Aquifer Groundwater Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $7,501,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,684 /ac-ft.

Table 5.9-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Stephenville

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,671	1,295	829	200	(497)	(1,260)
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Increase Supply to Erath County-Manufacturing (ac-ft/yr)	(17)	(10)	(3)	—	—	—
Total Needs Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	1,656	1,285	826	200	(497)	(1,260)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	318	390	405	385	395	395
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$536,000	$657,000	$154,000	$146,000	$150,000	$150,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,684	$1,684	$380	$380	$380	$380
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,972	1,675	1,231	585	(102)	(865)

5.9.3 County-Other

5.9.3.1 Description of Supply

The water supply entities comprising County-Other rely primarily on groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer for water supply. Some treated surface water supplies are provided through the City of Dublin and City of Gordon. Available Trinity Aquifer groundwater supplies are projected at 3,211 ac-ft/yr, while treated surface water is projected to provide an additional 122 ac-ft/yr of supply. Supply shortages are projected for the entity beginning by 2070.

5.9.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended for the Erath County-Other. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 32 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage of 126 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $281,402 in 2080.
2. Trinity Aquifer Groundwater Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2060.
    c. Project Cost: $2,475,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $859 /ac-ft.

Table 5.9-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Erath County – Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	857	661	417	128	(195)	(559)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	439	474	517	568	625	690
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$193,383	$207,657	$210,848	$231,647	$254,893	$281,402
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,296	1,135	934	696	430	131
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	276	283	283
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$237,000	$243,000	$69,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$859	$859	$244
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,296	1,135	934	972	713	414

5.9.4 Manufacturing

5.9.4.1 Description of Supply

Manufacturing water supply in Erath County is obtained from multiple sources including through local groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer, purchases of treated surface from the City of Dublin and County-Other entities, and groundwater purchases from the City of Stephenville. Manufacturing is projected to have a supply shortage until 2070.

5.9.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended for the Erath County-Other. Conservation is recommended. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.

2. Purchase additional groundwater supply from the City of Stephenville:
    a. Cost Source: Stephenville Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $22,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,271 /ac-ft. ($3.90/1,000 gal).

Table 5.9-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Erath County – Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(19)	(14)	(9)	(6)	(1)	6
Conservation						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2	4	6	6	6	6
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(17)	(10)	(3)	0	5	12
Purchase additional supply from City of Stephenville						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	17	10	3	—	—	—
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$22,000	$13,000	$4,000	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,271	$1,271	$1,271	—	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	5	12

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.9.5 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the county.

5.9.6 Mining

Water supply for Mining in Erath County is obtained through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer. No water supply shortages are projected for Mining entities in the County through the planning period.

5.9.7 Irrigation

Irrigation in Erath County obtains water solely through local groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer and run-of-river rights in the Brazos River. Irrigation in the County is projected to have a surplus of available water through the planning period. No change in water supply is recommended.

5.9.8 Livestock

Water supply for Livestock is obtained through local stock surface water impoundments and Trinity Aquifer groundwater. No shortages are projected for Livestock use and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.10 Falls County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.10-1 lists each water user group in Falls County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.10-1 Falls County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Bell-Milam WSC			See Bell County
City of Bruceville-Eddy			See McLennan County
Cego-Durango WSC	2	(167)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
East Bell County WSC			See Bell County
Levi WSC			See McLennan County
Little Elm Valley WSC			See Bell County
City of Marlin	1,017	1,359	Projected surplus
North Milam WSC			See Milam County
City of Rosebud	470	509	Projected surplus
West Brazos WSC	382	255	Projected surplus
County-Other	(300)	260	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Manufacturing	—	—	No projected demand
Steam-Electric	—	—	No projected demand
Mining	68	68	Projected surplus
Irrigation	2,195	2,132	Projected surplus
Livestock	411	411	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.10.1 Cego-Durango WSC

Cego-Durango WSC obtains its water supply solely through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer, which is projected to provide an available groundwater supply of 205 ac-ft/yr through the planning period. Shortages are projected for Cego-Durango WSC by 2040.

5.10.1.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water supply plan is recommended for the Cego-Durango WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 159 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $23,256 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Contract with West Brazos WSC:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2040.
    c. Annual Cost: $5,397,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,259/ac-ft.

Table 5.10-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Cego-Durango WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	2	(27)	(58)	(84)	(118)	(167)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	19	21	24	26	29	34
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$12,996	$14,364	$16,416	$17,784	$19,836	$23,256
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	21	(6)	(34)	(58)	(89)	(133)
Contract with West Brazos WSC						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	135	135	135	135	135
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$440,000	$440,000	$60,000	$60,000	$60,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$3,259	$3,259	$444	$444	$444
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	2	129	101	77	46	2

5.10.2 City of Marlin

5.10.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Marlin obtains its water supply through raw water diversions from local reservoirs and the Brazos River under water rights held by the City. The City owns and operates two existing reservoirs – Marlin City Lake and New Marlin Reservoir – that impound runoff from Big Sandy Creek, The City also has contracted to purchase raw surface water from the Brazos River Authority. Surface water supplies available through diversions by the City are projected to provide up to 2,960 ac-ft/yr of supply at the beginning of the planning period, then decreasing to 2,738 ac-ft/yr at the end of the period. Purchases of raw surface water under contract with the Brazos River Authority are projected to provide a constant supply of 1,200 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning period. No shortages are projected for the City of Marlin.

5.10.2.2 Water Supply Plan

The supplies projected are adequate to meet the City's water demand through 2080. Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended for the City of Marlin. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 267 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $363,204 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Brushy Creek Reservoir:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Total Project Cost: $59,720,000.
    d. Annual Cost: $4,413,000 (includes NRCS share of project).
    e. Unit Cost: $2,207/ac-ft.

Table 5.10-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Marlin

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,017	1,132	1,232	1,323	1,386	1,359
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	114	231	344	448	524	531
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$77,976	$158,004	$235,296	$306,432	$358,416	$363,204
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,131	1,363	1,576	1,771	1,910	1,890
Brushy Creek Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$4,413,000	$4,413,000	$1,529,000	$1,529,000	$655,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$2,207	$2,207	$765	$765	$328
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,131	3,363	3,576	3,771	3,910	3,890

5.10.3 City of Rosebud

5.10.3.1 Description of Supply

The City of Rosebud obtains its water supply primarily through purchases of treated surface water under contract from Central Texas WSC, which treats and delivers water from Stillhouse Hollow Lake through purchases under contract with the Brazos River Authority. This supply contract is projected to provide up to 525 ac-ft/yr of supply to the City. Additionally, the City of Rosebud also contracts directly with the Brazos River Authority for purchases of raw surface water which is projected to provide 100 ac-ft/yr of

supply. No shortages are projected for the City of Rosebud. And no change in water supply is recommended.

5.10.3.2 Water Supply Plan

The supplies projected are adequate to meet the City's water demand through 2080. Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Rosebud. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 40 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 114 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $57,993.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,620/ac-ft.

Table 5.10-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Rosebud

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	479	480	488	498	504	509
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	38	35	33	30	28	27
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$57,993	$56,686	$14,376	$13,069	$12,198	$11,762
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,526	$1,620	$436	$436	$436	$436
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	508	515	521	528	532	536

5.10.4 West Brazos WSC

5.10.4.1 Description of Supply

The service area for West Brazos WSC is located in multiple counties (McLennan and Falls) and obtains its water supply solely through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer. The values presented in Table 5.10-1 and Table 5.10-5 for West Brazos WSC represents the cumulative supply surplus for the water user group. Trinity Aquifer groundwater supply available to West Brazos WSC is projected at 788 ac-ft/yr during the planning period. No supply shortages are projected throughout the planning period for West Brazos WSC.

5.10.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended for the West Brazos WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 159 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $32,832 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.10-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for West Brazos WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	382	360	343	319	290	255
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	37	39	39	42	45	48
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$25,308	$26,676	$26,676	$28,728	$30,780	$32,832
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	419	399	382	361	335	303
Additional Demands from Strategies Recommended for Others						
Supply to Cego-Durango WSC (ac-ft/yr)	—	135	135	135	135	135
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	419	264	247	226	200	168

5.10.5 County-Other

Entities comprising Falls County-Other obtain water supply through purchases of treated surface water from Central Texas WSC and through local groundwater production from the Brazos River Alluvium and Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers. Supply purchases from Central Texas WSC are projected to provide a total of 326 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning period; available groundwater supply from the Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer are projected at 170 ac-ft/yr and available supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer is projected to range between 46 and 69 ac-ft/yr. Falls County-Other is projected to have water supply shortages beginning in 2030 at 300 ac-ft/yr, decreasing to 21 ac-ft/yr by 2060. In the decade of 2080, a water supply surplus of 260 ac-ft/yr is projected.

5.10.5.1 Description of Supply

Various entities are dealing with elevated levels of arsenic in groundwater supplies and have been pursuing water management strategies through the FHLM WSC. Through a TWDB sponsored study coordinated by FHLM WSC, these entities have considered a regional brackish RO WTP in Limestone County, Carrizo-Wilcox Regional Groundwater in Limestone County, Tehuacana Reservoir, and supplies from City of Marlin (Brushy Creek Reservoir), and City of Waco. The recommended strategy is to provide for arsenic treatment for individual entities. This strategy does not provide new supply.

5.10.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Falls County-Other. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 36 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 114 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $96,876.
    d. Unit Cost: $558/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Brazos River Alluvium:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $323,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $89/ac-ft.
3. Upgrade Treatment for Arsenic: Entities within County-Other for which Arsenic treatment is recommended include Moore WS.

Arsenic levels of existing supply wells are approaching levels that make the supply unusable. This is a treatment strategy that recovers existing supplies that would be lost due to high concentrations of Arsenic.

    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $279,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,887/ac-ft.

Table 5.10-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the Falls County – Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(346)	(262)	(167)	(74)	50	207
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	178	160	141	122	98	64
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$96,876	$89,280	$59,502	$51,484	$41,356	$27,008
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$544	$558	$422	$422	$422	$422
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(168)	(102)	(26)	48	148	271
Groundwater Development – Brazos River Alluvium						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	325	325	325	325	325	325
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$29,000	$29,000	$6,000	$6,000	$6,000	$6,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$89	$89	$18	$18	$18	$18
Upgrade Treatment for Arsenic						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	46	50	53	53	53	53
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$100,000	$100,000	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)(1)	$1,887	$1,887	$1,509	$1,509	$1,509	$1,509
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	203	273	352	426	526	649

Notes:
(1) Unit cost based on strategy yield of 53 ac-ft/yr, actual yield limited by source supply.

5.10.6 Manufacturing

No Manufacturing demand exists or is projected for the county.

5.10.7 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the county.

5.10.8 Mining

Mining operations in Falls County obtain water supply solely through groundwater production from the Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer. Mining has a projected surplus throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.10.9 Irrigation

Irrigation in Falls County obtains water supply through groundwater production from the Brazos River Alluvium. No supply shortages are projected for Irrigation through the planning period and no change in water supply is recommended.

5.10.10 Livestock

Livestock operations in Falls County obtain water supply through local stock surface water impoundments. No shortages are projected throughout the planning period and no change in water supply is recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.11 Fisher County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.11-1 lists each water user group in Fisher County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.11-1 Fisher County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Roby	34	44	Projected surplus
City of Rotan	(4)	(94)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
SUN WSC			See Taylor County
The Bitter Creek WSC			See Nolan County
County-Other	(24)	(13)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Manufacturing	43	4	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	–	–	No projected demand
Mining	110	110	Projected surplus
Irrigation	1,173	1,173	Projected surplus
Livestock	419	419	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.11.1 City of Roby

5.11.1.1 Description of Supply

Water supplies are obtained from the Seymour Aquifer at 34 ac-fr/yr and the City of Sweetwater from 121 ac-ft/yr to 117 ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080, respectively. No shortage is projected for the City of Roby throughout the planning period.

5.11.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Roby. The supplies projected are adequate to meet the City's water demand through 2080, although conservation is recommended to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gallons per capita per day (gpcd).

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $23,256 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.

Table 5.11-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Roby

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	34	37	39	40	42	44
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	20	31	34	33	33
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,840	$13,680	$21,204	$23,256	$22,572	$22,572
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	44	57	70	74	75	77

5.11.2 City of Rotan

5.11.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Rotan currently purchases water under contract from the City of Snyder from 258 ac-ft/yr to 140 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 2080, respectively. The City also provides supply for manufacturing demand in Fisher County at four ac-ft/yr. Shortages are projected by 2030.

5.11.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB and in coordination with Region F, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Rotan. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 165 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

2. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $21,204 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
3. Subordination – Colorado River Municipal Water District (CRMWD) System (Water Supply from City of Snyder to meet Contract):
    a. Cost Source: Costs applied to CRMWD to meet contracts (2020 Region F Water Supply Plan).
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: none, existing infrastructure assumed sufficient.
    d. Annual Cost: already contracted supplies.

Table 5.11-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Rotan

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(4)	(23)	(50)	(69)	(83)	(94)
Conservation						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	18	31	30	30	29	28
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$12,312	$21,204	$20,520	$20,520	$19,836	$19,152
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	14	8	(20)	(39)	(54)	(66)
Subordination – CRMWD System (Water Supply from City of Snyder)						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	-	19	46	65	79	88
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	-	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	14	27	26	26	25	22

5.11.3 County-Other

Entities in Fisher County-Other receive supplies from the Seymour Aquifer at 76 ac-ft/yr and are projected to have a shortage of water beginning in 2030.

5.11.3.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 104 is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Seymour Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $219,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $640/ac-ft.

Table 5.11-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other Fisher

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(24)	(20)	(18)	(16)	(15)	(13)
Seymour Aquifer Development						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	25	25	25	25	25
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$16,000	$16,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$640	$640	$40	$40	$40	$40
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1	5	7	9	10	12

5.11.4 Manufacturing

5.11.4.1 Description of Supply

Manufacturing obtains most of its supply from the Seymour Aquifer at 154 ac-ft/yr in combination with 79 ac-ft/yr from the Dockum Aquifer, minimal supplies from Hamlin at two ac-ft/yr and Rotan at four ac-ft/yr. Manufacturing is projected to have a surplus of water through the year 2080.

5.11.5 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists nor is projected for the county.

5.11.6 Mining

5.11.6.1 Description of Supply

Mining is projected to have a surplus of water through the year 2080. The main supply is from the Blaine Aquifer at 216 ac-ft/yr.

5.11.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to supplement supply for Fisher County Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location and have not been determined.
2. Groundwater Development – Blaine Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,272,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,193/ac-ft.

Table 5.11-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fisher County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	110	110	110	110	110	110
Conservation						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	12	20	25	22	19	17
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	122	130	135	132	129	127
Groundwater Development – Blaine Aquifer						
Supply from Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	166	118	75	38	5	5
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$198,000	$141,000	$17,000	$9,000	$1,000	$1,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,193	$1,193	$229	$229	$229	$229
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	288	248	210	170	134	132

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.11.7 Irrigation

Irrigation uses water supplies from the Blaine Aquifer at 3,642 ac-ft/yr and Seymour Aquifers at 1,820 ac-ft/yr. Irrigation in Fisher County is projected to have a surplus of water through the year 2080 and no change in water supply is recommended.

5.11.8 Livestock

Livestock water is obtained from local supplies and Seymour Aquifer groundwater and is projected to have a surplus of water through the year 2080; no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.12 Grimes County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.12-1 lists each water user group (WUG) in Grimes County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the WUGs and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.12-1 Grimes County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Dobbin Plantersville WSC	(75)	(1,256)	Region H
G&W WSC	342	829	Projected surplus
City of Navasota	401	78	Projected surplus
TDCJ Luther Units	336	337	Projected surplus
TDCJ W. Pack Unit	180	182	Projected surplus
Wickson Creek SUD			See Brazos County
County-Other	(183)	(312)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Manufacturing	71	62	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	7,055	7,055	Projected surplus
Mining	(92)	(93)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Irrigation	(190)	(190)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	1,285	1,285	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.12.1 Dobbin-Plantersville WSC

Dobbin Plantersville WSC serves customers in Grimes and Montgomery Counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.12-1 represents the cumulative totals for the WSC. The majority of the demand for the entity is in Montgomery County, which is part of Region H. Dobbin-Plantersville WSC obtains water supply through groundwater production from the Gulf Coast Aquifer. The WSC is projected to have a water supply shortage throughout the planning horizon. The Brazos G RWG supports the recommended WMSs for Dobbin-Plantersville WSC recommended by Region H for the purposes of the 2026 Regional Water Plan.

5.12.2 G&W WSC

G&W WSC serves customers in Grimes and Waller Counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.12-1 represents the cumulative totals for the WSC. The majority of the demand for the entity is in Waller County which is part of Region H. G&W WSC obtains water supply through groundwater production from the Gulf Coast Aquifer and through purchases of treated surface water from a supplier in Region H. No shortages in supply are projected throughout the planning period. The Brazos G RWG supports the recommended WMSs for G&W WSC recommended by Region H for the purposes of the 2026 Regional Water Plan.

5.12.3 City of Navasota

5.12.3.1 Description of Supply

The City of Navasota obtains its water supply solely through groundwater production from the Gulf Coast Aquifer, which is projected to provide 2,096 ac-ft/yr of supply. Additionally, the City provides a portion of supply under contract to Grimes County Manufacturing. No shortages are projected for the City throughout the planning period and no change to supply is recommended.

5.12.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended for City of Navasota. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 18 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 183 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $266,760 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $45,196 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $726/ac-ft.

Table 5.12-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Navasota

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	401	341	287	221	129	78
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	118	294	360	369	380	390
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$80,712	$201,096	$246,240	$252,396	$259,920	$266,760
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	61	64	66	67	69	71
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$44,296	$45,196	$19,800	$20,100	$20,700	$21,300
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$726	$706	$300	$300	$300	$300
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	580	699	713	657	578	539

5.12.4 TDCJ - Luther Units

5.12.4.1 Description of Supply

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice – Luther Units obtains its water supply through groundwater production from the Gulf Coast Aquifer, which is projected to provide 825 ac-ft/yr of water supply throughout the planning period. No shortages are projected for the WUG through the planning period.

5.12.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for TDCJ – Luther Units. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 247 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum $92,340 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.12-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for TDCJ – Luther Units

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	336	337	337	337	337	337
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	28	59	91	124	135	135
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$19,152	$40,356	$62,244	$84,816	$92,340	$92,340
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	364	396	428	461	472	472

5.12.5 TDCJ – W. Pack Unit

5.12.5.1 Description of Supply

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice – W. Pack Unit obtains its water supply through groundwater production from the Gulf Cost Aquifer, which is projected to provide 631 ac-ft/yr of water supply throughout the planning period. No shortages are projected for the WUG through the planning period.

5.12.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for TDCJ – W. Pack Unit. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 245 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $127,224 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.12-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for TDCJ – W. Pack Unit

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	180	182	182	182	182	182
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	36	81	126	173	186	186
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$24,624	$55,404	$86,184	$118,332	$127,224	$127,224
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	216	263	308	355	368	368

5.12.6 County-Other

5.12.6.1 Description of Supply

Entities comprising Grimes County-Other obtain water supply through groundwater production from the Gulf Coast and Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers in the County, which when combined is projected to provide 1,251 ac-ft/yr of available water supply throughout the planning period. County-Other entities are projected to have a supply shortage beginning in 2030 of 183 ac-ft/yr; increasing to 312 ac-ft/yr by 2080. The following water management strategy is recommended to meet the needs of Grimes County-Other. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.12.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Grimes County-Other.

1. Gulf Coast Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,541,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $809/ac-ft.

Table 5.12-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Grimes County – Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(183)	(248)	(297)	(318)	(326)	(312)
Groundwater Development – Gulf Coast Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	350	350	350	350	350	350
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$283,000	$283,000	$34,000	$34,000	$34,000	$34,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$809	$809	$97	$97	$97	$97
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	167	102	53	32	24	38

5.12.7 Manufacturing

Manufacturing operations in Grimes County obtain water supply through groundwater production from the Gulf Coast Aquifer and through purchases of groundwater from the City of Navasota and Wickson Creek SUD. No shortages are projected and no change in supply is recommended.

5.12.8 Steam-Electric

Grimes County Steam-Electric obtains water supply primarily through purchases of raw water under from the City of Huntsville and the Brazos River Authority. Groundwater production from the Gulf Coast Aquifer is also used, though the quantity is relatively small compared to the surface water supplies. No supply shortages are projected for Steam-Electric entities and no change in water supply is recommended.

5.12.9 Mining

5.12.9.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Grimes County are supplied by groundwater from the Gulf Coast Aquifer. Demands for Mining are projected to increase resulting in shortages beginning in 2030.

5.12.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Grimes County-Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $200/ac-ft.
2. Gulf Coast Aquifer Groundwater Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,934,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $625/ac-ft.

Table 5.12-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Grimes County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(92)	(92)	(92)	(92)	(93)	(93)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7	11	16	16	16	16
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,400	$2,200	$3,200	$3,200	$3,200	$3,200
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(85)	(81)	(76)	(76)	(77)	(77)
Groundwater Development – Gulf Coast Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	248	248	248	248	248	248
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$155,000	$155,000	$19,000	$19,000	$19,000	$19,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$625	$625	$77	$77	$77	$77
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	163	167	172	172	171	171

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.12.10 Irrigation

5.12.10.1 Description of Supply

Irrigation in Grimes County is supplied through groundwater production from the Gulf Coast, Brazos River Alluvium, and Navasota River Alluvium Aquifers. Water supply shortages of 190 ac-ft/yr are projected in each decade of the planning period for Irrigation.

5.12.10.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Grimes County-Irrigation.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $1,667/ac-ft.
2. Gulf Coast Aquifer Groundwater Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,934,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $851/ac-ft.

Table 5.12-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Grimes County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(190)	(190)	(190)	(190)	(190)	(190)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	21	36	49	49	49	49
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$ 35,000	$ 60,000	$ 81,667	$ 81,667	$ 81,667	$ 81,667
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(169)	(154)	(141)	(141)	(141)	(141)
Groundwater Development – Gulf Coast Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	181	181	181	181	181	181
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$154,000	$154,000	$18,000	$18,000	$18,000	$18,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$851	$851	$99	$99	$99	$99
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	12	27	40	40	40	40

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement irrigation conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.12.11 Livestock

Livestock in Grimes County is supplied through local stock surface water impoundments. No shortage is projected during the planning period and no change in water supply is recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.13 Hamilton County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.13-1 lists each water user group in Hamilton County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.13–1 Hamilton County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Hamilton	143	172	Projected surplus
City of Hico	390	409	Projected surplus
Coryell City Water Supply District			See Coryell County
Multi-County WSC			See Coryell County
County-Other	35	64	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	(17)	(22)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	—	—	No projected demand
Mining	—	—	No projected demand
Irrigation	(276)	(286)	Projected surplus
Livestock	160	160	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.13.1 City of Hamilton

5.13.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Hamilton obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the Upper Leon River Municipal Water District (MWD). The water supplied by the Upper Leon River MWD is diverted from Lake Proctor under contracts with the Brazos River Authority. The City of Hamilton is projected to obtain up to 921 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water supply from the Upper Leon River MWD through the planning period. No shortages in water supply are projected for the City throughout the planning period and no change in supply is recommended.

5.13.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for City of Hamilton. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 39 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 179 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $69,084 in 2080.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $147,007 in 2030.

Table 5.13–2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hamilton

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	143	147	147	154	163	172
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	40	101	101	100	98	96
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$27,360	$69,084	$69,084	$68,400	$67,032	$65,664
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	129	128	128	126	124	122
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$147,007	$146,575	$55,314	$54,450	$53,585	$52,721
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	312	376	376	380	385	390
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Multi-County WSC – Purchase Additional Supply from Hamilton (ac-ft/yr)	(167)	(149)	(115)	(144)	(174)	(174)
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	145	227	261	236	211	216

5.13.2 City of Hico

The City of Hico obtains its water supply through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer, which is projected to provide a constant 567 ac-ft/yr of supply through the planning period. No shortages in supply are projected for the City during the planning period. Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for City of Hamilton. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 16 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 134 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $3,602 in 2030.

Table 5.13–3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hico

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	390	395	399	402	406	409
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2	2	2	2	2	2
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,602	$3,602	$600	$600	$600	$600
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	392	397	401	404	408	411

5.13.3 County-Other

Entities in Hamilton County-Other obtain their water supply through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer, which is projected to provide a constant 450 ac-ft/yr of supply. No shortages are projected throughout the planning period and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 112 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.13.4 Manufacturing

Manufacturing water supply in Hamilton County is obtained through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer. There is a projected shortage throughout the planning period, and the development of Trinity Aquifer groundwater is the recommended water management strategy to meet projected demand.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $293,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,182.

Table 5.13–4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Hamilton County – Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)
Trinity Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	17	18	19	20	21	21
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$20,000	$21,000	$4,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
Unti Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,182	$1,182	$227	$227	$227	$227
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.13.5 Steam-Electric

There is no projected water demand for Steam-Electric in Hamilton County.

5.13.6 Mining

There is no projected water demand for Mining in Hamilton County.

5.13.7 Irrigation

Irrigation water supply in Hamilton County is obtained through groundwater production from the Trinity Aquifer and local Brazos run of the river water rights. Supply shortages are projected for Irrigation throughout the planning period. The development of Trinity Aquifer groundwater is the recommended water management strategy to meet projected Irrigation demand. Hamilton County is modeled availability groundwater limited, and demand is left unmet beginning in 2060.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030
    c. Project Cost: $1,135,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $444.

Table 5.13–5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Hamilton County – Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(276)	(278)	(281)	(284)	(286)	(286)
Trinity Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	284	283	282	281	280	279
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$126,000	$126,000	$46,000	$46,000	$45,000	$45,000
Unti Cost ($/ac-ft)	$444	$444	$162	$162	$162	$162
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	8	5	1	(3)	(6)	(7)

5.13.8 Livestock

Livestock water supply is obtained through local stock surface water impoundments and Trinity Aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet demands through the planning period. No change in water supply is recommended.

5.14 Haskell County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.14-1 lists each water user group in Haskell County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.14-1 Haskell County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Haskell	(581)	(562)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Stamford			See Jones County
County-Other	72	96	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
Steam-Electric	—	—	No projected demand
Mining	(4)	(4)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Irrigation	(8,309)	(8,309)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	12	12	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year

5.14.1 City of Haskell

5.14.1.1 Description of Supply

Surface water supplies are obtained from a contract with North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority (NCTMWA). While the contract exceeds the City's projected demands, the current supplies from the NCTMWA are not sufficient to meet demands through 2080.

5.14.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Haskell. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 174 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Water Shortages/Needs remain unmet in 2030 and 2040. These shortages will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $68,400 in 2080; Unit cost of $684/ac-ft.

2. Lake Creek Reservoir: This strategy would be developed by NCTMWA to augment existing supplies.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II:
        i. Project requires an agreement with the BRA in order to develop sufficient supply.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    c. Project Cost: none (cost would be borne by NCTMWA).
    d. Unit Cost: none (supply already purchased from NCTMWA).

Table 5.14-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Haskell

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(581)	(573)	(564)	(566)	(566)	(562)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	43	100	97	97	96	95
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$29,412	$68,400	$66,348	$66,348	$65,664	$64,980
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(538)	(473)	(467)	(469)	(470)	(467)
Lake Creek Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	472	483	499	499
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr	(538)	(473)	5	14	29	32

5.14.2 County-Other

Supplies for Haskell County-Other are obtained through groundwater production from the Seymour Aquifer and through contract supply purchases from the City of Stamford and NCTMWA. Although supplies from NCTMWA have been reduced due to projected availability of supplies, County-Other supplies are projected to be adequate to meet demands through 2080. No supply shortages are projected, however the most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 53 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 120 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $57,983 in 2030.

Table 5.14-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other Haskell

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	72	76	87	89	91	96
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	109	106	102	101	99	97
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$57,983	$56,619	$46,398	$45,943	$45,033	$44,124

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	181	182	189	190	190	193
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr	181	182	189	190	190	193

5.14.3 Manufacturing

The water supply for Manufacturing use in Haskell County consists of groundwater from the Seymour Aquifer. No shortages are projected for manufacturing in Haskell County and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.14.4 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.14.5 Mining

5.14.5.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Haskell County are supplied solely though groundwater production from the Seymour Aquifer; however, this Aquifer is projected to have zero supply availability throughout the planning period.

5.14.5.2 Recommended Strategy

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Haskell County-Mining. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought.

1. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

Table 5.14-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Haskell County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)

5.14.6 Irrigation

5.14.6.1 Description of Supply

Haskell County Irrigation is supplied through groundwater production from the Seymour Aquifer; however, no available supply is projected for this Aquifer throughout the planning period.

5.14.6.2 Recommended Strategy

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Haskell County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $7,875,640.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,964/ac-ft.
2. Rolling Plains GCD Managed Aquifer Recharge:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Total Project Cost: $7.05 million.
    d. Annual Cost: $493,000.
    e. Unit Cost: $34/ac-ft.
3. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

Table 5.14-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Haskell County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(8,309)	(8,195)	(8,309)	(8,195)	(8,309)	(8,309)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,493	2,488	3,483	3,483	3,483	3,483
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,431,108	$5,719,168	$7,702,808	$7,724,412	$7,875,640	$7,875,640
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(6,816)	(5,707)	(4,826)	(4,712)	(4,826)	(4,826)
Rolling Plains GCD Managed Aquifer Recharge						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	10,000	14,500	14,500	14,500	14,500
Annual Cost ($/yr)	0	$340,000	$493,000	$493,000	$493,000	$493,000
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(6,816)	0	0	0	0	0

5.14.7 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.15 Hill County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.15-1 lists each water user group in Hill County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections. Water supply plans are also presented for some entities that need pumping/conveyance facilities to utilize their existing water resources, or to become a regional provider.

Table 5.15-1 Hill County Surplus (Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Birome WSC	195	138	Projected surplus
Bold Springs WSC			See McLennan County
Brandon-Irene WSC	(62)	(170)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Chatt WSC	(100)	(152)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Double Diamond Utilities	(712)	(2,188)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Files Valley WSC	(143)	(418)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Gholson WSC			See McLennan County
HILCO United Services	(328)	(612)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Hill County WSC	389	321	Projected surplus
City of Hillsboro	168	(550)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Hubbard	202	153	Projected surplus
City of Itasca	(31)	(54)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Johnson County SUD			See Johnson County
Parker WSC			See Johnson County
Post Oak SUD	0	(73)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Whitney	0	(35)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Woodrow-Osceola WSC	(444)	(506)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	(296)	(390)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Manufacturing	43	63	Projected surplus
Mining	220	205	Projected surplus
Irrigation	69	39	Projected surplus
Livestock	474	474	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; SUD – special utility district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.15.1 Birome WSC

Birome WSC is located in Hill, Limestone, and McLennan Counties, however most of its demand is within Hill County. Birome WSC obtains its water from the Trinity Aquifer and purchases water from Post Oak SUD. Surpluses are projected through 2080 for Birome WSC, and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 137 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. The quantity shown in Table 5.15-1 and Table 5.15-2 represents the cumulative totals for Birome WSC.

Table 5.15-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Brandon-Irene WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	195	186	174	165	151	138
Additional Demands from Strategies Recommended for Others						
Supply to Post Oak SUD (ac-ft/yr)	125	125	125	125	125	125
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	70	61	49	40	26	13

5.15.2 Brandon-Irene WSC

5.15.2.1 Description of Supply

Brandon-Irene WSC is located in Hill and Navarro Counties, however most of its demand is located in Hill County. Brandon-Irene WSC obtains its water from the Trinity Aquifer and surface water through a contract with Aquilla WSD which provides 287 ac-ft/yr. The WSC also provides supply to the City of Bynum in Hill County (County-Other). Shortages are projected throughout the planning horizon for Brandon-Irene WSC. The quantity shown in Table 5.15-1 and Table 5.15-3 represents the cumulative totals for Brandon-Irene WSC.

5.15.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following plan is recommended for Brandon-Irene WSC. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 249 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $183,312 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Trinity Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $183,312 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Brandon-Irene WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(62)	(81)	(95)	(111)	(139)	(170)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	104	167	231	260	268
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$30,780	$71,136	$114,228	$158,004	$177,840	$183,312
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(17)	23	72	120	121	98
Trinity Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	30	30	30	30	30	30
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$155,000	$155,000	$18,000	$18,000	$18,000	$18,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$5,167	$5,167	$600	$600	$600	$600
Additional Demands from Strategies Recommended for Others						
Supply to Hill County-Other (ac-ft/yr)	57	63	59	66	63	70
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	13	53	102	150	151	128

5.15.3 Chatt WSC

5.15.3.1 Description of Supply

Chatt WSC obtains water supply from the Trinity Aquifer which is projected to provide an available groundwater supply of 84 ac-ft/yr through the planning period. Chatt WSC also purchases 86 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water from Aquilla WSD. The WSC provides water to Hill County Manufacturing. A shortage is projected for Chatt WSC throughout the planning horizon.

5.15.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended to meet projected needs. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 27 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 162 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $17,100 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $84,125 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,116/ac-ft.

3. Groundwater Development – Woodbine Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,140,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,690/ac-ft.
4. Purchase Water from Files Valley WSC:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2060.
    c. Project Cost: Cost of purchase only.
    d. Unit Cost: $652/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Chatt WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(100)	(110)	(119)	(128)	(142)	(152)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	15	23	23	24	24	25
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$10,260	$15,732	$15,732	$16,416	$16,416	$17,100
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	27	27	28	28	28	30
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$84,125	$84,125	$10,284	$10,284	$10,284	$11,018
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(58)	(60)	(68)	(76)	(90)	(97)
Groundwater Development – Woodbine Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	100	100	100	100	100	100
Annual Cost:	$169,000	$169,000	$18,000	$18,000	$18,000	$18,000
Unit Cost:	$1,690	$1,690	$180	$180	$180	$180
Purchase Water from Files Valley WSC						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	1	12	12
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$652	$7,820	$7,820
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$652	$652	$652
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	42	40	32	25	22	15

5.15.4 Double Diamond Utilities

5.15.4.1 Description of Supply

Double Diamond Utilities is located in Hill, Johnson and Palo Pinto Counties, however most of its demand is located in Hill County. The Utility obtains water supply from the Trinity Aquifer and has a contract to purchase surface water from the Brazos River Authority (BRA) for 1,619 ac-ft/yr of that contracted supply 1,000 ac-ft is diverted from Possum Kingdom Lake and the remaining 619 ac-ft is diverted upstream of

Lake Whitney. Double Diamond Utilities' water supply is projected to have water supply shortages beginning in 2030. The quantity shown in Table 5.15-1 and Table 5.15-4 represents the cumulative totals for the entire Utility.

5.15.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended to meet projected needs. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 1,023 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. In2030, the remaining unmet need results from contracts not being fully allocated and is a consequence of the conservative methodology used to determine source supply volumes. Contract supplies from the BRA are firm supplies.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $1,842,012 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $8,225,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,138/ac-ft.
3. Need left unmet:
    a. 130 ac-ft of need left unmet in 2030.

Table 5.15-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Double Diamond Utilities

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(712)	(989)	(1,276)	(1,549)	(1,825)	(2,188)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	314	690	1,110	1,574	2,096	2,693
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$214,776	$471,960	$759,240	$1,076,616	$1,433,664	$1,842,012
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(398)	(299)	(166)	25	271	505
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	268	201	118	26	0	0
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$728,000	$728,000	$149,000	$149,000	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,716	$3,622	$1,263	$5,731	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(130)	(98)	(48)	51	271	505

Table 5.15-6 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for Double Diamond Utilities

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	640	640	640	640	640	640
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$728,000	$728,000	$149,000	$149,000	$149,000	$149,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,138	$1,138	$233	$233	$233	$233
Intake and WTP – Utilize BRA Contract						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	1,619	1,619	1,619	1,619	1,619
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$7,589,000	$7,589,000	$3,228,000	$3,228,000	$3,228,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$4,687	$4,687	$1,994	$1,994	$1,994

After recommended strategies 130 ac-ft/yr of supply shortage remains for the 2030 planning decade. This shortage would occur during drought conditions. The shortage could be mitigated by water use restrictions during drought conditions. Contract supplies from the BRA are firm supplies, reduction in supply from BRA is a consequence of the conservative methodology used to determine source supply volumes.

5.15.5 Files Valley WSC

5.15.5.1 Description of Supply

Files Valley WSC is located in Hill and Ellis (Region C) Counties, however most of its demand is located in Hill County. The WSC has a contract for 1,149 ac-ft/yr of treated surface water from Lake Aquilla through Aquilla Water Supply District. Files Valley WSC also provides water to Parker WSC and and Ellis County-Other entities. The WSC has a projected shortage throughout the planning period. The quantity shown in Table 5.15-1 and Table 5.15-7 represents the cumulative totals for Files Valley WSC.

5.15.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for Files Valley WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 179 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $155,268 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $12,712,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,461/ac-ft.

3. Purchases from Tarrant Regional WD:
    a. Cost Source: Region C.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Region C.
    d. Unit Cost: Region C.
4. Purchases from Waxahachie:
    a. Cost Source: Region C.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Region C.
    d. Unit Cost: Region C.

Table 5.15-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Files Valley WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(143)	(196)	(246)	(298)	(355)	(418)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	69	183	193	203	214	227
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$47,196	$125,172	$132,012	$138,852	$146,376	$155,268
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(74)	(13)	(53)	(95)	(141)	(191)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	289	267	248	197	206	212
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$999,000	$999,000	$104,000	$104,000	$104,000	$104,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$3,457	$3742	$419	$528	$505	$491
Supply from Region C Strategies						
Purchases from Tarrant Regional WD	0	0	12	41	59	59
Purchases from Waxahachie	53	57	50	23	9	9
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	268	311	257	166	133	89

Table 5.15-8 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for Files Valley WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	684	684	684	684	684	684
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$999,000	$999,000	$104,000	$104,000	$104,000	$104,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,716	$2,716	$152	$152	$152	$152
Intake and WTP – Utilize BRA Contract						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	1,619	1,619	1,619	1,619	1,619
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$7,589,000	$7,589,000	$3,228,000	$3,228,000	$3,228,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$4,687	$4,687	$1,994	$1,994	$1,994

5.15.6 HILCO United Services

5.15.6.1 Description of Supply

HILCO United Services is located in Hill, Ellis, and Bosque Counties, however most of its demand is located in Hill County. HILCO United Services obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer. HILCO United Services has contracted for 150 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 150 ac-ft/yr in 2030 decreasing to 137 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses proscribed under water planning guidelines. HILCO United Services is projected to have shortages during the entire planning period. The quantity shown in Table 5.15-1 and Table 5.15-9 represents the cumulative totals for HILCO United Services.

5.15.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 187 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $254,448 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for HILCO United Services

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(328)	(381)	(430)	(481)	(544)	(612)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	106	245	333	344	357	372
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$72,504	$167,580	$227,772	$235,296	$244,188	$254,448
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(222)	(136)	(97)	(137)	(187)	(240)

5.15.7 Hill County WSC

Hill County WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer and a treated surface water contract with Aquilla Water Supply District which supplies 230 ac-ft/yr. The existing contract and production capacity of the wells and groundwater availability are adequate to supply the needs of the WSC through the year 2080. No change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.15.8 City of Hillsboro

5.15.8.1 Description of Supply

The City of Hillsboro purchases its water supply from the Aquilla WSD, amounting to 3,640 ac-ft/yr. Based on water availability analyses conducted under water planning guidelines, this supply is expected to meet the City's needs through 2030, with 3,640 ac-ft/yr available, decreasing to 3,320 ac-ft/yr by 2080. However, a water supply shortage is projected to begin in 2060 at 71 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 550 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.15.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for the City of Hillsboro. Conservation is recommended to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $843,372 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Increase contract with Aquilla WSD – Contingent upon Lake Aquilla Pool Reallocation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2060.
    c. Project Cost: Borne by Aquilla WSD.
    d. Unit Cost: $774/ac-ft.
3. Lake Whitney Reallocation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Borne by Brazos River Authority.
    d. Unit Cost: $77/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Hillsboro

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	168	73	7	(71)	(306)	(550)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	273	635	1,016	1,180	1,204	1,233
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$186,732	$434,340	$694,944	$807,120	$823,536	$843,372
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	441	708	1,023	1,109	898	683
Increase contract with Aquilla WSD						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	200	200	200
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$154,800	$154,800	$134,600
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$774	$774	$673

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Lake Whitney Reallocation contract from BRA						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	300	300	300	300	300	300
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$23,100	$23,100	$23,100	$23,100	$23,100	$23,100
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	741	1,008	1,323	1,609	1,398	1,183

5.15.9 City of Hubbard

5.15.9.1 Description of Supply

The City of Hubbard obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer and from Lake Navarro Mills through the Post Oak SUD. The City of Hubbard has a projected surplus throughout the planning period. No change in water supply is recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 132 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.15.10 City of Itasca

5.15.10.1 Description of Supply

The City of Itasca obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer which is projected to provide an available groundwater supply of 217 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning period. The production capacity of the wells and groundwater availability are not adequate to supply the demands of the City of Itasca through the year 2080.

5.15.10.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended to meet projected needs. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 110 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,366,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,473/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Itasca

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(31)	(36)	(40)	(44)	(49)	(54)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	40	40	40	45	50	55
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$191,000	$191,000	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$4,775	$4,775	$600	$533	$480	$436
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	9	4	0	1	1	1

5.15.11 Post Oak SUD

5.15.11.1 Description of Supply

Post Oak SUD services Hill, Navarro, and Limestone Counties, however the majority of demand is in Hill County. Post Oak SUD purchases raw and treated surface water supply from Corsicana which can supply 870 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 718 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The SUD has a projected water supply shortage beginning in 2040 and continuing throughout the planning period. Balance and strategies represented in Table 5.15-1 and Table 5.15-6 are for the entire SUD across all counties and planning areas.

5.15.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended to meet projected needs. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 205 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $66,348 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Buyback contracted supply from Birome WSC:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Cost of existing contract.
    d. Unit Cost: Cost of purchased water.
3. Buyback contracted supply from Coolidge:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Cost of existing contract.
    d. Unit Cost: Cost of purchased water.
4. Alternative: Purchase Additional Supply from Corsicana:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $281,274 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,591/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-12 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Post Oak SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	0	(8)	(28)	(44)	(59)	(73)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	60	93	97	94	96
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$17,100	$41,040	$63,612	$66,348	$64,296	$65,664
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	25	52	65	53	35	23
Buyback contracted supply from Birome WSC						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	125	125	125	125	125	125
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Buyback contracted supply from Coolidge						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	58	0	9	39	77	71
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	208	177	199	217	237	219

5.15.12 City of Whitney

5.15.12.1 Description of Supply

The City of Whitney obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer. The City of Whitney has a contract for 750 ac-ft/yr of water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 750 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 649 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guideline; however, the City has not constructed the required infrastructure to utilize this supply.

5.15.12.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended to meet projected needs. Associated costs are included. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 172 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $54,720 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Intake and WTP – Utilize BRA Contract:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2040.

c. Project Cost: $47,722,000.
d. Unit Cost: $7,967/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-13 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Whitney

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	0	(11)	(21)	(23)	(24)	(35)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	33	75	76	77	79	80
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$22,572	$51,300	$51,984	$52,668	$54,036	$54,720
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	33	64	55	54	55	45
Intake and WTP – Utilize BRA Contract						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	750	750	750	750	750	750
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$5,975,000	$5,975,000	$2,619,000	$2,619,000	$2,619,000	$2,619,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$7,967	$7,967	$3,492	$3,492	$3,492	$3,492
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	783	814	805	804	805	795

5.15.13 Woodrow-Osceola WSC

5.15.13.1 Description of Supply

Woodrow-Osceola WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer. The existing production capacity of the wells and groundwater availability are not adequate to supply the demands of the WSC through the year 2080.

5.15.13.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for Woodrow-Osceola WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 176 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $75,924 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Trinity Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $5,081,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,066/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-14 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Woodrow-Osceola WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(444)	(459)	(469)	(480)	(492)	(506)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	43	102	104	106	108	111
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$29,412	$69,768	$71,136	$72,504	$73,872	$75,924
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(401)	(357)	(365)	(374)	(384)	(395)
Trinity Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	425	425	425	425	425	425
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$453,000	$453,000	$96,000	$96,000	$96,000	$96,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,066	$1,066	$226	$226	$226	$226
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	24	68	60	51	41	30

5.15.14 County-Other

5.15.14.1 Description of Supply

Entities in Hill County-Other use Trinity and Woodbine Aquifer groundwater and surface water from Brandon-Irene WSC, Corsicana, and the Trinity River Authority. County-Other entities are projected to have a shortage in water supply from 2030 through 2080.

5.15.14.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended to meet projected needs. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase Additional Supply from Brandon-Irene WSC:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Cost of purchase only.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,629/ac-ft.
2. Trinity Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,635,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,168/ac-ft.
3. Woodbine Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $877,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,760/ac-ft.

Table 5.15-15 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Hill County - Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(296)	(309)	(331)	(356)	(379)	(390)
Purchase Additional Supply from Brandon-Irene WSC						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	57	63	59	66	63	70
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$92,868	$102,643	$96,126	$107,531	$102,643	$114,048
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,629	$1,629	$1,629	$1,629	$1,629	$1,629
Trinity Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	87	88	83	72	77	83
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$229,000	$229,000	$44,000	$44,000	$44,000	$44,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,168	$1,168	$224	$224	$224	$224
Woodbine Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	24	25	24	25	25
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$69,000	$69,000	$7,000	$7,000	$7,000	$7,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,760	$2,760	$280	$280	$280	$280
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(127)	(134)	(164)	(194)	(214)	(212)

5.15.15 Manufacturing

Hill County Manufacturing purchases its water supply from Chatt WSC and is projected to have sufficient water supplies throughout the year 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.15.16 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.15.17 Mining

Supplies for Mining in Hill County include groundwater from the Trinity, Woodbine, and Brazos River Alluvium Aquifers and from a BRA contract for 1,000 ac-ft/yr. Mining has a projected surplus throughout the planning period.

5.15.18 Irrigation

Supplies for Irrigation in Hill County include groundwater from the Woodbine and Brazos River Alluvium Aquifers, and from a BRA contract for 1,000 ac-ft/yr. There are no projected shortages identified within the planning horizon.

5.15.19 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through the year 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.16 Hood County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.16-1 lists each water user group in Hood County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.16-1 Hood County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Acton MUD	2,038	(407)	Projected shortage – see plan below
City of Granbury	(767)	(3,259)	Projected shortage – see plan below
City of Lipan	27	(43)	Projected shortage – see plan below
Santo SUD			See Palo Pinto County
City of Tolar	38	(130)	Projected shortage – see plan below
County-Other	(2,568)	(4,203)	Projected shortage – see plan below
Manufacturing	6	1	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	6,053	5,753	Projected surplus
Mining	(2,955)	(4,293)	Projected shortage – see plan below
Irrigation	1,793	1,554	Projected surplus
Livestock	98	98	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; MUD – municipal utility district; SUD – special utility district

5.16.1 Acton MUD

5.16.1.1 Description of Supply

The Acton MUD service area includes portions of Hood and Johnson Counties. Acton MUD obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer and a contract with the Brazos River Authority for water from Lake Granbury. Treated surface water is constrained by the SWATS plant capacity, co-owned with Johnson County SUD through the Brazos Regional Public Utility Agency. The surpluses and shortages shown in Table 5.16-1 and Table 5.16-2 represent the cumulative totals for Acton MUD in Hood and Johnson Counties.

5.16.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Acton MUD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 185 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $527,364 in 2080; Unit cost of $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,385,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $727/ac-ft.
3. Increase WTP Capacity (SWATS):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $18,544,000 (Acton MUD portion).
    d. Annual Cost: $2,584,000 (maximum of phased costs).

Table 5.16-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Acton MUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	2,038	1,805	1,546	704	(131)	(407)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	170	443	603	655	711	771
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$116,280	$303,012	$412,452	$448,020	$486,324	$527,364
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	2,208	2,248	2,149	1,359	580	364
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer (Hood and Johnson Counties)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	51	51	51	51	417	417
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$37,000	$37,000	$8,000	$8,000	$66,000	$66,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$727	$727	$158	$158	$158	$158
Increase WTP Capacity (SWATS)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	3,051	3,007	3,527	3,456	2,753
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$2,584,000	$2,546,000	$1,241,000	$1,216,000	$969,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$847	$847	$352	$352	$352
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	2,259	5,350	5,207	4,937	4,453	3,534

5.16.2 City of Granbury

5.16.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Granbury obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer and a contract with the Brazos River Authority for water from Lake Granbury. There is a water treatment plant constraint on the surface water from Lake Granbury, and a water supply shortage is projected beginning in 2030.

5.16.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Granbury. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 175 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $674,424 in 2080; Unit cost of $684/ac-ft.
2. Granbury North Water Treatment Plant:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $45,500,000.
    d. Annual Cost: $7,155,000 (maximum of phased costs).

Table 5.16-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Granbury

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(767)	(1,190)	(1,630)	(2,111)	(2,651)	(3,259)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	225	626	703	787	880	986
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$153,900	$428,184	$480,852	$538,308	$601,920	$674,424
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(542)	(564)	(927)	(1,324)	(1,771)	(2,273)
Granbury North Water Treatment Plant						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,994,000	$8,994,000	$4,811,000	$4,811,000	$4,811,000	$4,811,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$3,212	$3,212	$1,718	$1,718	$1,718	$1,718
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	2,258	2,236	1,873	1,476	1,029	527

5.16.3 City of Lipan

The City of Lipan receives 173 ac-ft/yr of supply from the Trinity Aquifer. There is a projected shortage for the City beginning in 2060.

5.16.3.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Lipan. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be implemented: by 2060.
    c. Project Cost: $507,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $800.

Table 5.16-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Lipan

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	27	15	2	(11)	(26)	(43)
Trinity Aquifer Groundwater						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	50	50	50
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$40,000	$40,000	$4,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$800	$800	$80
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	27	15	2	39	24	7

5.16.4 City of Tolar

The City of Tolar receives 224 ac-ft/yr of supply from the Trinity Aquifer. There is a projected shortage for the City beginning in 2050.

5.16.4.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Tolar. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 148 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $674,424 in 2080; Unit cost of $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2050.
    c. Project Cost: $1,580,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,008.

Table 5.16-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Tolar

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	38	10	(20)	(52)	(89)	(130)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5	5	6	6	8	8
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,420	$3,420	$4,104	$4,104	$5,472	$5,472
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	43	15	(14)	(46)	(81)	(122)
Trinity Aquifer Groundwater						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	125	125	125	125
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$126,000	$126,000	$15,000	$15,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$1,008	$1,008	$120	$120
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	43	15	111	79	44	3

5.16.5 County-Other

5.16.5.1 Description of Supply

Entities in Hood County-Other receive groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer and surface water supplies through contracts with Acton MUD and the Brazos River Authority. Shortages are projected throughout the planning period.

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the development of Trinity Aquifer groundwater is recommended for County-Other entities. The Trinity Aquifer modeled available groundwater limit is at capacity especially in later decades, and County-Other needs are left unmet. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 94 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

1. Trinity Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $9,303,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $487/ac-ft.

Table 5.16-6 Plan Costs by Decade for Hood County – Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(2,568)	(3,050)	(3,528)	(4,043)	(4,068)	(4,203)
Trinity Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,950	1,950	1,574	1,252	876	740
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$950,000	$950,000	$238,000	$189,000	$132,000	$112,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$487	$487	$151	$151	$151	$151
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(618)	(1,100)	(1,954)	(2,791)	(3,192)	(3,463)

5.16.6 Manufacturing

Hood County Manufacturing obtains treated water from the Trinity Aquifer. Hood County Manufacturing is projected to have a surplus of water through the year 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.16.7 Steam-Electric

Steam-Electric operations in Hood County are supplied by Trinity Aquifer groundwater and water from Lake Granbury. No shortages are projected and no change in water supply is recommended.

5.16.8 Mining

5.16.8.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Hood County are supplied by Trinity Groundwater. Demands for Mining are projected to increase significantly, resulting in shortages beginning in 2030.

5.16.8.2 Recommended Strategy

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Hood County-Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.
    d. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer.
2. Trinity Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $6,465,000.
    d. Unit Cost: Max of $138/ac-ft.

Table 5.16-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Hood County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(2,955)	(3,345)	(3,685)	(3,950)	(4,156)	(4,293)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	61	121	155	148	142	143
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(2,894)	(3,224)	(3,530)	(3,802)	(4,014)	(4,150)
Groundwater Well Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,894	3,246	3,530	3,802	4,014	4,150
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$399,000	$448,000	$99,000	$106,000	$112,000	$116,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$138	$138	$28	$28	$28	$28
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	22	0	0	0	0

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.16.9 Irrigation

Hood County Irrigation demand is met by Trinity Aquifer groundwater and the purchase of water from the Brazos River Authority and is projected to meet demands through 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.16.10 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Trinity Aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet demands through 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.17 Johnson County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.17-1 lists each water user group in Johnson County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.17-1 Johnson County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Acton MUD			See Hood County
City of Alvarado	1,568	1,064	Projected surplus
Bethany WSC	938	694	Projected surplus
Bethesda WSC	(837)	(4,900)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Burleson	(1,121)	(6,513)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Cleburne	674	(6,060)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Crowley	(443)	(2,513)	Region C
Double Diamond Utilities			See Hill County
City of Forth Worth	(31,620)	(147,735)	Region C
City of Godley	12	(112)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Grandview	73	(128)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Johnson County SUD	654	8,551)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Keene	689	495	Projected surplus
City of Mansfield	(17,952)	(41,988)	Region C
Mountain Peak SUD	(4,591)	(20,015)	Region C
Parker WSC	302	323	Project surplus
City of Rio Vista	90	(78)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Venus	42	(33)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	(68)	1,280	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	477	1,461	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	(571)	(571)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Mining	1,250	1,164	Projected surplus
Irrigation	(245)	(245)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	159	159	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; MUD – municipal utility district; SUD – special utility district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.17.1 City of Alvarado

The City of Alvarado obtains its water supply from treated surface water from Johnson County SUD at 2,241 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City of Alvarado and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 125 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.17.2 Bethany SUD

Bethany SUD obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 296 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning period and treated surface water from Johnson County SUD at 1,120 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for Bethany WSC and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 127 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.17.3 Bethesda WSC

5.17.3.1 Description of Supply

Bethesda WSC is located in Johnson and Tarrant (Region C) Counties and obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 2,184 to 2,183 ac-ft/yr and surface water contracts from Tarrant Regional Water District (TRWD) through the Fort Worth System at 3,341 to 7,191 ac-ft/yr and Arlington System at 1,670 to 3,595 ac-ft/yr. Bethesda WSC is projected to have a shortage from 2030 to 2080.

5.17.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), and in coordination with Region C, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Bethesda WSC. Interbasin Transfer strategies were considered, however the purchase of additional supplies from TRWD is a recommended strategy in the 2026 Region C Plan and is reflected below as part of the interregional coordination process. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 188 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $2,114,928 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Purchase Additional Supplies from TRWD via Fort Worth:
    a. Cost Source: Region C Water Plan.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: none.
    d. Unit Cost: $531/ac-ft ($1.63/1,000 gallons).

3. Trinity Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $8,481,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $610/ac-ft.
4. Woodbine Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2080.
    c. Project Cost: $7,563,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,596/ac-ft.

Table 5.17-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bethesda WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(837)	(1,623)	(2,290)	(3,117)	(3,980)	(4,900)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	592	1,533	2,265	2,510	2,784	3,092
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$404,928	$1,048,572	$1,549,260	$1,716,840	$1,904,256	$2,114,928
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(245)	(90)	(25)	(607)	(1,196)	(1,808)
Purchase additional supplies from Fort Worth						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	378	937	881	1,522	2,894	2,886
Annual Cost ($/yr)						
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$531	$531	$531	$531	$531	$531
Trinity Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,412	0	0	0	0	0
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$861,000					
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$610					
Woodbine Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	369
Annual Cost ($/yr)						$589,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)						$1,596
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,545	847	856	915	1,698	1,447

5.17.4 City of Burleson

5.17.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Burleson obtains its water supply from TRWD through the Fort Worth System, which ranges from 7,042 to 8,269 ac-ft/yr. Burleson is projected to have a shortage from 2030 to 2080. Balance and strategies represented in Table 5.17-1 and Table 5.17-3 below are for the entire City in both counties and regions.

5.17.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Burleson. For the 2026 RWP, Region C has recommended that the City of Burleson purchase additional supplies from TRWD which would require an interbasin transfer. The Brazos G RWPG has reflected this recommended strategy from the 2026 Region C Plan as part of the interregional coordination process. Advanced Conservation is a recommended strategy and aligns with the City's 2024 Adopted Water Conservation Plan, which targets a gpcd goal of 123 by the end of 2025.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $1,104,660 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Purchase from TRWD via from Fort Worth:
    a. Cost Source: Region C Water Plan.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Region C Water Plan.
    d. Unit Cost: Region C Water Plan.

Table 5.17-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Burleson

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(1,121)	(2,278)	(3,177)	(4,273)	(5,373)	(6,513)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	566	1,036	1,180	1,308	1,453	1,615
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$387,144	$708,624	$807,120	$894,672	$993,852	$1,104,660
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(555)	(1,242)	(1,997)	(2,965)	(3,920)	(4,898)
Purchase from TRWD via Fort Worth						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,121	2,277	3,176	4,272	5,372	6,512
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	566	1,035	1,179	1,307	1,452	1,614

5.17.5 City of Cleburne

The City of Cleburne is projected to have a shortage beginning in 2040. The City of Cleburne obtains its water supply from direct reuse at 1,344 ac-ft/yr, to 5,590 ac-ft/yr from Pat Cleburne Reservoir, 55 ac-ft/yr from Trinity Aquifer. The City of Cleburne has contracted for 15,000 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority (BRA), which can supply 15,000 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 13,222 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Currently, the City does not have the infrastructure to utilize 9,700 ac-ft/yr from Lake Whitney.

5.17.5.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Cleburne. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 192 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $2,109,456 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. City of Cleburne West Loop Reuse Phase 2:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II and City of Cleburne Water Supply and Reuse Integration Plan.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $25,807,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $693/ac-ft.
3. Lake Whitney Desalination Phase 1:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II and City of Cleburne Water Supply and Reuse Integration Plan.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2060.
    c. Project Cost: $107,899,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,018/ac-ft.
4. Lake Whitney Desalination Phase 2:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II and City of Cleburne Water Supply and Reuse Integration Plan.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2070.
    c. Project Cost: $39,719,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,495/ac-ft.
5. Alternative Johnson County SUD Connection:
    a. Cost Source: City of Cleburne Water Supply and Reuse Integration Plan.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2060.
    c. Project Cost: $6,902,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,597/ac-ft.

Table 5.17-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Cleburne

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	674	(653)	(1,963)	(3,177)	(4,749)	(6,060)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	572	1,483	2,360	2,574	2,815	3,084
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$391,248	$1,014,372	$1,614,240	$1,760,616	$1,925,460	$2,109,456
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,246	830	397	(603)	(1,934)	(2,976)
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Increase Reuse Amount to Johnson County Steam Electric (ac-ft/yr)	571	571	571	571	571	571
Total Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies	675	(259)	(174)	(1,174)	(2,505)	(3,547)
City of Cleburne West Loop Reuse: Phase 2						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5,377	5,377	5,377	5,377	5,377	5,377
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,724,000	$3,724,000	$1,914,000	$1,914,000	$1,914,000	$1,914,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$693	$693	$356	$356	$356	$356
Lake Whitney Desalination Phase 1						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	4,300	4,300	4,300
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	$12,978,900	$12,978,900	$5,387,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	–	–	$3,018	$3,018	$1,253
Lake Whitney Desalination Phase 2						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	–	3,100	3,100
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	–	$7,734,200	$7,734,200
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	–	–	–	$2,495	$2,495
Alternative: Johnson County SUD Connection						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	–	3,360	3,360
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	–	$5,365,920	$5,365,920
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	–	–	–	$1,597	$1,597
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	6,052	5,118	5,203	8,503	10,272	9,230

5.17.6 City of Crowley

5.17.6.1 Description of Supply

The City of Crowley is mostly located in Tarrant County; however, a portion of the City limits is within Johnson County. The City obtains its water from the City of Fort Worth.

5.17.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, and through coordination with Region C. The full water plan for City of Crowley is discussed in the 2026 Region C Water Plan.

5.17.7 City of Fort Worth

The City of Fort Worth is a wholesale water provider in Region C in Tarrant County; however, a portion of the City limits is within Johnson County in Brazos G. The City obtains its water supply from surface water supplies located in Region C.

5.17.8 City of Godley

5.17.8.1 Description of Supply

The City of Godley obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 182 ac-ft/yr. Based on the available groundwater supply, the City of Godley is projected to have shortages starting in 2040.

5.17.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for the City of Godley. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 116 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,231,000.
    d. Unit Cost:[1] $633/ac-ft.
    e. Recommended project sized for 150 ac-ft/yr, limited by modeled available groundwater (MAG). Alternative Strategy represents full project.

Table 5.17-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Godley

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	12	(12)	(37)	(59)	(84)	(112)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	87	97	110	124	57	57
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$95,000	$95,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,029	$979	$73	$65	$140	$140
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	99	85	73	65	(27)	(55)

[1] Unit cost for strategy yield of 150 ac-ft/yr. Supply MAG limited.

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	150	150	150	150	150	150
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$95,000	$95,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$633	$633	$53	$53	$53	$53

Remaining unmet needs are a result of the MAG limitation on groundwater. Such shortage would only occur during drought of record conditions. Drought restrictions can help to reduce demand to minimize the unmet need.

5.17.9 City of Grandview

5.17.9.1 Description of Supply

The City of Grandview obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Woodbine Aquifer at 364 ac-ft/yr and is projected to have needs from 2050 through the year 2080. Balance and strategies represented in Table 5.17-1 and Table 5.17-6 represents the cumulative totals for the entire city in both counties and regions.

5.17.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Grandview. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 153 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $17,100 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Woodbine Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2060.
    c. Project Cost: $1,834,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,304/ac-ft.

Table 5.17-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Grandview

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	73	34	(6)	(42)	(83)	(128)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	17	19	21	24	25
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$10,944	$11,628	$12,996	$14,364	$16,416	$17,100
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	89	51	13	(21)	(59)	(103)

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development – Woodbine Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	125	125	125
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	$163,000	$163,000	$34,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	–	–	$1,304	$1,304	$272
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	89	51	13	104	66	22

5.17.10 Johnson County SUD

5.17.10.1 Description of Supply

Johnson County SUD obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer, which is projected to provide an available groundwater supply of 1,537 ac-ft/yr through the planning period. They also have contracts with BRA, which supplies 9,528 ac-ft/yr, and Mansfield, which supplies 7,215 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 8,845 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Johnson County SUD is projected to have shortages from 2040 to 2080. This WUG is located in multiple counties (Johnson, Tarrant (Region C), Ellis (Region C), and Hill). The balance shown in Table 5.17-1 and Table 5.17-7 represents the cumulative totals for all of Johnson County SUD.

5.17.10.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Johnson County SUD. For the 2026 RWP, Region C has recommended that Johnson County SUD purchase additional supplies from TRWD which would require an interbasin transfer. The Brazos G RWPG has reflected this recommended strategy from the 2026 Region C Plan as part of the interregional coordination process. Advanced water conservation is recommended and aligns with the Johnson County SUD Final 2022 Water Conservation Plan. The SUD has a five-year historical average of 102 gpcd, with the goal to reach 98 gpcd by 2026. The projected municipal unmet needs in 2080 result from contracts not being fully allocated due to limited source availability as determined by using the Brazos G RWPG's adopted methodology for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G RWP, which is consistent with the specific assumptions and methods required for regional water planning. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent to or worse than the drought of record, with the full implementation of all existing water rights in the basin. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online. Notably, BRA contract supplies are reported by BRA as firm supplies.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $2,060,208 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2060.

c. Project Cost: $13,414,000.
d. Unit Cost: $946/ac-ft.

3. Groundwater Development – Woodbine Aquifer:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $8,391,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $649/ac-ft.
4. Increase WTP Capacity (SWATS):
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2040.
   c. Project Cost: $23,877,000 (Johnson County SUD portion based on ratio of Acton MUD and Johnson County SUD BRA Contract Supplies).
   d. Unit Cost: $847/ac-ft.
5. Purchase from Tarrant Regional WD:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
   c. Project Cost: Cost of water purchase.
   d. Unit Cost: $500/ac-ft.

Table 5.17-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Johnson County SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	654	(1,310)	(3,153)	(4,912)	(6,695)	(8,551)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	631	2,077	2,310	2,517	2,750	3,012
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$431,604	$1,420,668	$1,580,040	$1,721,628	$1,881,000	$2,060,208
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,285	767	(843)	(2,395)	(3,945)	(5,539)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	750	1,274	1,274
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	$1,205,000	$1,205,000	$261,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	–	–	$946	$946	$205
Groundwater Development – Woodbine Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	100	100	100	200	1,037	668
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$673,000	$673,000	$83,000	$83,000	$83,000	$83,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$6,730	$6,730	$830	$415	$80	$124

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
WTP Expansion (SWATS)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	909	852	795	737	480
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	$770,000	$721,000	$280,000	$259,000	$169,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	$847	$847	$352	$352	$352
Purchase from Tarrant Regional WD						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	991	2,125	2,604	3,156	3,573	3,897
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$495,500	$1,062,500	$1,302,000	$1,578,000	$1,786,500	$1,948,500
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$500	$500	$500	$500	$500	$500
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	2,884	3,784	3,042	(11)	(74)	(2,232)

5.17.11 City of Keene

The City of Keene obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 439 ac-ft/yr and a contract with Johnson County SUD at 1,120 ac-ft/yr. The City of Keene is expected to have a surplus and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 130 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.17.12 City of Mansfield

The City of Mansfield is located in Tarrant, Ellis and Johnson Counties with a majority of its population and demand in Tarrant County. The City obtains its water supply from surface water from the TRWD, principally located in Region C. More information on City of Mansfield is discussed in the 2026 Region C Water Plan.

5.17.13 Mountain Peak SUD

Mountain Peak SUD is located in Johnson and Ellis Counties, with a majority of its population and demand in Ellis County (Region C). The WUG obtains its water supply from the City of Midlothian. More information on Mountain Peak SUD is discussed in the 2026 Region C Water Plan.

5.17.14 Parker WSC

5.17.14.1 Description of Supply

Parker WSC is located in Hill and Johnson Counties and obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 274 ac-ft/yr and surface water supplies from Files Valley WSC at 336 ac-ft/yr. The Parker WSC is expected to have a surplus and no changes in water supply are recommended. The surplus/shortages shown in Table 5.17-1 and the table below represents the cumulative totals for Parker WSC.

5.17.14.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Parker WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 147 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $2,736 in 2070 and 2080.
   d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Trinity Aquifer Development:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2060.
   c. Project Cost: $2,249,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $1,395/ac-ft.

Table 5.17-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Parker WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	302	305	308	312	317	323
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	4	3	4	4	4	4
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,736	$2,052	$2,736	$2,736	$2,736	$2,736
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	306	308	312	316	321	327
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	48	124	124
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	$173,000	$173,000	$15,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	–	–	$3,604	$1,395	$121
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	306	308	312	364	445	451

5.17.15 City of Rio Vista

5.17.15.1 Description of Supply

The City of Rio Vista obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 275 ac-ft/yr. Shortages are projected for the City of Rio Vista.

5.17.15.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for the City of Rio Vista. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 159 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $25,308 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft
2. Need left unmet.

Table 5.17-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Rio Vista

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	90	65	36	3	(35)	(78)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	14	37	21	24	28	31
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$9,576	$25,308	$14,364	$16,416	$19,152	$21,204
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	104	102	57	27	(7)	(47)

The City of Rio Vista is projected to have unmet needs in 2070 and 2080. The nearest WUG is Johnson County SUD who also has projected needs but may have sufficient supply available in the future with implementation of their WMSs. Impacts of unmet needs in a drought of record can be mitigated by the implementation of drought restrictions. The City may have the capability to secure permitted groundwater in amounts exceeding the MAG amounts identified as the maximum for regional water planning, which would address this unmet need.

5.17.16 City of Venus

5.17.16.1 Description of Supply

The City of Venus obtains its water supply from the Woodbine Aquifer at 103 ac-ft/yr and surface water contract from the City of Midlothian in Region C for 442 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 308 in 2080. The City projected to have a water supply shortage beginning in 2050.

5.17.16.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB and in coordination with Region C, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Venus. Interbasin Transfer strategies were considered, however the purchase of additional supplies from Midlothian are recommended strategies in the 2026 Region C Plan and is reflected below as part of the interregional coordination process. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 168 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Note all shortages and supplies from strategies are totals for Region C and Brazos G, shown in both Table 5.17-1 and Table 5.17-10.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.

c. Annual Cost: maximum of $38,988 in 2080.
d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

2. Purchase Water from Midlothian (various Region C strategies):

a. Cost Source: Region C Water Plan.
b. Date to be Implemented: 2020.
c. Project Cost: N/A.
d. Unit Cost: $534/ac-ft (maximum of weighted average of Region C strategies).

Table 5.17-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Venus

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	42	4	(11)	(25)	(31)	(33)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	33	57	53	50	46	43
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$22,572	$38,988	$36,252	$34,200	$31,464	$29,412
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	75	61	42	25	15	10
Purchase Water from Midlothian (various Region C strategies)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	239	281	314	369	448	447
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$127,626	$150,054	$167,676	$197,046	$239,232	$238,698
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$534	$534	$534	$534	$534	$534
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	314	342	356	394	463	457

5.17.17 County-Other

Entities in Johnson County-Other obtain water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at seven ac-ft/yr, as well as treated surface water from Johnson County SUD at 2,290 to 1,507 ac-ft/yr and Grand Prairie at 628 to 866 ac-ft/yr. A surplus of supply is projected for Johnson County-Other through 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd

5.17.18 Manufacturing

Johnson County Manufacturing is supplied by the Trinity Aquifer at 194 ac-ft/yr, and the cities of Burleson at two ac-ft/yr, Cleburne at 2,705 to 4,169 ac-ft/yr and Hillsboro at seven to 12 ac-ft/yr. No shortage is projected for Johnson County Manufacturing and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.17.19 Steam-Electric

5.17.19.1 Description of Supply

Johnson County Steam-Electric currently receives 1,344 ac-ft/yr of reuse and potable water supplies from the City of Cleburne. Johnson County Steam-Electric is projected to have shortages through year 2080. Conservation for Steam-Electric use is not recommended by the Brazos G RWPG.

5.17.19.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Johnson County Steam-Electric.

1. Purchase reuse water from the City of Cleburne:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $30,238,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $427/ac-ft.

Table 5.17-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Johnson County – Steam-Electric

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(571)	(571)	(571)	(571)	(571)	(571)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(571)	(571)	(571)	(571)	(571)	(571)
Purchase reuse water from the City of Cleburne						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	571	571	571	571	571	571
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$243,817	$243,817	$84,508	$84,508	$84,508	$84,508
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$427	$427	$148	$148	$148	$148
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Reuse (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.17.20 Mining

Johnson County Mining obtains its water supply from Cleburne at 1,443 ac-ft/yr. Johnson County Mining is projected to have a surplus throughout the planning period. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.17.21 Irrigation

Johnson County Irrigation obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 167 ac-ft/yr and the Woodbine Aquifer at 130 ac-ft/yr. Shortages are projected for Johnson County Irrigation.

5.17.21.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Johnson County Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $917/ac-ft
2. Leave Need Unmet

Table 5.17-12 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Johnson County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(245)	(245)	(245)	(245)	(245)	(245)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	28	38	38	38	38
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$ 14,667	$ 25,667	$ 34,833	$ 34,833	$ 34,833	$ 34,833
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(229)	(217)	(207)	(207)	(207)	(207)
Unmet Need	(229)	(217)	(207)	(207)	(207)	(207)

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement irrigation conservation technologies will vary based on location.

5.17.22 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.18 Jones County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.18-1 lists each water user group in Jones County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.18-1 Johnson County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Abilene			See Taylor County
City of Anson	28	143	Projected surplus
Hamby WSC	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
City of Hamlin	209	325	Projected surplus
Hawley WSC	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
City of Stamford	470	818	Projected surplus
County-Other	(567)	(289)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Manufacturing	-	-	No projected demand
Steam-Electric	-	-	No projected demand
Mining	70	70	Projected surplus
Irrigation	276	276	Projected surplus
Livestock	155	155	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.18.1 City of Anson

5.18.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Anson receives surface water supplies from the West Central Texas Municipal Water District at 1,523 to 1,600 ac-ft/yr. The City sells water both to the City of Hamlin and Hawley WSC. No shortages are projected for the City of Anson. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 139 is below the selected goal of 140 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). No changes to Anson's water supplies are recommended.

5.18.2 Hamby WSC

5.18.2.1 Description of Supply

Hamby WSC has a contract with the City of Abilene for up to 308 ac-ft/yr. Under this contract with Abilene, Hamby WSC has enough supply to meet their projected demands throughout the planning horizon. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 116 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. No changes in the water supply plan are recommended.

5.18.3 City of Hamlin

5.18.3.1 Description of Supply

The City of Hamlin receives surface water supplies from the City of Anson, which ranges from 495 to 524 ac-ft/yr. The City also provides two ac-ft/yr to Manufacturing entities in Fisher County. A surplus is projected for the City of Hamlin.

5.18.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Hamlin. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 187 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $38,304 in 2050.

Table 5.18-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hamlin

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	209	246	270	292	307	325
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	24	48	56	48	43	39
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$16,416	$32,832	$38,304	$32,832	$29,412	$26,676
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	233	294	326	340	350	364

5.18.4 Hawley WSC

Hawley WSC is located in multiple counties (Taylor, and Jones). This description represents the cumulative totals for Hawley WSC. Hawley WSC has water supply contracts with the City of Abilene for 383 ac-ft/yr and the City of Anson for 221 ac-ft/yr. Under these two water supply contracts, Hawley WSC has no shortages throughout the planning period. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 109 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. No changes in the water supply plan are recommended.

5.18.5 City of Stamford

The City of Stamford is located in Jones County. The City has a contract with Brazos River Authority (BRA) to compensate BRA for the reduction in yield of its system as the result of the City's upstream diversion. The City also provides water for local entities included in Haskell and Jones County-Others. The City's supply is sufficient to meet current and projected demands, with no shortages projected through 2080.

5.18.5.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Stamford. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 48 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 233 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $17,784 in 2060.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $199,943 in 2030.

Table 5.18-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Stamford

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	470	527	589	652	728	818
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	26	23	18
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$0	$0	$0	$17,784	$15,732	$12,312
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	245	226	206	184	158	128
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$199,943	$191,401	$92,607	$82,717	$71,029	$57,543
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	715	753	795	862	909	964

5.18.6 County-Other

Entities in County-Other receive supplies through the City of Stamford at 89 ac-ft/yr and the Seymour Aquifer at 201 ac-ft/yr. County-Other entities are projected to have a shortage of water throughout the planning period.

5.18.6.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Jones County-Other. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 113 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Seymour Aquifer:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $570,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $119/ac-ft.
2. Purchase Additional Supplies from City of Abilene:
   a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rates.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $0 (Current infrastructure assumed to be adequate).
   d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.18-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Jones County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(567)	(524)	(477)	(423)	(361)	(289)
Seymour Aquifer Groundwater						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	400	402	402	405	408	411
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$48,000	$48,000	$9,000	$9,000	$9,000	$9,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$119	$119	$22	$22	$22	$22
Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	167	122	102	112	121	121
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$386,400	$282,300	$236,000	$259,200	$280,000	$280,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	27	94	168	243

5.18.7 Manufacturing

There is no projected demand for Manufacturing in Jones County.

5.18.8 Steam-Electric

There is no projected demand for Steam-Electric in Jones County.

5.18.9 Mining

Jones County Mining obtains its water supply from run-of-the river water rights which are not reliable in the drought of record and 79 ac-ft/yr from the Seymour Aquifer. No shortages are projected for Mining in Jones County throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.18.10 Irrigation

Jones County Irrigation is supplied by the Seymour Aquifer at 2,638 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for Irrigation in Jones County throughout the planning period. Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $340,400 maximum in2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,719 /ac-ft.

Table 5.18-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Jones County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	276	276	276	276	276	276
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	85	141	198	198	198	198
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$146,100	$242,400	$340,400	$340,400	$340,400	$340,400
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,719	$1,719	$1,719	$1,719	$1,719	$1,719
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	361	417	474	474	474	474
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	361	417	474	474	474	474

5.18.11 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Seymour aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.19 Kent County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.19-1 lists each water user group in Kent County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2040 and 2070. A brief summary of each water user group supply is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.19-1 Kent County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Jayton	152	140	Projected surplus
County-Other	(14)	(17)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Manufacturing	-	-	No projected demand
Steam-Electric	-	-	No projected demand
Mining	706	706	Projected surplus
Irrigation	788	788	Projected surplus
Livestock	32	32	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year

5.19.1 City of Jayton

5.19.1.1 Description of Supply

Water supply for the City of Jayton is 249 ac-ft/yr from the Seymour Aquifer. Jayton has sufficient supplies through 2080.

5.19.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water supply plan is recommended to supplement supply for the City of Jayton. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 180 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $14,364 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.19-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Jayton

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	152	153	149	146	143	140
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	8	19	20	21	21	21
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$5,472	$12,996	$13,680	$14,364	$14,364	$14,364
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	160	172	169	167	164	161

5.19.2 County-Other

Water supply for County-Other is from local groundwater within the Seymour Aquifer. Shortages are projected throughout the planning period.

5.19.2.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended to meet for entities in Kent County-Other. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 109 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Seymour Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $243,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $950/ac-ft.

Table 5.19-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Kent County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(14)	(14)	(13)	(14)	(16)	(17)
Seymour Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	20	20	20	20	20	20
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$19,000	$19,000	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$950	$950	$100	$100	$100	$100
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	6	6	7	6	4	3

5.19.3 Manufacturing

No Manufacturing demand exists or is projected for the county.

5.19.4 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the county.

5.19.5 Mining

Mining operations are supplied with water from the Seymour Aquifer. No shortages are projected for Mining, surpluses are projected through 2080, and no change in water supply are recommended.

5.19.6 Irrigation

Irrigation in Kent County is supplied by the Dockum and Seymour Aquifers. No shortages are projected for Irrigation, a surplus of 788 ac-ft/yr is projected through 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.19.7 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Dockum Aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Kent County Livestock water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.20 Knox County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.20–1 lists each water user group in Knox County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of each water user group supply is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.20-1 Knox County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Benjamin	(26)	(35)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Knox City	(237)	(241)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Munday	(219)	(253)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	45	75	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	–	–	No projected demand
Steam-Electric	–	–	No projected demand
Mining	–	–	No projected demand
Irrigation	(10,331)	(10,212)	Projected shortage - see plan below
Livestock	102	102	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year

5.20.1 City of Benjamin

5.20.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Benjamin obtains water through the purchase of treated surface water under contract from the North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority (NCTMWA) and through local groundwater production from the Seymour Aquifer. The City is contracted to purchase up to 64 ac-ft/yr from the NCTMWA; however, due to availability of supplies, this contract is prorated to provide a maximum of only 14 ac-ft/yr during the planning period. Additionally, no local groundwater supply from the Seymour Aquifer is projected to be available to the City. Needs remain unmet in the 2030 and 2040 decades. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

5.20.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Benjamin. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 277 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $14,364 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Lake Creek Reservoir. This strategy would be developed by NCTMWA to augment existing supplies.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II:
        i. Project requires an agreement with the Brazos River Authority (BRA).
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    c. Project Cost: none (cost would be borne by NCTMWA).
    d. Unit Cost: none (supply already purchased from NCTMWA).

Table 5.20–2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Benjamin

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(26)	(29)	(23)	(30)	(17)	(35)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5	10	14	19	21	18
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,420	$6,840	$9,576	$12,996	$14,364	$12,312
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(21)	(19)	(9)	(11)	4	(17)
Lake Creek Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	23	30	17	35
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(21)	(19)	14	19	21	18

5.20.2 Knox City

5.20.2.1 Description of Supply

Knox City obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the NCTMWA. The City is contracted to purchase up to 187 ac-ft/yr from the NCTMWA; however, due to availability of supplies, this contract is prorated to provide a maximum of only 24 ac-ft/yr during the planning period. Additionally, no local groundwater supply is projected to be available. Needs remain unmet in 2030 and 2040.

These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

5.20.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Knox City. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 37 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 224 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $60,192 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $52,078 in 2030.
3. Lake Creek Reservoir. This strategy would be developed by NCTMWA to augment existing supplies:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II:
        i. Project requires a subordination agreement with the BRA.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: none (cost would be borne by NCTMWA).
    d. Unit Cost: none (supply already purchased from NCTMWA).

Table 5.20–3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Knox City

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(237)	(238)	(240)	(241)	(241)	(241)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	14	33	32	33
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$9,576	$22,572	$21,888	$22,572
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	55	55	55	55	54	54
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$52,078	$52,078	$23,458	$23,458	$23,031	$23,031
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(182)	(183)	(171)	(153)	(155)	(154)
Lake Creek Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	192	197	202	202
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(182)	(183)	21	44	47	48

5.20.3 City of Munday

5.20.3.1 Description of Supply

The City of Munday obtains surface water via a contract with NCTMWA. The City is contracted to purchase up to 291 ac-ft/yr from the NCTMWA; however, due to availability of supplies, this contract is prorated to provide a maximum of only 22 ac-ft/yr during the planning period. Additionally, no local groundwater supply is projected to be available to the City.

5.20.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Munday. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 180 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Needs remain unmet in 2030 and 2040. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $34,200 in 2080
    d. Unit Cost: $684 /ac-ft.
2. Lake Creek Reservoir. This strategy would be developed by NCTMWA to augment existing supplies.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II:
        i. Project requires a subordination agreement with the BRA.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: none (cost would be borne by NCTMWA).
    d. Unit Cost: none (supply already purchased from NCTMWA).

Table 5.20–4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Munday

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(219)	(224)	(231)	(235)	(242)	(253)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	17	41	47	47	48	50
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$11,628	$28,044	$32,148	$32,148	$32,832	$34,200
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(202)	(183)	(184)	(188)	(194)	(203)
Lake Creek Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	222	229	234	234
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(202)	(183)	38	41	40	31

5.20.4 County-Other

Entities in Knox County-Other obtain water supply through groundwater production from the Seymour and Blaine Aquifers and through purchases of surface water under contracts with the BRA. No future local groundwater supply is projected to be available from the Seymour Aquifer; local available supply to Knox County-Other users from the Blaine Aquifer is projected at 100 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning period. No water supply shortages are projected and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the current per capita usage of 93 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.20.5 Manufacturing

No Manufacturing demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.20.6 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.20.7 Mining

No Mining demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.20.8 Irrigation

5.20.8.1 Description of Supply

Knox County Irrigation obtains water supplies from the Seymour and Blaine Aquifers. Irrigation shortages are projected throughout the planning horizon.

5.20.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $5,762,700.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,037 /ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Blaine Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $956,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $211 /ac-ft.
3. Rolling Plains Groundwater Conservation District (GCD) Managed Aquifer Recharge:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Total Project Cost: $7.05 million.
    d. Annual Cost: $34,000.
    e. Unit Cost: $34/ac-ft.
4. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

Table 5.20-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Knox County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(10,331)	(10,747)	(10,441)	(7,806)	(9,999)	(10,212)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,111	1,851	2,592	2,592	2,592	2,592
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,686,800	$4,479,400	$5,685,300	$5,428,600	$5,762,700	$5,762,700
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(9,220)	(8,896)	(7,849)	(5,214)	(7,407)	(7,620)
Groundwater Development – Blaine Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	383	383	383	383	383	383
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$81,000	$81,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$211	$211	$37	$37	$37	$37
Rolling Plains GCD - Managed Aquifer Recharge						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	-	-	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	-	$34,000	$34,000	$34,000	$34,000
Unit Cost ($ac-ft)	-	-	$34	$34	$34	$34
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(8,837)	(8,513)	(6,466)	(3,831)	(6,024)	(6,237)

5.20.9 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Blaine Aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Knox County Livestock water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.21 Lampasas County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.21-1 lists each water user group in Lampasas County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.21-1 Lampasas County Surplus (Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Copperas Cove			See Coryell County
Corix Utilities Texas, Inc			See Washington county
Kempner WSC	(971)	(961)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Lampasas	(432)	(977)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Multi-County WSC			See Coryell County
County-Other	125	183	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	(59)	(68)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	-	-	No projected demand
Mining	81	81	Projected surplus
Irrigation	(144)	(167)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	288	288	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.21.1 Kempner WSC

Kempner WSC has service areas in portions of Coryell, Bell, Lampasas, and Burnet (Region K) Counties. Kempner WSC has contracted for 8,900 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 7,417 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 7,184 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The WSC also has a contract with the Central Texas WSC. Kempner's supplies are constrained by water treatment capacity of 3,965 ac-ft/yr. Kempner WSC sells supplies to the Lampasas County-Other, Lampasas County Mining, Salado WSC, and provides the conveyance of treated water from Central Texas WSC to the City of Lampasas. Shortages are projected for Kempner WSC in 2030 through 2080.

5.21.1.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Kempner WSC. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 31 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 176 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Kempner WSC has no shortages in the Region K portion; however, the Region K RWPG has recommended conservation and drought management strategies.

1. Conservation:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
   d. Annual Cost: maximum of $43,092 in 2040.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $664,697 in 2040.
3. Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 (Groundwater):
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $4,500, Project Costs borne by BRA.
   d. Unit Cost: $100/ac-ft.
4. Increase Water Treatment Plant Capacity:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $13,550,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $835/ac-ft.

Table 5.21-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Kempner WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(971)	(881)	(855)	(897)	(936)	(961)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	63	61	60	60	59
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	$43,092	$41,724	$41,040	$41,040	$40,356
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	535	552	558	555	551	546
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$636,650	$644,736	$223,200	$222,000	$220,400	$218,400
Drought Management & Conservation (Region K Portion)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	18	17	17	16	15	14
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Drought Management (ac-ft/yr)	(418)	(249)	(219)	(266)	(310)	(342)
Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	45	45	45	45	45
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,500	$4,500	$4,500	$4,500	$4,500	$4,500
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$100	$100	$100	$100	$100	$100

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Increase WTP Capacity						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)(1)	1,120	1,120	2,015	2,015	2,015	2,015
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$935,000	$935,000	$404,000	$727,000	$727,000	$727,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$835	$835	$361	$361	$361	$361
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	747	916	1,841	1,794	1,750	1,718

Notes:
(1) Quantity represents increase in treatment capacity required to develop existing supplies currently constrained by treatment capacity. Existing contracted supplies are sufficient to meet shortage if treatment capacity is expanded.

5.21.2 City of Lampasas

5.21.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Lampasas has contracted for water supply from Kempner WSC at 1,281 ac-ft/yr. The City of Lampasas has also contracted for 3,500 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 2,917 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 2,825 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses developed for the purposes of regional water planning under water planning guidelines and assumptions. The City's supplies are constrained by water treatment capacity. The City provides supply for Lampasas County-Manufacturing demands. Shortages are projected beginning in 2030 through 2080.

5.21.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Lampasas. The City also is considering an expansion to their conveyance system to access more of the contracted water through BRA. This WMS is included in Volume II but is not shown below because it would not increase the City's existing supply but allow them to access more of the existing contractual supply. The City is also considering the development of groundwater as an alternative WMS. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 17 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 167 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $153,900 in 2070.
    d. Unit cost of $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $35,678 in 2040.
3. Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 (Groundwater :
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

c. Annual Cost: maximum of $4,500, Project Costs borne by BRA.
d. Unit Cost: $100 /ac-ft.

4. New Water Treatment Plant:

a. Cost Source: Volume II.
b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
c. Project Cost: $39,697,000.
d. Unit Cost: $3,788.

5. Alternative: Groundwater Development – Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer:

a. Cost Source: Volume II.
b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
c. Project Cost: $5,006,000.
d. Unit Cost: $3,079.

Table 5.21-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Lampasas

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(432)	(604)	(778)	(933)	(1,008)	(977)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	77	186	204	219	225	221
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$52,668	$127,224	$139,536	$149,796	$153,900	$151,164
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	40	44	48	51	53	52
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$34,478	$35,678	$14,400	$15,300	$15,900	$15,600
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(315)	(374)	(526)	(663)	(730)	(704)
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Lampasas Manufacturing – Purchase Treated Water from Lampasas	(16)	(7)	(4)	-	-	-
Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	45	45	45	45	45
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,500	$4,500	$4,500	$4,500	$4,500	$4,500
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$100	$100	$100	$100	$100	$100
New Water Treatment Plant						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,250	1,242	1,234	1,227	1,219	1,211
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,735,000	$4,705,000	$1,918,000	$1,907,000	$1,895,000	$1,882,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$3,788	$3,788	$1,554	$1,554	$1,554	$1,554

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
(Alternative) Groundwater Development – Ellenburger – San Saba Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	-	140	140	140	140	140
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	$431,000	$431,000	$79,000	$79,000	$79,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	-	$3,079	$3,079	$564	$564	$564
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	964	906	749	609	534	552

5.21.3 County-Other

Entities included in Lampasas County-Other obtain five ac-ft/yr of water supply from the Trinity Aquifer and six ac-ft/yr from the Marble Falls Aquifer. Surpluses are projected through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 121 is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.21.4 Manufacturing

Lampasas County Manufacturing obtains its water supply from the City of Lampasas at 137 to 213 ac-ft/yr and run-of-river rights at 48 to zero ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080. Based on the available surface water supply, Lampasas County Manufacturing is projected to have a shortage throughout the planning period after conservation.

5.21.4.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the Lampasas County Manufacturing. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.
2. Increase treatment contract with City of Lampasas:
    a. Cost Source: Lampasas Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Existing infrastructure assumed sufficient.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,499/ac-ft. ($4.60/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.21-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Lampasas County-Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(59)	(63)	(68)	(73)	(76)	(68)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	6	11	15	15	15	15
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(53)	(52)	(53)	(28)	(61)	(53)
Increase treated water contract from City of Lampasas						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	7	4	-	–	–
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$24,000	$10,000	$6,000	-	–	–
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,499	$1,499	$1,499	-	-	-
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(37)	(45)	(49)	(58)	(61)	(53)

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.21.5 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand is projected for Lampasas County.

5.21.6 Mining

5.21.6.1 Description of Supply

Lampasas County Mining currently obtains its water supply from Kempner WSC at 25 ac-ft/yr and the Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer at 79 ac-ft/yr. Mining is projected to have a surplus throughout the planning period.

5.21.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Lampasas County-Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Groundwater Development – Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,769,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,489/ac-ft.

Table 5.21-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Lampasas County - Minning

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	81	81	81	81	81	81
Groundwater Development – Ellenburger – San Saba Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	73	83	97	115	133	133
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$182,000	$207,000	$48,000	$57,000	$66,000	$66,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,489	$2,489	$496	$496	$496	$496
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	154	164	178	196	214	214

5.21.7 Irrigation

5.21.7.1 Description of Supply

Lampasas County Irrigation is supplied by the Trinity, Marble Falls, and Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifers at 208 ac-ft/yr and run of the river water rights at 169 to 146 ac-ft/yr. Irrigation is projected to have shortages throughout the planning period.

5.21.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Lampasas County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $65,300 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,719/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Marble Falls Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,772,000.
    d. Unit Cost: Max of $1,534/ac-ft.

Table 5.21-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Lampasas County - Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(144)	(149)	(153)	(158)	(162)	(167)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	27	38	38	38	38
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$27,500	$46,400	$65,300	$65,300	$65,300	$65,300
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,719	$1,719	$1,719	$1,719	$1,719	$1,719
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(128)	(122)	(115)	(120)	(124)	(129)
Groundwater Development – Marble Falls Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	203	195	198	201	204	204
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$311,000	$299,000	$47,000	$47,000	$48,000	$48,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,534	$1,534	$235	$235	$235	$235
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	75	73	83	81	80	75

5.21.8 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Lampasas County Livestock water supply are recommended.

5.22 Lee County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.22-1 lists each water user group in Lee County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.22-1 Lee County Surplus (Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Aqua WSC	(3,565)	(26,648)	Region K
City of Giddings	562	634	Projected surplus
Lee County WSC	1,646	1,192	Projected surplus
City of Lexington	291	316	Projected surplus
Southwest Milam WSC			See Milam County
County-Other	(115)	(33)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Manufacturing	3	7	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	0	0	No projected demand
Mining	1,775	2,088	Projected surplus
Irrigation	359	435	Projected surplus
Livestock	163	163	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.22.1 Aqua WSC

Aqua WSC is located in Lee (Brazos G) and Bastrop (Region K), Fayette (Region K), Travis (Region K), and Caldwell (Region L) Counties with a majority of its demand in Bastrop County. Aqua WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer.

5.22.2 City of Giddings

5.22.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Giddings obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 1,743 ac-ft/yr. The City of Giddings sells water to Lee County Manufacturing at 14 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 18 ac-ft/yr in 2080. There are surpluses projected through 2080.

5.22.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Giddings. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 188 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $179,208 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.22-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Giddings

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	562	549	565	585	607	634
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	88	204	262	258	252	245
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$60,192	$139,536	$179,208	$176,472	$172,368	$167,580
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	650	753	827	843	859	879

5.22.3 Lee County WSC

Lee County WSC is located in Lee, Bastrop (Region K) and Fayette (Region K) counties. The majority of water demand is located in Lee County. The WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Queen City Aquifer at 83 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 94 ac-ft/yr in 2080, the Carrizo Wilcox at 3,934 ac-ft/yr, and the Sparta Aquifer at 272 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the planning period.

5.22.4 City of Lexington

5.22.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Lexington obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 667 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City of Lexington, surpluses are projected through 2080.

5.22.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Lexington. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 177 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $48,564 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.22-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Lexington

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	291	286	292	299	308	316
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	29	71	69	68	66	65
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$19,836	$48,564	$47,196	$46,512	$45,144	$44,460
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	320	357	361	367	374	381

5.22.5 Lee County-Other

5.22.5.1 Description of Supply

Lee County-Other receive supplies from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 156 ac-ft/yr. County-Other is projected to have a water supply shortage of 115 ac-ft/yr beginning in 2030, decreasing to 33 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.22.5.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Lee County-Other. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $45,144 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $426/ac-ft.
2. Queen City Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,364,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,081/ac-ft.
3. Sparta Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,271,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,081/ac-ft.

Table 5.22-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Lee County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(115)	(111)	(94)	(76)	(55)	(33)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7	7	6	5	5	5
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,986	$2,985	$1,800	$1,500	$45,144	$44,460
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$426	$426	$300	$300	$300	$300
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(108)	(104)	(88)	(71)	(50)	(28)
Queen City Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	99	99	99	99	99	99
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$107,000	$107,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,081	$1,081	$111	$111	$111	$111
Sparta Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	10	10	10	10	10
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$97,000	$97,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$9,700	$9,700	$800	$800	$800	$800
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1	5	21	38	59	81

5.22.6 Manufacturing

Manufacturing is supplied from City of Giddings at 14 to 18 ac-ft/yr and is projected to have a surplus of water through the year 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.22.7 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists nor is there a water supply surplus or shortage projected for the county.

5.22.8 Mining

5.22.8.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Lee County are supplied water from the Carrizo-Wilcox at 3,011 to 3,324 ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080 and is projected to have a surplus of water through the year 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.22.9 Irrigation

Lee County Irrigation is supplied from run-of-the river water rights at one ac-ft/yr, the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 780 to 783 ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080, and the Queen City Aquifer at 518 to 591 ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080. Irrigation is projected to have a surplus of water through the year 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.22.10 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.23 Limestone County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.23-1 lists each water user group in Limestone County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.23-1 Limestone County Surplus (Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Birome WSC			See Hill County
Bistone MWSD	32	(192)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Coolidge	237	132	Projected surplus
City of Groesbeck	(585)	(499)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Mart			See McLennan County
City of Mexia	(987)	(785)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Point Enterprise WSC	0	0	Region C
Post Oak SUD			See Hill County
Prairie Hill WSC	(215)	(272)	Projected shortages – see plan below.
SLC WSC	80	94	Projected surplus
Tri-County SUD	590	674	Projected surplus
White Rock WSC	108	163	Projected surplus
County-Other	29	69	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	(227)	(273)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	(3,054)	(3,648)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Mining	(3,029)	(2,228)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Irrigation	21	21	Projected surplus
Livestock	235	235	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/year – ac-ft/yr; MWSD – municipal water supply district; SUD – special utility district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.23.1 Bistone Municipal Water Supply District

5.23.1.1 Description of Supply

Bistone Municipal Water Supply District obtains its water supply through groundwater production from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer with a production capacity of 1,052 ac-ft/yr and has been modeled available groundwater (MAG) limited 292 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 391 ac-ft/yr in 2080, through diversions of surface water from Lake Mexia under water rights held by the District. Water supply obtained through surface water diversions by the District is projected to have an availability of 1,002 ac-ft/yr at the beginning of the planning period, which will decrease to 502 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

Bistone Municipal Water Supply District also provides sales of treated surface water under contract with the City of Coolidge, White Rock Water SUD, and Mexia State School which is grouped within the

Limestone County-Other Water User Group. Additionally, the Bistone Municipal Water Supply District provides sales of Carrizo-Wilcox groundwater produced by the District to the City of Mexia. Shortages in water supply are projected for Bistone Municipal Water Supply District starting in 2040.

5.23.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended for the Bistone Municipal Water Supply District. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 419 gpcd. The district has indicated that the projected gpcd is artificially high due to the methods of calculation, wholesale customers, and population undercount. The unmet needs in 2040 through 2080 result from contracts not being fully allocated is a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. Additionally, the MAG in Limestone County is much lower for this planning round due to an error that did not account for existing pumping in the county when the MAG was derived. Unmet needs resulting from MAG-limited existing supplies originating from Limestone County are, for the purposes of this plan, not considered a true unmet need due to the error.

1. (Alternative) Carrizo Aquifer Development – Bistone MWSD:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $16,129,000.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $130,680.
    e. Unit Cost: $3,589/ ac-ft.

Table 5.23-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bistone Municipal Water Supply District

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	32	(55)	(139)	(143)	(122)	(192)
Carrizo Aquifer Development – Bistone MWSD Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	460	460	460	460	460	460
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,651,000	$1,651,000	$516,000	$516,000	$516,000	$516,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$3,589	$3,589	$1,122	$1,122	$1,122	$1,122

Supply for the Alternative WMS Carrizo Aquifer Development – Biston MWSD is supply that is transferred to the City of Mexia and City of Wortham (Region C).

5.23.2 City of Coolidge

5.23.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Coolidge obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contracts with the Bistone Municipal Water Supply District at 225 ac-ft/yr and Post Oak SUD at 191 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 239 ac-ft/yr in 2080; water provided by Post Oak SUD is sourced within Region C. Total treated water supplies available to the City are projected to range between 263 ac-ft/yr in 2080 to 430 ac-ft/yr in 2040. No shortages are projected for the City of Coolidge during the planning period, and no change is recommended to water supply.

5.23.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, and in coordination with Region C, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Coolidge. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 174 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $15,732 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.23-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Coolidge

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	229	254	252	173	125	123
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	23	23	22	21	20
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,840	$15,732	$15,732	$15,048	$14,364	$13,680
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	239	277	275	195	146	143

5.23.3 City of Groesbeck

5.23.3.1 Description of Supply

The City of Groesbeck obtains its water supply through diversions from the Navasota River; however, no surface water supplies are projected as being available to the City during the planning period. The City owns senior water rights (priority date of 1921) on the Navasota River and has limited storage available from Springfield Lake. The City has purchased a quarry to temporarily store water supply to manage the most recent drought. However, until a permanent solution is identified, the City of Groesbeck is projected to have shortages.

5.23.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Groesbeck. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. Needs remain unmet in 2030. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $51,300 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $7,495 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,589/ ac-ft.
3. Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $35,278,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,624/ ac-ft.

Table 5.23-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Groesbeck

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(585)	(569)	(551)	(534)	(517)	(499)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	43	75	73	71	69	66
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$29,412	$51,300	$49,932	$48,564	$47,196	$45,144
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5	5	5	5	5	5
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$7,945	$7,945	$1,500	$1,500	$1,500	$1,500
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$1,589	$1,589	$300	$300	$300	$300
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(537)	(489)	(473)	(458)	(443)	(428)
Groesbeck OCR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$2,842,000	$2,842,000	$1,186,000	$1,186,000	$641,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	—	$1,624	$1,624	$678	$678	$366
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(537)	1,261	1,277	1,292	1,307	1,322

5.23.4 City of Mexia

5.23.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Mexia obtains its water supply through contracted purchases of Carrizo-Wilcox groundwater produced by the Bistone Municipal Water Supply District, which is projected to provide 2,067 ac-ft/yr of available supply at the beginning of the planning period and decreasing to 1,615 ac-ft/yr in 2080. The City also provides sales of treated water to White Rock Water SUD, Manufacturing entities in Limestone County, and the City of Wortham (Region C). Additionally, the City sells Carrizo-Wilcox groundwater purchased from the Bistone Municipal Water District to County-Other users in Limestone County, including Shiloh WSC and the 84 West WSC. Shortages in available water supply for the City are projected to start in 2030.

5.23.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Mexia. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 133 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. The City's water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 36 percent thus, a water loss reduction strategy is recommended. The City's contractual supply is sufficient to meet demands in all decades. The remaining unmet need reported, results from contracts not being fully allocated as a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. Specifically, the MAG in Limestone County is much lower for this planning round due to an error that did not account for existing pumping in the county when the MAG was derived. Unmet needs resulting from MAG limited existing supplies originating from Limestone County are, for the purposes of this plan, not considered a true unmet need due to the error.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $286,599 in 2030
    d. Unit Cost: $1,332/ ac-ft
2. (Alternative) Carrizo Aquifer Development – Bistone MWSD:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
        i. Project requires Bistone Municipal Water Supply District to develop additional Carrizo-Wilcox groundwater supply.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2060.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $983,400.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,589/ ac-ft.

Table 5.23-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Mexia

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(987)	(942)	(890)	(855)	(826)	(785)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	220	213	205	198	190	182
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$286,599	$283,639	$86,673	$83,714	$80,331	$76,949
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$1,303	$1,332	$423	$423	$423	$423
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(767)	(729)	(685)	(657)	(636)	(603)
Carrizo Aquifer Development – Bistone MWSD Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	274	274	274	274	274	274
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$983,400	$983,400	$307,400	$307,400	$307,400	$307,400
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$3,589	$3,589	$1,122	$1,122	$1,122	$1,122
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(767)	(729)	(685)	(657)	(636)	(603)

5.23.5 Point Enterprise WSC

Point Enterprise WSC's service area includes portions of Limestone and Freestone Counties (Region C). Point Enterprise WSC obtains water supply through groundwater production from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. The full water plan for Point Enterprise WSC is discussed in the 2026 Region C Water Plan.

5.23.6 Prairie Hill WSC

5.23.6.1 Description of Supply

Prairie Hill WSC obtains its water supply solely through groundwater production from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, which has the capacity to provide 406 ac-ft/yr of supply. Prairie Hill WSC's production capacity is sufficient to meet projected demands throughout the planning horizon, however, due to MAG limitations the projected supply is 62 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 95 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Considerable shortages are projected for Prairie Hill WSC.

Various entities are dealing with elevated levels of arsenic in groundwater supplies and have been pursuing water management strategies through the Falls, Hill, Limestone, and McLennan counties (FHLM) WSC. Through a TWDB sponsored study coordinated by FHLM WSC, these entities have considered a regional brackish reverse osmosis water treatment plant in Limestone County, Carrizo-Wilcox Regional Groundwater in Limestone County, Tehuacana Reservoir, and supplies from City of Marlin (Brushy Creek Reservoir), and City of Waco. The recommended strategy is to provide arsenic treatment for individual entities. This strategy does not provide new supplies.

5.23.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Prairie Hill WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 183 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to

reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The MAG in Limestone County is much lower for this planning round due to an error that did not account for existing pumping in the county when the MAG was derived. Unmet needs resulting from MAG limited existing supplies originating from Limestone County are, for the purposes of this Plan, not considered a true unmet need due to the error.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $53,352 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Upgrade Treatment for Arsenic:

Arsenic levels of existing supply wells are approaching levels that make the supply unusable. This is a treatment strategy that recovers existing supplies that would be lost due to high concentrations of Arsenic.

    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,538,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,164/ ac-ft.

Table 5.23-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Prairie Hill WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(277)	(295)	(308)	(326)	(345)	(367)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	21	53	65	71	74	78
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$14,364	$36,252	$44,460	$48,564	$50,616	$53,352
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(256)	(242)	(243)	(255)	(271)	(289)
Upgrade Treatment for Arsenic						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	62	69	78	86	95	95
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$312,000	$312,000	$204,000	$204,000	$204,000	$204,000
Unit Cost(1) ($/ ac-ft)	$1,164	$1,164	$761	$761	$761	$761
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(194)	(173)	(165)	(169)	(176)	(194)

Notes:
(1) Unit cost based on strategy treatment capacity of 268 acft/yr of existing supply.

5.23.7 SLC WSC

SLC WSC obtains its water supply through purchases of raw surface water under contract from the Brazos River Authority. The surface water purchases are projected to provide a constant 200 ac-ft/yr. No shortages in water supply are projected for SLC WSC throughout the planning period and no change in supply is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage of 95 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.23.8 Tri-County SUD

5.23.8.1 Description of Supply

Tri-County SUD sources its water supply through groundwater production from the Trinity and Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers in Falls County, and from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Robertson County. The total groundwater supply available for production by the SUD is projected to be 1,032 ac-ft/yr during the planning period, with 575 ac-ft/yr from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and 457 ac-ft/yr from the Trinity Aquifer No water supply shortages are projected and no change in supply is recommended for Tri-County SUD.

5.23.8.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Tri-County SUD. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 24 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 116 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $302,519 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $7,195/ ac-ft.

Table 5.23-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Tri-County SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	590	605	623	639	656	674
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	43	42	40	38	37	35
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$302,519	$302,183	$13,456	$12,783	$12,447	$11,774
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$7,035	$7,195	$336	$336	$336	$336
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	633	647	663	677	693	709

5.23.9 White Rock Water SUD

White Rock Water SUD obtains its water supply through purchases of treated water under contracts with the Bistone Municipal Water Supply District at 274 ac-ft/yr and the City of Mexia at 487 ac-ft/yr. These contracts are projected to provide a constant 761 ac-ft/yr of supply throughout the planning period. The City's contractual supply is sufficient to meet demands in all decades. Conservation was considered and is not recommended because the entity's usage is 101 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

Table 5.23-8 Unmet Needs for White Rock Water SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	108	122	139	152	168	163

5.23.10 County-Other

5.23.10.1 Description of Supply

Entities in County-Other obtain water supply through local groundwater production from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, through purchases of groundwater from the City of Mexia and Shiloh WSC, and through purchases of treated surface water from the Bistone Municipal Water Supply District by the Mexia State School. Groundwater supplies available for local production are projected at 39 ac-ft/yr in 2030, increasing to 59 ac-ft/yr by 2080. Purchases of groundwater and treated surface water are projected to provide 280 ac-ft/yr in 2030, decreasing to 279 ac-ft/yr by 2080. No supply shortages are projected and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.23.11 Manufacturing

5.23.11.1 Description of Supply

Limestone County Manufacturing obtains its water supply through purchases of treated water from the City of Mexia and City of Groesbeck and through purchases of groundwater from the City of Coolidge. Manufacturing in the County is projected to experience water supply shortages beginning in 2030 at 227 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 273 ac-ft/yr by 2080. The remaining unmet need reported results from contracts not being fully allocated as a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. Specifically, the MAG in Limestone County is much lower for this planning round due to an error that did not account for existing pumping in the county when the MAG was derived. Unmet needs resulting from MAG limited existing supplies originating from Limestone County are, for the purposes of this plan, not considered a true unmet need due to the error.

5.23.11.2 Recommended Strategy

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Limestone County-Manufacturing. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $105/ ac-ft
2. (Alternative) Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,347,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $758/ ac-ft.

Table 5.23-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the Limestone County - Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(227)	(236)	(245)	(253)	(262)	(273)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7	13	19	19	21	22
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$735	$1,365	$1,995	$1,995	$2,205	$2,310
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(220)	(223)	(226)	(234)	(241)	(251)
Groundwater Development – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	314	314	314	314	314	314
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$238,000	$238,000	$73,000	$73,000	$73,000	$73,000
Unit Cost(1) ($/ ac-ft)	$758	$758	$232	$232	$232	$232
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(220)	(223)	(226)	(234)	(241)	(251)

Notes:
(1) Unit cost is based on strategy yield of 314 acft/yr, however strategy is MAG limited.
(2) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.23.12 Steam-Electric

5.23.12.1 Description of Supply

Steam-Electric water demand in Limestone County is associated with the NRG (formerly Reliant Energy) power plant located at Lake Limestone. NRG has contracted with the Brazos River Authority for up to 21,837 ac-ft/yr of raw water supply through purchases of raw water from Lake Limestone. Additionally, NRG utilizes local groundwater produced from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer; this supply is projected to provide an additional 110 ac-ft/yr of water supply in 2030, increasing to 171 ac-ft/yr by 2080. Limestone County Steam-Electric is projected to have shortages from 2030 through the year 2080. The remaining unmet need reported results from contracts not being fully allocated as a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. Specifically, the MAG in Limestone County is much lower for this planning round due to an error that did not account for existing pumping in the county when the MAG was derived. Unmet needs resulting from MAG limited existing supplies originating from Limestone County are, for the purposes of this plan, not considered a true unmet need due to the error.

5.23.12.2 Recommended Strategy

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Limestone County Mining. The Brazos G RWPG does not recommend conservation for Steam-Electric use.

1. (Alternative) Carrizo-Wicox Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,281,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $534/ ac-ft.

Table 5.23-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Limestone County - Steam-Electric

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(3,054)	(3,171)	(3,287)	(3,403)	(3,517)	(3,648)
Groundwater Development - Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	388	388	388	388	388	388
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$207,000	$207,000	$46,000	$46,000	$46,000	$46,000
Unit Cost(1) ($/ ac-ft)	$534	$534	$119	$119	$119	$119
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(3,054)	(3,171)	(3,287)	(3,403)	(3,517)	(3,648)

Notes:
(1) Unit cost is based on strategy yield of 388 acft/yr, however strategy is MAG limited.

5.23.13 Mining

5.23.13.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Limestone County are supplied by Carrizo-Wilcox groundwater. Demands for Mining exceed current supplies resulting in shortages beginning in 2030.

5.23.13.2 Recommended Strategy

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Limestone County-Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $200.
2. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Mining activity in Limestone County has slowed down since the release of the most recent demand projections and current mine operations are focused on reclamation. Projected demands and corresponding shortages are not anticipated to be realized during the planning period.
    b. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    c. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

Table 5.23-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Limestone County - Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(3,029)	(3,073)	(3,120)	(3,146)	(2,157)	(2,228)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	106	181	262	268	204	209
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$21,200	$36,200	$52,400	$53,600	$40,800	$41,800
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(2,923)	(2,892)	(2,858)	(2,878)	(1,953)	(2,019)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(2,923)	(2,892)	(2,858)	(2,878)	(1,953)	(2,019)

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.23.14 Irrigation

Irrigation in Limestone County obtains water supply through local groundwater production from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and through purchases of surface water from Limestone County-Other entities. Irrigation is projected to have a surplus of water supply throughout the planning period. No change in water supply is recommended.

5.23.15 Livestock

Water supply for Livestock in Limestone County is obtained from local stock surface water impoundments, which are projected to meet demands through the planning period. No change in water supply is recommended.

5.24 McLennan County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.24-1 lists each water user group in McLennan County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.24-1 McLennan County Surplus (Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/Shortage		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Axtell WSC	(16)	(228)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Bellmead	559	364	Projected surplus
Birome WSC			See Hill County
Bold Springs WSC	902	840	Projected surplus
City of Bruceville-Eddy	(41)	(744)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Central Bosque WSC	101	109	Projected surplus
Chalk Bluff WSC	125	(270)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Coryell City Water Supply District			See Coryell County
City of Crawford	(79)	(220)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Cross Country WSC	35	(375)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
East Crawford WSC	(116)	(197)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Elm Creek WSC			See Bell County
EOL WSC	140	36	Projected surplus
Gholson WSC	139	(246)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
H&H WSC	100	59	Projected surplus
City of Hewitt	(740)	(729)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Highland Park WSC			See Bosque County
Hilltop WSC	308	291	Projected surplus
Hog Creek WSC	(128)	(116)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Lacy-Lakeview	98	0	Projected surplus
Leroy Tours Gerald WSC	190	140	Projected surplus
Levi WSC	(76)	(303)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Lorena	409	292	Projected surplus
City of Mart	(268)	(98)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of McGregor	(253)	(1,011)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
McLennan County WCID No. 2	483	586	Projected surplus
City of Moody	324	133	Projected surplus
North Bosque WSC	121	(370)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Prairie Hill WSC			See Limestone County
City of Riesel	150	99	Projected surplus

Water User Group	Surplus/Shortage		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Robinson	234	(2,598)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Ross WSC	382	187	Projected surplus
Spring Valley WSC	20	(298)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Texas State Technical College	(336)	(335)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Valley Mills			See Bosque County
City of Waco	(5,925)	(26,900)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of West	982	897	Projected surplus
West Brazos WSC			See Falls County
Windsor Water	126	97	Projected surplus
City of Woodway	571	542	Projected surplus
County-Other	47	(376)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Manufacturing	(1,111)	(747)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Steam-Electric	27,818	27,758	Projected surplus
Mining	375	266	Projected surplus
Irrigation	(265)	(265)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Livestock	453	453	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WCID – water control and improvement district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.24.1 Axtell WSC

5.24.1.1 Description of Supply

Axtell WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 287 ac-ft/yr. A shortage is projected beginning in 2030 of 16 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 228 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended for Axtell WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 157 gallos per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. To reduce arsenic concentrations, Axtell plans to purchase treated water to blend with water purchased from the City of Waco. This purchase may be made through the Falls, Hill, Limestone, and McLennan counties (FHLM) WSC.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $28,044 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

2. Purchase water from City of Waco to blend to reduce arsenic concentrations:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: assumed unit cost of $3,273/ ac-ft ($10.15/1,000 gallons) for wholesale treated water, including transmission costs.
3. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2060.
    c. Project Cost: $3,484,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,770/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Axtell WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(16)	(58)	(100)	(143)	(186)	(228)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	27	30	34	38	41
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$17,100	$18,468	$20,520	$23,256	$25,992	$28,044
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	9	(31)	(70)	(109)	(148)	(187)
Purchase water from the City of Waco for Arsenic Blending						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	86	90	94	99	104	104
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$281,478	$294,570	$307,662	$324,027	$340,392	$340,392
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	100	50	83
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	$277,000	$277,000	$32,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	–	–	$2,770	$5,540	$386
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	95	59	24	90	6	0

5.24.2 City of Bellmead

5.24.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Bellmead obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 1,702 ac-ft/yr beginning in 2030, increasing to 2,000 ac-ft/yr by 2080. The City of Bellmead also has contracted with the City of Waco at 1,344 ac-ft/yr for supplemental surface water supply from Lake Waco but has no plans to utilize the contract. No shortages are projected for the City of Bellmead; however, the City of Waco and the City of Bellmead are considering alternative water supplies in order to reduce Bellmead's dependence on Trinity Aquifer groundwater. The purchase of supplemental reuse water from Waco Metropolitan Area Regional Sewerage System (WMARSS) is recommended to reduce demands on the Trinity Aquifer.

5.24.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Bellmead. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 120 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase reuse water from WMARSS (Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse). The reuse supply will reduce demands for landscape irrigation at existing or future parks, schools, ball fields, and other green spaces. Reuse water may also potentially supply existing or future industrial customers.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: None. City of Waco is the project sponsor. Entity will purchase from the City.
    d. Unit Cost: $731/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bellmead

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	559	518	475	444	407	364
WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy Lakeview Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,637,000	$1,637,000	$383,000	$383,000	$383,000	$383,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$731	$731	$171	$171	$171	$171
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,680	1,639	1,596	1,565	1,528	1,485

5.24.3 Bold Springs WSC

Bold Springs WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 613 ac-ft/yr and surface water from the City of Waco at 560 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for Bold Springs WSC and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 135 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.24.4 City of Bruceville-Eddy

5.24.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Bruceville-Eddy obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer (832 ac-ft/yr) and has a contract for surface water from Bluebonnet WSC at 938 ac-ft/yr which supplies 908 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 878 ac-ft/yr in 2080. A shortage is projected to begin in 2030 of 41 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 744 ac-ft/yr by 2080. This WUG is located in multiple counties (McLennan and Falls). The shortages shown in Table 5.24-1 and the table below represent the cumulative totals for the City of Bruceville-Eddy.

5.24.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Bruceville-Eddy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 245 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $698,364 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bruceville-Eddy

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(41)	(162)	(296)	(438)	(589)	(744)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	142	344	570	833	956	1,021
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$97,128	$235,296	$389,880	$569,772	$653,904	$698,364
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	101	182	274	395	367	277

5.24.5 Central Bosque WSC

5.24.5.1 Description of Supply

Central Bosque WSC obtains its water supply at 135 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 164 ac-ft/yr in 2080 from a contract with McGregor and 112 ac-ft/yr from a contract with Waco. No shortages are projected for Central Bosque WSC.

5.24.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Central Bosque WSC. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 161 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $11,628 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Central Bosque WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	101	101	104	110	113	109
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	15	15	15	17	17
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,840	$10,260	$10,260	$10,260	$11,628	$11,628
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	111	116	119	125	130	126

5.24.6 Chalk Bluff WSC

5.24.6.1 Description of Supply

Chalk Bluff WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 715 ac-ft/yr. A shortage is projected to begin in 2050 of 31 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 270 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Chalk Bluff WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 147 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $8,892 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2050.
    c. Project Cost: $2,471,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $733/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Central Bosque WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	125	48	(31)	(111)	(190)	(270)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	9	9	11	12	13
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,840	$6,156	$6,156	$7,524	$8,208	$8,892
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	135	57	(22)	(100)	(178)	(257)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	100	100	180	257
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	$232,000	$232,000	$58,000	$58,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	–	$2,320	$2,320	$193	$226
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	135	57	78	0	2	0

5.24.7 City of Crawford

5.24.7.1 Description of Supply

The City of Crawford obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 126 ac-ft/yr. A shortage is projected to begin in 2030 of 79 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 220 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Crawford. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 212 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $75,924 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,018,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $818/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Crawford

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(79)	(106)	(130)	(157)	(187)	(220)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	41	72	91	100	111
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$10,944	$28,044	$49,248	$62,244	$68,400	$75,924
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(63)	(65)	(58)	(66)	(87)	(109)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	110	110	110	110	110	109
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$90,000	$90,000	$18,000	$18,000	$18,000	$18,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$818	$818	$164	$164	$164	$164
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	47	45	52	44	23	0

5.24.8 Cross Country WSC

5.24.8.1 Description of Supply

Cross Country WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 678 ac-ft/yr. Cross Country WSC is projected to have a shortage beginning in 2040 of 44 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 375 ac-ft/yr by 2080. This WUG is located in McLennan and Bosque Counties. The shortages shown in Table 5.24-1 and in the table below represent the cumulative totals for Cross Country WSC.

5.24.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the Cross Country WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 178 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $137,484 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,243,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,990/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Cross County WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	35	(44)	(112)	(190)	(278)	(375)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	50	137	151	165	182	201
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$34,200	$93,708	$103,284	$112,860	$124,488	$137,484
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	85	93	39	(25)	(96)	(174)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	25	100	38
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	$199,000	$199,000	$41,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	–	–	$7,960	$1,990	$1,079
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	85	93	39	0	4	(136)

5.24.9 East Crawford WSC

East Crawford WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 215 ac-ft/yr. A shortage is projected to begin in 2030 of 116 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 197 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.9.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the East Crawford WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 304 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $149,796 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Purchase water from the City of Waco:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: assumed unit cost of $3,273/ ac-ft ($10.15/1,000 gallons) for wholesale treated water, including transmission costs.
3. (Alternative) Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,256,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,743/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for East Crawford WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(116)	(133)	(148)	(162)	(179)	(197)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	29	65	104	147	194	219
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$19,836	$44,460	$71,136	$100,548	$132,696	$149,796
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(87)	(68)	(44)	(15)	15	22
Purchase from Waco						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	105	93	81	68	55	55
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$369,849	$343,665	$304,389	$265,113	$222,564	$100,815
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$1,833

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer: Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	113	113	113	113	113	113
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$197,000	$197,000	$38,000	$38,000	$38,000	$38,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$1,743	$1,743	$336	$336	$336	$336
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	18	25	37	53	70	77

5.24.10 EOL WSC

The EOL WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 368 ac-ft/yr. A surplus is projected through the year 2080. To reduce arsenic concentrations, Axtell plans to purchase treated water to blend with water purchased from the City of Waco. This purchase may be made through the FHLM WSC.

5.24.10.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for EOL WSC. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 113 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. To reduce arsenic concentrations, EOL WSC plans to purchase treated water to blend with water purchased from the City of Waco.

1. Purchase water from City of Waco to blend to reduce arsenic concentrations:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: assumed unit cost of $3,273/ ac-ft ($10.15/1,000 gallons) for wholesale treated water, including transmission costs.

Table 5.24-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for EOL WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	140	120	99	78	57	36
Purchase water from the City of Waco for Arsenic Blending						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	120	125	131	131	138	138
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$392,760	$409,125	$428,763	$428,763	$451,674	$451,674
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	260	245	230	209	195	174

5.24.11 Gholson WSC

5.24.11.1 Description of Supply

The Gholson WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 766 ac-ft/yr. Gholson WSC is split between Hill and McLennan counties, with primary demands in the McLennan County. The quantity shown in Table 5.24-1 and Table 5.24-11 represents the cumulative totals for the WSC. Gholson WSC is projected to have a water supply shortage beginning in 2060 of 72 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 246 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.11.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Gholson WSC. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 127 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,254,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $820/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Gholson WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	139	65	1	(72)	(154)	(246)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	–	250	250	250
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	$205,000	$205,000	$46,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	–	–	$820	$820	$184
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	139	65	1	178	96	4

5.24.12 H & H WSC

The H&H WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 383 ac-ft/yr. A surplus is projected through the year 2080; and, there are no changes recommended to the water supply. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 125 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.24.13 City of Hewitt

5.24.13.1 Description of Supply

The City of Hewitt obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 1,429 ac-ft/yr and has a contract with the City of Waco at 2,352 ac-ft/yr for a supplemental supply from Lake Waco.

5.24.13.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Hewitt. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 176 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $404,928 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Purchase reuse water from WMARSS (Bulhide Creek Reuse). The reuse supply will reduce demands for landscape irrigation at existing or future parks, schools, ball fields, and other green spaces. Reuse water may also potentially supply existing or future industrial customers.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: None. City of Waco is the project sponsor. Entity will purchase from the City.
    d. Unit Cost: $826/ ac-ft.
3. Purchase additional water from City of Waco:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2050.
    c. Unit Cost: assumed unit cost of $2,164/ ac-ft ($6.64/1,000 gallons) for wholesale treated water.

Table 5.24-12 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hewitt

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(740)	(729)	(729)	(729)	(729)	(729)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	258	592	592	592	592	592
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$176,472	$404,928	$404,928	$404,928	$404,928	$404,928
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(482)	(137)	(137)	(137)	(137)	(137)
WMARSS – Bullhide Creek Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,233	1,233	1,233	1,233	1,233	1,233
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,388,000	$1,388,000	$410,000	$410,000	$410,000	$410,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$826	$826	$244	$244	$244	$244
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Reuse (ac-ft/yr)	751	1,096	1,096	1,096	1,096	1,096

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Purchase Water from City of Waco						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	62	420	771	771
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	$147,000	$909,000	$1,668,000	$1,668,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	–	$2,164	$2,164	$2,164	$2,164
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	751	1,096	1,158	1,516	1,867	1,867

5.24.14 Hilltop WSC

The Hilltop WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 329 ac-ft/yr and a contract with Waco at 97 ac-ft/yr. A surplus is projected through the year 2080; and there are no changes recommended to the water supply. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 143 gpcd, which is approximately equal to the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.24.15 Hog Creek WSC

5.24.15.1 Description of Supply

Hog Creek WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 268 ac-ft/yr. Shortages are projected for Hog Creek WSC throughout the planning period.

5.24.15.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the Hog Creek WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 962 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $156,636 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-13 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the Hog Creek WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(128)	(129)	(130)	(124)	(119)	(116)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	37	77	118	155	192	229
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$25,308	$52,668	$80,712	$106,020	$131,328	$156,636
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(91)	(52)	(12)	31	73	113

5.24.16 City of Lacy-Lakeview

5.24.16.1 Description of Supply

The City of Lacy-Lakeview obtains its water supply from the City of Waco at 2,352 ac-ft/yr. Based on the current contracted amount; the City of Lacy-Lakeview is projected to have a surplus of supplies. Supplemental reuse water from WMARSS is recommended to reduce demands on water supplied by the City of Waco.

5.24.16.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Lacy-Lakeview. Purchase reuse water from WMARSS (Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse). The reuse supply will reduce demands for landscape irrigation at existing or future parks, schools, ball fields, and other green spaces. Reuse water may also potentially supply existing or future industrial customers. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 125 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. WMARSS – Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: None. City of Waco is the project sponsor. Entity will purchase from the City.
    d. Unit Cost: $731/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-14 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Lacy-Lakeview

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	98	25	0	0	0	0
WMARSS – Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	745	745	745	745	745	745
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$544,600	$544,600	$127,400	$127,400	$127,400	$127,400
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$731	$731	$171	$171	$171	$171
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	843	770	745	745	745	745

5.24.17 Leroy Tours Gerald WSC

5.24.17.1 Description of Supply

The Leroy Tours Gerald WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 383 ac-ft/yr. This entity also has a contract with City of Waco which supplies 224 ac-ft/yr. A surplus is projected through the year 2080; and there are no changes recommended to the water supply except to pursue a strategy to reduce arsenic levels.

5.24.17.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Leroy Tours Gerald WSC. An alternative strategy is to treat arsenic at each well head. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 115 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase Water from Waco for Arsenic Blending:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: None; delivered by FHLM WSC.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,273/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-15 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Leroy Tours Gerald WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	190	179	166	153	141	140
Purchase Water from Waco for Arsenic Blending						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	72	74	78	82	86	86
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-$229,110	$235,656	$242,202	$255,294	$268,386	$281,478
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	-$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273	$3,273
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	262	253	244	235	227	226

5.24.18 Levi WSC

5.24.18.1 Description of Supply

The Levi WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 498 ac-ft/yr. A water supply shortage is projected beginning in 2030 of 76 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 303 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.18.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Levi WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 238 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $218,880 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,184,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $5,933.

Table 5.24-16 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Levi WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(76)	(128)	(180)	(218)	(259)	(303)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	49	114	192	285	301	320
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$33,516	$77,976	$131,328	$194,940	$205,884	$218,880
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(27)	(14)	12	67	42	17
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	30	30	30	30	30	30
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$178,000	$178,000	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$5,933	$5,933	$800	$800	$800	$800
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	3	16	42	97	72	47

5.24.19 City of Lorena

5.24.19.1 Description of Supply

The City of Lorena obtains its water supply from a contract with the City of Robinson at 560 ac-ft/yr, and Brazos River Authority (BRA) at 2,500 ac-ft/yr. They also have a groundwater supply from Trinity Aquifer at 383 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City of Lorena; however, purchase of supplemental reuse water from WMARSS is recommended to reduce demands on groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer.

5.24.19.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Lorena. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 37 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 171 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $69,084 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $141,702 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,144/ ac-ft.

3. Purchase reuse water from WMARSS (Bull Hide Creek Reuse). The reuse supply will reduce demands for landscape irrigation at existing or future parks, schools, ball fields, and other green spaces. Reuse water may also potentially supply existing or future industrial customers.
   a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Project Cost: None. City of Waco is the project sponsor. Entity will purchase from the City.
   d. Unit Cost: $826/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-17 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Lorena

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	409	386	363	343	319	292
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	40	86	90	93	97	101
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$27,360	$58,824	$61,560	$63,612	$66,348	$69,084
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	122	127	133	137	143	149
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$139,565	$141,702	$56,866	$58,576	$61,142	$63,707
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$1,144	$1,116	$428	$428	$428	$428
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	571	599	586	573	559	542
WMARSS – Bullhide Creek Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	448	448	448	448	448	448
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$370,100	$370,100	$109,300	$109,300	$109,300	$109,300
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$826	$826	$244	$244	$244	$244
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,019	1,047	1,034	1,021	1,007	990

5.24.20 City of Mart

5.24.20.1 Description of Supply

The City of Mart obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 192 ac-ft/yr. Based on the available groundwater supply and no firm yield from Lake Mart, the City of Mart is projected to have a shortage through the year 2080. The City is located in multiple counties (McLennan and Limestone). The shortages shown in Table 5.24-1 and in the table below represent the cumulative totals for the City of Mart.

5.24.20.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Mart. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 233 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Needs remain unmet in 2030. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the

unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $97,812 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Purchase water from the City of Waco:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: assumed unit cost of $2,164/ ac-ft ($6.64/1,000 gallons) for wholesale treated water.

Table 5.24-18 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Mart

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(268)	(240)	(217)	(180)	(141)	(98)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	37	79	116	143	128	111
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$25,308	$54,036	$79,344	$97,812	$87,552	$75,924
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(231)	(161)	(101)	(37)	(13)	13
Purchase Water Supply from City of Waco						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	165	180	199	220	243	243
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$357,060	$389,520	$432,800	$478,244	$528,016	$528,016
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$2,164	$2,164	$2,164	$2,164	$2,164	$2,164
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(66)	19	98	183	230	256

5.24.21 City of McGregor

5.24.21.1 Description of Supply

The City of McGregor has contracted for 810 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the BRA, which can supply 675 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 654 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The City also has a contract with Bluebonnet WSC for 2,139 ac-ft/yr, which supplies 2,071 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 2,003 ac-ft/yr in 2080. The City also sells water to Central Bosque WSC and Manufacturing entities in McLennan County. The City of McGregor is projected to experience water supply shortages beginning in 2030 of 253 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 1,011 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.21.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of McGregor. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 238 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Needs remain unmet in 2030. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse

than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $891,936 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24-19 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of McGregor

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(253)	(411)	(558)	(698)	(856)	(1,011)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	214	502	808	1,188	1,243	1,304
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$146,376	$343,368	$552,672	$812,592	$850,212	$891,936
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(39)	91	250	490	387	293

5.24.22 McLennan County WCID No. 2

5.24.22.1 Description of Supply

McLennan County WCID No. 2 obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 778 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the McLennan County WCID No. 2.

5.24.22.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the McLennan County WCID No. 2. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 172 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $21,888 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–20 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the McLennan County WCID No. 2

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	483	501	515	537	560	586
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	32	30	27	23	19
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$10,944	$21,888	$20,520	$18,468	$15,732	$12,996
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	499	533	545	564	583	605

5.24.23 City of Moody

The City of Moody obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 211 ac-ft/yr. They also have a contract with Bluebonnet WSC at 401 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City of Moody.

5.24.23.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Moody. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 135 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 43 percent and recommends water loss mitigation.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $86,453 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,066/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–21 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Moody

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	324	286	248	209	169	133
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	77	87	97	107	118	128
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$82,047	$86,453	$42,733	$47,139	$51,985	$56,390
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$1,066	$994	$441	$441	$441	$441
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	401	373	345	316	287	261

5.24.24 North Bosque WSC

5.24.24.1 Description of Supply

North Bosque WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 759 ac-ft/yr. Based on the available groundwater supply; North Bosque WSC is projected to have a shortage beginning in 2050 at 42 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 370 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.24.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for North Bosque WSC. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 279 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $377,568 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–22 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for North Bosque WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	121	45	(42)	(139)	(247)	(370)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	55	133	231	351	492	552
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$37,620	$90,972	$158,004	$240,084	$336,528	$377,568
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	176	178	189	212	245	182

5.24.25 City of Riesel

5.24.25.1 Description of Supply

The City of Riesel obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 181 ac-ft/yr. This WUG also has a contract with County-Other McLennan at 125 ac-ft/yr. Based on the available groundwater supply, the City of Riesel is projected to have a surplus through the year 2080.

5.24.25.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Riesel. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 27 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 118 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $21,304 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–23 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Riesel

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	150	141	131	120	110	99
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	19	20	21	22	24	25
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$20,937	$21,304	$7,688	$8,054	$8,786	$9,152
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$1,102	$1,065	$366	$366	$366	$366
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	169	161	152	142	134	124

5.24.26 City of Robinson

5.24.26.1 Description of Supply

The City of Robinson sources its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer, with an annual yield of 1,101 ac-ft/yr. Additionally, the City receives surface water from the Brazos River, totaling 3,621 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 3,421 ac-ft/yr in 2080. City of Robinson holds contracts with the BRA for 2,323 ac-ft/yr and the City of Waco for 561 ac-ft/yr. Furthermore, Robinson has a 560 ac-ft/yr contract to provide treated water to the City of Lorena, utilizing Lorena's contract with the BRA. Based on the constrained supply amounts, the City of Robinson is projected to have shortages. Although the City has sufficient raw water supply to meet its future needs, the City's water treatment plant has an annual average capacity of 1,125 ac-ft.

5.24.26.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Robinson. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 200 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $1,103,976 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Expand Water Treatment Plant (4 million gallons per day [mgd]):
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $20,410,000.
    d. Unit Cost[1]: $582/ ac-ft.

[1] Unit cost based on treatment capacity of 4,481 acft/yr

Table 5.24–24 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Robinson

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	234	(190)	(681)	(1,238)	(1,874)	(2,598)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	234	605	1,086	1,238	1,413	1,614
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$160,056	$413,820	$742,824	$846,792	$966,492	$1,103,976
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	468	415	405	0	(461)	(984)
Expand WTP (4 mgd)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,621	3,581	3,541	3,498	3,295	3,295
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,610,000	$2,610,000	$1,174,000	$1,174,000	$1,174,000	$1,174,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$721	$729	$332	$336	$356	$356
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	4,089	3,996	3,946	3,498	2,834	2,311

Notes:
WTP – water treatment plant

5.24.27 Ross WSC

The Ross WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 421 ac-ft/yr and surface water from the City of Waco at 336 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the Ross WSC, and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 140 gpcd, which is not above the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.24.28 Spring Valley WSC

The Spring Valley WSC obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 166 ac-ft/yr. This entity also has a contract with Bluebonnet WSC for 301 ac-ft/yr, which supplies 291 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 282 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Spring Valley WSC is projected to experience a water supply shortage beginning in 2040 of 42 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 298 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.28.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Spring Valley WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 160 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $49,248 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,006,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $704/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–25 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Spring Valley WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	20	(42)	(95)	(157)	(225)	(298)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	43	49	53	59	66	72
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$29,412	$33,516	$36,252	$40,356	$45,144	$49,248
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	63	7	(42)	(98)	(159)	(226)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	-	-	250	250	160	226
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	-	$176,000	$176,000	$35,000	$35,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	-	-	$140	$140	$140	$140
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	63	7	208	152	1	0

5.24.29 Texas State Technical College

Texas State Technical College obtains its water supply from the City of Waco at 1,680 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning period. Texas State Technical College is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030 at 336 ac-ft/yr. Needs remain unmet in 2030. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

5.24.29.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Texas State Technical College. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 1,804 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $824,904 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–26 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Texas State Technical College

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(336)	(335)	(335)	(335)	(335)	(335)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	197	399	600	803	1,005	1,206
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$134,748	$272,916	$410,400	$549,252	$687,420	$824,904
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(139)	64	265	468	670	871

5.24.30 City of Waco

The City of Waco secures its water supply from various sources to ensure reliable service in the coming decades. The Brazos River provides a consistent supply of 5,600 ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080, while Direct Reuse contributes 16,802 ac-ft/yr throughout the same period. City also has groundwater supplies from the Trinity Aquifer which adds an additional 245 ac-ft/yr. Waco Lake remains a significant source, with its supply gradually decreasing from 44,882 ac-ft/yr in 2030 to 43,138 ac-ft/yr in 2080, for which the City holds water rights. The City supplies several neighboring communities with treated water.

A portion of the City's treated wastewater is also contracted to steam-electric and manufacturing customers in the County. The City is projected to have a shortage of supplies starting in 2030.

Needs remain unmet in 2030, 2040, 2070 and 2080. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

5.24.30.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Waco. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 222 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Waco plans to expand the Riverside WTP, which will cost an inflation-adjusted $15.7 million and utilize Brazos River water at the Riverside WTP, which will cost an additional $18.1 million. Those strategies are not shown here.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $13,496,688 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects McLennan I-84:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $33,311,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,604/ ac-ft.

3. Reuse WMARSS Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $17,870,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $731/ ac-ft.
4. Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects North-China Spring:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $44,298,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,705/ ac-ft.
5. Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects Bullhide Creek:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $13,959,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $826/ ac-ft.
6. Lake Waco Reallocation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2050.
    c. Project Cost: $31,219,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $963/ ac-ft.
7. Lake Whitney Reallocation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Cost borne by Brazos River Authority.
    d. Unit Cost: $77/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–27 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Waco

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(5,925)	(10,128)	(13,987)	(18,040)	(22,634)	(26,900)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,008	7,396	12,685	16,949	18,261	19,732
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,057,472	$5,058,864	$8,676,540	$11,593,116	$12,490,524	$13,496,688
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(2,917)	(2,732)	(1,302)	(1,091)	(4,373)	(7,168)
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Increase Contract Amount to East Crawford WSC (ac-ft/yr)	105	93	81	68	55	55
Increase Contract Amount to City of Hewitt (ac-ft/yr)	–	–	62	420	771	771
Increase Contract Amount to City of Mart (ac-ft/yr)	165	180	199	220	243	243

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
New Contract with Axtel WSC	86	90	94	99	104	104
New Contract with EOL WSC	120	125	131	131	138	138
Total Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies	(3,393)	(3,220)	(1,869)	(2,029)	(5,684)	(8,479)
Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects – McLennan I-84						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,400	1,400	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,645,600	$3,645,600	$2,032,800	$2,032,800	$2,032,800	$2,032,800
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$2,604	$2,604	$1,210	$1,210	$1,210	$1,210
Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects – Bellmead/Lacy-Lakeview						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	374	374	374	374	374	374
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$273,400	$273,400	$64,000	$64,000	$64,000	$64,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$731	$731	$171	$171	$171	$171
Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects – North-China Spring						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,146,600	$4,146,600	$1,034,880	$1,034,880	$1,034,880	$1,034,880
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$3,705	$3,705	$924	$924	$924	$924
Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects – Bullhide Creek						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,681	1,681	1,681	1,681	1,681	1,681
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,388,000	$1,388,000	$410,000	$410,000	$410,000	$410,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$826	$826	$244	$244	$244	$244
Supply to City of Hewitt	1,233	1,233	1,233	1,233	1,233	1,233
Supply to City of Lorena	448	448	448	448	448	448
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Reuse	(499)	(326)	1,305	1,145	(2,510)	(5,305)
Lake Waco Reallocation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	-	-	1,860	1,860	1,860	1,860
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	-	$1,792,000	$1,792,000	$1,792,000	$1,792,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	-	-	$963	$963	$963	$963
Lake Whitney Reallocation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$269,500	269,500	269,500	269,500	269,500	269,500
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	3,001	3,174	6,665	6,505	2,850	55

5.24.31 City of West

5.24.31.1 Description of Supply

The City of West obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 371 ac-ft/yr. City of West also has contract with City of Waco for 1,120 ac-ft/yr. Surpluses are projected through 2080.

5.24.31.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of West. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 165 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $49,932 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–28 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of West

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	982	968	951	934	916	897
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	36	64	66	68	70	73
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$24,624	$43,776	$45,144	$46,512	$47,880	$49,932
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,018	1,032	1,017	1,002	986	970

5.24.32 Windsor Water

5.24.32.1 Description of Supply

Windsor Water obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 245 ac-ft/yr. Surpluses are projected through 2080.

5.24.32.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of West. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 148 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $2,052 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–29 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Windsor Water

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	126	121	116	110	104	97
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3	2	2	2	2	3
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,052	$1,368	$1,368	$1,368	$1,368	$2,052
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	129	123	118	112	106	100

5.24.33 City of Woodway

5.24.33.1 Description of Supply

The City of Woodway obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer at 2,456 ac-ft/yr. This entity also has contract with City of Waco for 1,120 ac-ft/yr. Moreover, they also receive supplies from Bluebonnet WSC at 1,362 ac-ft/yr, which supplies 1,319 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 1,275 ac-ft/yr in 2080. The City provides two ac-ft/yr for McLennan County Manufacturing. They have projected shortages throughout the planning period and under drought conditions, Bluebonnet WSC may not be able to provide the full contract amount to all of its customers, including Woodway.

5.24.33.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Woodway. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 351 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $1,614,924 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,351,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,055/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–30 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Woodway

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	571	568	560	551	542	542
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	348	744	1,145	1,547	1,948	2,361
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$238,032	$508,896	$783,180	$1,058,148	$1,332,432	$1,614,924
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	919	1,312	1,705	2,098	2,490	2,903
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	200	200	200	200	200	0
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$211,000	$211,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000	$45,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$1,055	$1,055	$225	$225	$225	$225
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,119	1,512	1,905	2,298	2,690	2,903

5.24.34 County-Other

5.24.34.1 Description of Supply

McLennan County-Other entities obtain water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 781 ac-ft/yr beginning in 2030, increasing to 799 ac-ft/yr by 2080. Entities in County-Other provide additional supply to Riesel and provide supply to steam-electric power and manufacturing customers in McLennan County.

Various entities are dealing with elevated levels of arsenic in groundwater supplies and have been pursuing water management strategies through the FHLM WSC. A shortage is projected to begin in 2040 at 169 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 376 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.34.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for McLennan County-Other. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $3,040,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $702/ac-ft.
2. Upgrade Treatment for Arsenic: Arsenic levels of existing supply wells are approaching levels that make the supply unusable. This is a treatment strategy that recovers existing supplies that would be lost due to high concentrations of Arsenic.
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $4,832,000.

d. Unit Cost: $2,231/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–31 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the McLennan County - Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(203)	(419)	(464)	(482)	(524)	(626)
Upgrade Treatment for Arsenic						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	250	250	250	250	250	250
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$557,750	$557,750	$465,000	$465,000	$465,000	$465,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$2,231	$2,231	$1,860	$1,860	$1,860	$1,860
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	169	214	232	274	376
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	$118,640	$150,230	$30,856	$36,442	$50,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	-	$702	$702	$133	$133	$133
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	47	0	0	0	0	0

5.24.35 Manufacturing

5.24.35.1 Description of Supply

Water supply for manufacturing in McLennan County is obtained by purchase from a city or water supply corporation, from Trinity Aquifer wells operated by the manufacturing entity, and from run-of-river rights. McLennan County Manufacturing is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030 of 1,111 ac-ft/yr, decreasing to 747 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.24.35.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for McLennan County Manufacturing. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
   a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
   c. Unit Cost: $105/ ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Cross Timbers Aquifer:
   a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: $875,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $350.

Table 5.24–32 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for McLennan County - Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(1,111)	(964)	(817)	(717)	(500)	(747)

Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	172	298	433	449	465	483
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$18,060	$31,290	$45,465	$47,145	48,825	$50,715
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	939	(666)	(384)	(268)	(35)	(264)
Groundwater Development – Cross Timbers Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	10	10	10	10	10
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$875,000	$875,000	$340,000	$340,000	$340,000	$340,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$350	$350	$136	$136	$136	$136
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	949	(656)	(374)	(258)	(25)	(254)

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.24.36 Steam-Electric

McLennan County Steam-Electric obtains its water supply from Tradinghouse Reservoir, Lake Creek Reservoir, the Trinity Aquifer, and from WMARSS reuse. No shortage is projected for McLennan County Steam-Electric and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.24.37 Mining

5.24.37.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in McLennan County are supplied by Brazos River Alluvium groundwater at 735 ac-ft/yr. No shortage is projected for McLennan County Mining.

5.24.38 Irrigation

5.24.38.1 Description of Supply

McLennan County Irrigation is supplied by groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 561 ac-ft/yr and the Brazos River Alluvium at 4,259 ac-ft/yr and run of the river water rights at 37 ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080. McLennan County Irrigation is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030 at 265 ac-ft/yr which will be held constant throughout the planning horizon.

5.24.38.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for McLennan Irrigation. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $1,543/ ac-ft.

Table 5.24–33 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for McLennan County Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(265)	(265)	(265)	(265)	(265)	(265)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	154	256	359	359	359	359
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$ 237,632	$ 395,024	$ 553,959	$ 553,959	$ 553,959	$ 553,959
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(111)	(9)	94	94	94	94

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement irrigation conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.24.39 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.25 Milam County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.25-1 lists each water user group (WUG) in Milam County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each WUG with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.25-1 Milam County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Bell-Milam Falls WSC			See Bell County
City of Cameron	1,350	1,536	Projected surplus
Milano WSC	213	241	Projected surplus
North Milam WSC	120	151	Projected surplus
City of Rockdale	36	(17)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Salem Elm Ridge WSC	304	330	Projected surplus
Southwest Milam WSC	539	20	Projected surplus
City of Thorndale	(63)	(157)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	25,282	15,773	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	0	0	No projected surplus/(shortage)
Steam-Electric	0	0	No projected shortage/(shortage)
Mining	(768)	(767)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Irrigation	586	783	Projected surplus
Livestock	615	615	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.25.1 City of Cameron

5.25.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Cameron obtains its water supply from Brazos run-of-the-river rights at 2,792 ac-ft/yr. The City provides supply to North Milam WSC at 38 ac-ft/yr, and Salem Elm Ridge WSC at 125 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City of Cameron.

5.25.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Cameron. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 217 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $268,812 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. New Little River Intake and Raw Water Pipeline:
    a. Strategy restores lost surface water supply due to river migration away from the existing intake structure.
    b. Cost Source: Volume II.
    c. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    d. Project Cost: $14,785,000.
    e. Unit Cost: $462/ac-ft.

Table 5.25-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Cameron

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,350	1,373	1,415	1,454	1,494	1,536
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	103	221	338	393	380	365
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$70,452	$151,164	$231,192	$268,812	$259,920	$249,660
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	1,453	1,594	1,753	1,847	1,874	1,901
New Little River Intake and Raw Water Pipeline						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,615	2,615	2,615	2,615	2,615	2,615
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,289,000	$1,289,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000
Unit Costt ($/ac-ft)	$462	$462	$90	$90	$90	$90
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	4,068	4,209	4,368	4,462	4,489	4,516

5.25.2 Milano WSC

5.25.2.1 Description of Supply

Milano WSC obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 724 ac-ft/yr. This WUG is located in Milam and Burleson Counties. No shortages are projected for Milano WSC and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.25.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the Milano WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 167 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.

b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
c. Annual Cost: maximum of $268,812 in 2060.
d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.25-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Milano WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	213	216	223	228	234	241
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	38	68	67	67	66	65
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$25,992	$46,512	$45,828	$45,828	$45,144	$44,460
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	251	284	290	295	300	306

5.25.3 North Milam WSC

5.25.3.1 Description of Supply

North Milam WSC obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 636 ac-ft/yr. They also have contracts with Cameron for 38 ac-ft/yr. This WUG is located in multiple counties (Milam and Burleson). The surplus shown in Table 5.25-1 and in the table below represents the cumulative total for North Milam WSC. No shortages are projected for North Milam WSC.

5.25.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the North Milam WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 173 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Annual Cost: maximum of $20,520 in 2040.
   d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. City of Cameron New Little River Intake and Raw Water Pipeline:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Project Cost: None. City of Cameron is the project sponsor. Entity will purchase from the City.
   d. Unit Cost: $462/ac-ft.

Table 5.25-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for North Milam WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	120	125	132	138	144	151
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	13	30	28	27	26	26

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,892	$20,520	$19,152	$18,468	$17,784	$17,784
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	133	155	160	165	170	177
City of Cameron Little River Intake						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	38	38	38	38	38	38
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,289,000	$1,289,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$462	$462	$90	$90	$90	$90
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	171	193	198	203	208	215

5.25.4 City of Rockdale

5.25.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Rockdale obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 1,645 ac-ft/yr. Shortage are projected for the City of Rockdale in 2070 and 2080. The City of Rockdale is forecasting significant near-term growth as a result of development in the surrounding area with new manufacturing, Sandow Lakes Ranch, and newly permitted subdivisions within the city itself. Uncertainty in the near-term population growth provides support for water management strategies that meet potential demands beyond the demand projected and adopted for this regional plan.



Figure 5.25-1 City of Rockdale Projected Population Growth

5.25.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Rockdale. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 198 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $311,904 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Supply from Lee County Carrizo-Wilcox Wells:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $7,720,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,513/ac-ft.

Table 5.25-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Rockdale

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	36	29	18	6	(5)	(17)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	128	292	446	449	452	456
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$87,552	$199,728	$305,064	$307,116	$309,168	$311,904
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	164	321	464	455	447	439
Water Supply from Lee County Carrizo Wilcox Wells						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)		353	360	360	400	400
Annual Cost ($/yr)		$655,000	$655,000	$112,000	$112,000	$112,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)		$1,513	$1,513	$259	$259	$259
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	164	674	824	815	847	839

5.25.5 Salem Elm Ridge WSC

5.25.5.1 Description of Supply

Salem Elm Ridge WSC obtains its water supply from Cameron at 125 ac-ft/yr and Central Texas WSC at 347 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for Salem Elm Ridge WSC and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.25.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the Salem Elm Ridge WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 175 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $19,836 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. City of Cameron New Little River Intake and Raw Water Pipeline:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: None. City of Cameron is the project sponsor. Entity will purchase from the City.
    d. Unit Cost: $462/ac-ft.

Table 5.25-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Salem Elm Ridge WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	304	308	314	319	325	330
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	13	29	28	27	26	25
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,892	$19,836	$19,152	$18,468	$17,784	$17,100
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	317	337	342	346	351	355
New Little River Intake and Raw Water Pipeline						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	125	125	125	125	125	125
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,289,000	$1,289,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000
Unit Costt ($/ac-ft)	$462	$462	$90	$90	$90	$90
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	442	462	467	471	476	480

5.25.6 Southwest Milam WSC

5.25.6.1 Description of Supply

at 2,528 ac-ft/yr. This WUG is located in multiple counties (Milam, Lee, Williamson, and Burleson). This WUG sells water to the City of Thorndale for 202 ac-ft/yr. The surplus/shortages shown in Table 5.25-1 and in the table below represent the cumulative totals for Southwest Milam WSC. Southwest Milam WSC is projected to have a surplus from 2030 to 2080.

5.25.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Southwest Milam WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 190 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $383,040 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Supply from Milam County Carrizo Wilcox Wells:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,852,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $429/ac-ft.
3. Alternative: modeled available groundwater (MAG) limited supply from Water Supply from Milam County Carrizo Wilcox Wells:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,852,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $429/ac-ft.

Table 5.25-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Southwest Milam WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	539	456	368	268	153	20
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	140	331	475	499	527	560
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$95,760	$226,404	$324,900	$341,316	$360,468	$383,040
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	679	787	843	767	680	580
Water Supply from Lee County Carrizo-Wilcox Wells						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	200	365	325	392	534	534
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$358,000	$358,000	$87,000	$87,000	$87,000	$87,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$429	$429	$104	$104	$104	$104
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	979	1,396	1,468	1,459	1,514	1,414

Table 5.25-8 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for Southwest Milam WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Water Supply from Lee County Carrizo-Wilcox Wells - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	300	300	300	300	300	300
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$358,000	$358,000	$87,000	$87,000	$87,000	$87,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$429	$429	$104	$104	$104	$104

5.25.7 City of Thorndale

The City of Thorndale is located in Milam and partially in Williamson County. The City obtains its water supply from Southwest Milam WSC at 202 ac-ft/yr. Shortages are projected for the City of Thorndale from 2030 to 2080.

5.25.7.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 138 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development Carrizo-Wilcox – Milam:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $13,774,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $5,415/ac-ft.
2. Alternative: Groundwater Development Carrizo-Wilcox – Milam:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $13,774,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $5,415/ac-ft.

Table 5.25-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Thorndale

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(63)	(78)	(96)	(115)	(136)	(157)
Groundwater Development Carrizo-Wilcox						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	10	10	10	10	10
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,083,000	$1,083,000	$114,000	$114,000	$114,000	$114,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$5,415	$5,415	$570	$570	$570	$570
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(53)	(68)	(86)	(103)	(116)	(137)

Table 5.25-10 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of Thorndale

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Groundwater Development Carrizo-Wilcox - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	200	200	200	200	200	200
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,083,000	$1,083,000	$114,000	$114,000	$114,000	$114,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$5,415	$5,415	$570	$570	$570	$570

5.25.8 County-Other

5.25.8.1 Description of Supply

Entities in County-Other obtain supplies from Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer at 160 ac-ft/yr, along with surface water from Lake Alcoa and a contract for 5,000 ac-ft/yr with BRA which can supply 4,167 ac-ft/yr. County Other Milam contains a new development, Sandow Lakes Ranch (SLR), which is planning significant growth in the region. County Other is projected to have a shortage beginning in 2040 at 1,274 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 10,241 by 2080. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.25.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Alternative: Makeup for reduced supplies from Carrizo-Wilcox:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $14,420,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $217/ac-ft.
2. Alternative: SLR Future Groundwater Permit
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $21,784,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $253/ac-ft.

Table 5.25-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Milam County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	25,282	21,584	18,834	14,546	15,799	15,773
Alternative: Makeup for reduced supplies						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7,436	6,386	5,565	4,509	3,230	3,230
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,611,000	$1,611,000	$596,000	$596,000	$596,000	$596,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$217	$217	$80	$80	$80	$80
Alternative: SLR Future Groundwater Permit						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,280,000	$2,280,000	$747,000	$747,000	$747,000	$747,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$253	$253	$83	$83	$83	$83
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	25,282	21,584	18,834	14,546	15,799	15,773

Alternative strategies represent pending or granted groundwater permits held by SLR but the permitted volume is limited by the MAG.

5.25.9 Manufacturing

Presently no manufacturing demands exist.

5.25.10 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demands exists nor is projected for the County

5.25.11 Mining

5.25.11.1 Description of Supply

Milam County Mining obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 64 to 71 ac-ft/yr, from 2030 to 2080, used for mine reclamation. Milam County Mining is projected to have a shortage beginning in 2030 at 768 ac-ft/yr, decreasing to 767 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.25.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $200 ac-ft/yr.

2. Groundwater Development – Queen City Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $7,336,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $720 ac-ft/yr.

Table 5.25-12 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Milam County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(768)	(772)	(767)	(765)	(766)	(767)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	42	58	59	59	59
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$5,000	$8,400	$11,600	$11,800	$11,800	$11,800
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(743)	(730)	(709)	(706)	(707)	(708)
Groundwater Development – Queen City Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	800	800	800	800	800	800
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$576,000	$576,000	$60,000	$60,000	$60,000	$60,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$720	$720	$75	$75	$75	$75
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	57	70	91	94	93	92

5.25.12 Irrigation

Milam County Irrigation is supplied by groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City and Brazos River Alluvium Aquifers as well as run of the river water rights. Irrigation is projected to have a surplus throughout the planning period.

5.25.13 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.26 Nolan County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.26 1 lists each water user group (WUG) in Nolan County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each WUG with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.26-1 Nolan County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Bitter Creek WSC	(138)	(199)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Roscoe	(107)	(83)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Sweetwater	(145)	(1)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	4	103	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	(42)	(154)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	-	-	No projected demand
Mining	(4)	(5)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Irrigation	(9,634)	(8,847)	Projected shortage – see plan below
Livestock	7	7	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.26.1 Bitter Creek WSC

5.26.1.1 Description of Supply

The Bitter Creek WSC obtains its water supply from the Dockum Aquifer at 109 ac-ft/yr. This WUG is located in Nolan and Fisher Counties. The totals shown in Table 5.26-1 and the table below represent the cumulative totals for Bitter Creek WSC in both counties. Shortages are projected through 2080.

5.26.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Bitter Creek WSC. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 63 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 140 is equal to the selected target rate of 140 gallons per capita per day (gpcd).

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $3,297,483 in 2040.

2. Groundwater Development – Blaine Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,488,000.
3. Unit Cost: $4,100/ac-ft.

Table 5.26-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bitter Creek WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(138)	(145)	(155)	(167)	(180)	(199)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	120	124	129	136	142	151
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,295,627	$3,297,483	$59,855	$63,103	$65,887	$70,063
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction n (ac-ft/yr)	(18)	(21)	(26)	(31)	(38)	(48)
Blaine Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	50	50	50	50	50	50
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$205,000	$205,000	$30,000	$30,000	$30,000	$30,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$4,100	$4,100	$600	$600	$600	$600
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	32	29	24	19	12	2

Notes:
WMS – water management strategies

5.26.2 City of Roscoe

5.26.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Roscoe obtains groundwater from the Dockum Aquifer at 115 ac-ft/yr. A need is projected for the City of Roscoe through 2080.

5.26.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Roscoe. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 186 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $31,464 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Cedar Ridge Reservoir (Purchase Water from Sweetwater):
    a. Cost Source: Sweetwater Wholesale Water Rate.

b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
c. Project Cost: Existing infrastructure assumed sufficient.
d. Unit Cost: $2,463/ac-ft ($7.56/1,000 gallons).

3. Groundwater Development – Edwards Aquifer:

a. Cost Source: Volume II.
b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
c. Project Cost: $11,866,000.
d. Unit Cost: $10,618/ac-ft.

Table 5.26-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Roscoe

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(107)	(99)	(92)	(87)	(84)	(83)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	18	37	46	45	45	44
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$12,312	$25,308	$31,464	$30,780	$30,780	$30,096
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(89)	(62)	(46)	(42)	(39)	(39)
Cedar Ridge Reservoir (Purchase Water from Sweetwater)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	-	90	96	101	107	107
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	$221,700	$236,400	$248,800	$263,500	$263,500
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	-	$2,463	$2,463	$2,463	$2,463	$2,463
Edwards Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	89	-	-	-	-	-
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$945,000	-	-	-	-	-
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$10,618	-	-	-	-	-
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	28	50	59	68	68

5.26.3 City of Sweetwater

5.26.3.1 Description of Supply

The City of Sweetwater obtains 2,329 ac-ft/yr of groundwater from the Dockum Aquifer throughout the planning period. The City of Sweetwater supplies water to County Other-Taylor, Manufacturing-Nolan, and Roby. A shortage is projected for the City of Sweetwater through 2080.

5.26.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Sweetwater. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 15 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Audit:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $13,156 in 2030.
2. Purchase from Abilene (Cedar Ridge Reservoir):
    a. The City of Abilene is pursuing the Cedar Ridge Reservoir project to develop the supplies necessary to meet Abilene's future municipal demands and contractual sales.
    b. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    c. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    d. Project Cost: $90,373,000.
    e. Unit Cost: $6,378/ac-ft (includes cost to purchase water from Abilene).
3. Additional water from Oak Creek Reservoir Conjunctive Use and Subordination:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: None infrastructure is in place.

Table 5.26-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Sweetwater

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(145)	(119)	(91)	(62)	(32)	(1)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	15	15	14	14	14	14
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$13,156	$13,156	$4,200	$4,200	$4,200	$4,200
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(130)	(104)	(77)	(48)	(18)	13
Purchase from Abilene (Cedar Creek Reservoir)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	1,668	1,731	1,787	1,839	1,839
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	$10,639,000	$11,040,000	$5,218,000	$5,370,000	$5,370,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	$6,378	$6,378	$2,920	$2,920	$2,920
Additional Water from Oak Creek Conjunctive Use (Brazos G) and Subordination (Region F)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,073	1,068	1,062	1,059	1,056	1,053
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	943	2,632	2,716	2,798	2,877	2,905

5.26.4 County-Other

Entities in Nolan County-Other obtain 140 ac-ft/yr of water from the Edwards-Trinity Aquifer. A surplus is projected through 2080. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use of 105 is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd. No changes are recommended to the Water Supply Plan.

5.26.5 Manufacturing

5.26.5.1 Description of Supply

Nolan County Manufacturing obtains its water supply from the Dockum Aquifer, City of Sweetwater and from the Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifer. Manufacturing is projected to have a shortage beginning in year 2030.

5.26.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Nolan County-Manufacturing. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.
2. Groundwater Development – Edwards Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $3,349,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,173 /ac-ft.

Table 5.26-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Nolan County - Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(42)	(64)	(87)	(109)	(131)	(154)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	13	26	37	37	37	37
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(29)	(38)	(50)	(72)	(94)	(117)
Edwards Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	34	133	133	133	133	133
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$74,000	$289,000	$53,000	$53,000	$53,000	$53,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,173	$2,173	$398	$398	$398	$398
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	5	95	83	61	39	16

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.26.6 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.26.7 Mining

5.26.7.1 Description of Supply

Nolan County Mining obtains its water supply from the Blaine and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) Aquifers. Based on the available groundwater supply, Nolan County Mining is projected to have a shortage between 2030 and 2080.

5.26.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Nolan County-Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.
2. Cedar Ridge Reservoir (Purchase Water Supply from Sweetwater):
    a. Cost Source: Sweetwater Wholesale Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Project Cost: Existing infrastructure assumed sufficient.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,031/ac-ft (Sweetwater Wholesale Rate).
3. Groundwater Development – Edwards Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $789,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $7,100/ac-ft.

Table 5.26-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Nolan County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(5)	(5)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3	5	6	5	5	4
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(1)	1	2	1	0	(1)

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Additional Water from Sweetwater						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	-	186	166	147	131	131
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	$191,800	$171,200	$151,600	$135,100	$135,100
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	-	$1,031	$1,031	$1,031	$1,031	$1,031
Edwards Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	-	-	-	-	-
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$71,000	-	-	-	-	-
Unit Cost ($ac-ft)	$7,100	-	-	-	-	-
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	9	187	168	148	131	130

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.26.8 Irrigation

5.26.8.1 Description of Supply

Nolan County Irrigation obtains its water supply from the Dockum and Edwards-Trinity Aquifers and run-of-river diversions from the Brazos River. Based on the available supply, Nolan County Irrigation is projected to have a shortage between 2030 and 2080.

5.26.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Nolan County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: max $988,600 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,222/ac-ft.
2. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. New supplies for irrigation would be cost prohibitive to develop and most farms would switch to dry-land crops or allow fields to go fallow during a prolonged drought.
    b. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – will be provided by TWDB.
    c. Date to be Implemented: 2030.

Table 5.26-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Nolan County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(9,634)	(9,634)	(9,250)	(9,008)	(8,847)	(8,847)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	347	578	809	809	809	809
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$424,000	$706,300	$988,600	$988,600	$988,600	$988,600
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(9,287)	(9,056)	(8,441)	(8,199)	(8,038)	(8,038)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(9,287)	(9,056)	(8,441)	(8,199)	(8,038)	(8,038)

5.26.9 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Blaine and Edwards-Trinity Aquifer groundwater. Nolan County Livestock is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.27 Palo Pinto County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.27-1 lists each water user group in Palo Pinto County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.27-1 Palo Pinto County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/Shortage		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Double Diamond Utilities			See Hill County
City of Gordon	(166)	(161)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
City of Mineral Wells	(920)	(2,315)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
North Rural WSC	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
Palo Pinto WSC	77	78	Projected surplus
Parker County SUD			See Region C
Possum Kingdom WSC	80	80	Projected surplus.
Santo SUD	40	25	Projected surplus.
Sportsmans World MUD	14	16	Projected surplus.
Stephens Regional SUD			See Stephens County
City of Strawn	(14)	(10)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Sturdivant Progress WSC	68	77	Projected surplus
County-Other	(167)	(160)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Manufacturing	(18)	(23)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	1	1	Projected surplus
Mining	(25)	(29)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Irrigation	(1,501)	(1,534)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	(95)	(131)	Projected shortage - see plan below.

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; MUD – municipal utility district; SUD – special utility district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.27.1 City of Gordon

5.27.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Gordon is split between Erath and Palo Pinto Counties; however, the majority of the City's demand is located in Palo Pinto County. Gordon receives 50 ac-ft/yr of water supply from the City of Strawn; the City also sells water to Erath County-Other entities. Water shortages are projected throughout the planning period. The projected municipal unmet needs result from limited source availability as determined by using the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group's (RWPG's) adopted methodology for

the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan, which is consistent with the specific assumptions and methods required for regional water planning.

The City has an existing water right of 405 ac-ft/yr from Lake CB Long, however during a drought equivalent to or worse than the drought of record, the modeled water availability indicated there would be no firm supply available from this reservoir or from the City's Emergency authorization to access supply from Lake Gordon. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent to or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online. The quantity shown in Table 5.27-1 and Table 5.27-2 represents the cumulative totals for the City of Gordon.

5.27.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Gordon. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 24 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 230 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $30,780 in 2060 and 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $16,280 in 2030.
3. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $1,946,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,427/ac-ft.

Table 5.27-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Gordon

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(166)	(166)	(164)	(164)	(163)	(161)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	13	29	45	45	43
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$8,892	$19,836	$30,780	$30,780	$29,412
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	16	16	16	16	16

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$16,280	$16,280	$5,401	$5,401	$5,401	$5,401
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(150)	(137)	(119)	(103)	(102)	(102)
Trinity Aquifer Development (Purchase Water from Strawn)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	113	120	124	118	121	121
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$161,000	$171,000	$40,000	$38,000	$39,000	$39,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,427	$1,427	$323	$323	$323	$323
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(37)	(17)	5	15	19	19

Notes:
WMS – water management strategies

5.27.2 Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC

Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC obtains its water supply from Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District (MWD) No. 1. The WSC has enough projected supply throughout the planning period, and no changes to water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the current per capita use of 112 gpcd is below the target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.27.3 City of Mineral Wells

5.27.3.1 Description of Supply

The City of Mineral Wells is split between Parker County in Region C and Palo Pinto County (Brazos G); however, the majority of demand lies within Palo Pinto County. The City obtains water supply from Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1. Mineral Wells provides water to Palo Pinto WSC, Santo SUD, Sturdivant Progress WSC, North Rural WSC, Palo Pinto County-Other and Manufacturing entities, and to various users in Region C. Due to a prorated reduction in treated surface water supply form Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1, water shortages are projected for the City of Mineral Wells from 2030 through 2080. Balances shown in Table 5.27-1 and Table 5.27-3 are for the entire City, including areas in Parker County and Region C. Water conservation and water loss reduction as recommended water management strategies are shown for both the Brazos G and Region C portions.

5.27.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Mineral Wells. The City has requested that a recommended strategy for an 8 million gallons per day (mgd) expansion of the existing Hilltop Water Treatment Plant (WTP) be included in the Plan. The water supply for this expansion will come from the Turkey Peak WMS; the expansion project is also included in Volume II of the Regional Water Plan. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 39 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 180 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $578,664 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $1,375,942 in 2040.
3. WTP Expansion (8 mgd) (Turkey Peak Reservoir):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $41,000,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $515/ac-ft ($1.58/1000 gallons).
4. Indirect Potable Reuse
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be implemented: before 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $17,799,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,352.

Table 5.27-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Mineral Wells

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(920)	(1,246)	(1,583)	(1,922)	(2,088)	(2,315)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr) (Brazos G)	914	962	1,011	1,062	1,062	1,062
Annual Cost ($/yr) (Brazos G portion only)	$1,355,152	$1,375,942	$437,903	$459,993	$459,993	$459,993
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(6)	(284)	(572)	(860)	(1,026)	(1,253)
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Increase Contract Amount to County-Other (ac-ft/yr)	(190)	(187)	(187)	(184)	(177)	(177)
Increase Contract Amount to Palo Pinto Manufacturing (ac-ft/yr)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)
Total Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	(214)	(490)	(779)	(1,065)	(1,225)	(1,453)
WTP Expansion (Turkey Peak Reservoir)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,731,000	$1,731,000	$652,000	$652,000	$652,000	$652,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$515	$515	$194	$194	$194	$194

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Indirect Potable Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$1,514,000	$1,514,000	$264,000	$264,000	$264,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$1,352	$1,352	$236	$236	$236
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	3,146	3,990	3,701	3,415	3,255	3,027

5.27.4 North Rural WSC

North Rural WSC is split between Parker County in Region C and Palo Pinto County (Brazos G); however, the majority of demand lies within Palo Pinto County in the earlier decades with a shift of increased demand in Parker County later in the planning period. North Rural WSC obtains its water supply from the City of Mineral Wells. No shortages are projected for the WSC and no changes in water supply are recommended throughout the planning period. Conservation was considered; however, the current per capita use rate of 100 gpcd is below the targeted rate of 140 gpcd.

5.27.5 Palo Pinto WSC

Palo Pinto obtains its water supply from the City of Mineral Wells. No shortages are projected for the WSC and no changes in water supply are recommended throughout the planning period. Conservation was considered; however, the current per capita use rate of 127 gpcd is below the targeted rate of 140 gpcd.

5.27.6 Possum Kingdom WSC

Possum Kingdom WSC is split between Stephens and Palo Pinto County. The WSC receives supply from the Brazos River Authority (BRA). No water shortages are projected throughout the planning period. Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to supplement water needs for Possum Kingdom WSC. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 384 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $233,928 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.27-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Possum Kingdom WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	80	78	82	81	80	80
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	51	113	169	228	286	342
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$34,884	$77,292	$115,596	$155,952	$195,624	$233,928

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	131	191	251	309	366	422
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	131	191	251	309	366	422

5.27.7 Santo SUD

Santo SUD is split between Hood and Palo Pinto counties as well as Parker County in Region C, however the majority of the SUD's demand lies within Palo Pinto County. Santo SUD obtains treated surface water supply from the City of Mineral Wells.

No shortages are projected for the SUD and no changes in water supply are recommended throughout the planning period. Conservation was considered; however, the current per capita use rate of 125 is below the targeted rate of 140 gpcd.

5.27.8 Sportsmans World MUD

Sportsman World MUD is supplied by surface water from the main stem of the Brazos River. The MUD has no projected shortages throughout the planning period. Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to supplement water supply for Sportsman World MUD. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 890 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $29,412 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.27-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Sportsmans World MUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	14	14	15	15	16	16
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7	14	22	29	36	43
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,788	$9,576	$15,048	$19,836	$24,624	$29,412
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	21	28	37	44	52	59
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	21	28	37	44	52	59

5.27.9 City of Strawn

5.27.9.1 Description of Supply

The City of Strawn is supplied by surface water from Lake Tucker and is projected to have shortages through 2080. The City also sells 50 ac-ft/yr of water to the City of Gordon.

5.27.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Strawn. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 32 percent , and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 207 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $10,944 in 2070 and 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $62,288 in 2030.
3. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer (Erath County):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $7,732,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $21,759/ac-ft.

Table 5.27-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Strawn

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	*(14)*	*(14)*	*(12)*	*(12)*	*(11)*	*(10)*
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	12	15	16	16
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$8,208	$10,260	$10,944	$10,944
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	22	22	22	22	21	21
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$62,288	$62,288	$8,967	$8,967	$8,559	$8,559
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	*8*	*8*	*22*	*25*	*26*	*27*
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer (Erath County)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	27	28	29	28	29	29
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$587,000	$609,000	$87,000	$84,000	$87,000	$87,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$21,759	$21,759	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	*35*	*36*	*51*	*53*	*55*	*56*

5.27.10 Sturdivant Progress WSC

Sturdivant Progress WSC purchases treated water from the City of Mineral Wells. The WSC's contract is projected to provide sufficient supply throughout the planning period. Conservation was considered; however, the current per capita use rate of 97 gpcd is below the targeted rate of 140 gpcd. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.27.11 County-Other

5.27.11.1 Description of Supply

Entities in Palo Pinto County-Other obtain treated surface water from the City of Mineral Wells and water from the BRA. There is a projected shortage for County-Other from 2030 through 2080.

5.27.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for Palo-Pinto County-Other entities. Conservation was also considered; however, the current per capita use rate of 84 gpcd is below the targeted rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase Additional Water from the City of Mineral Wells:
    a. Cost Source: Mineral Wells Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $1,187,000 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $6,247/ac-ft ($19.17/1000 gallons).

Table 5.27-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(167)	(166)	(163)	(161)	(160)	(160)
Purchase Additional Water from the City of Mineral Wells						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	190	187	187	184	177	177
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,187,000	$1,168,000	$1,168,000	$1,149,000	$1,106,000	$1,106,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$6,247	$6,247	$6,247	$6,247	$6,247	$6,247
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	23	21	24	23	17	17

5.27.12 Manufacturing

5.27.12.1 Description of Supply

Palo Pinto County Manufacturing obtains its water supply from the City of Mineral Wells and the Trinity Aquifer. Palo Pinto County Manufacturing has projected needs throughout the planning horizon.

5.27.12.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Palo Pinto Manufacturing.

1. Purchase Additional Supply from the City of Mineral Wells
    a. Cost Source: Mineral Wells Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $144,000 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $6,247/ac-ft ($19.17/1000 gallons).

Table 5.27-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)
Purchase Additional Supply from the City of Mineral Wells						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	18	19	20	21	22	23
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$112,000	$119,000	$125,000	$131,000	$137,000	$144,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$6,247	$6,247	$6,247	$6,247	$6,247	$6,247
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.27.13 Steam-Electric

Palo Pinto County Steam-Electric obtains its water supply from Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1 and from Palo Pinto County-Other entities. Steam-Electric is projected to have surplus of supply through the planning period, and no change to water supply is recommended.

5.27.14 Mining

5.27.14.1 Description of Supply

Palo Pinto County Mining obtains its water supply from Palo Pinto County-Other entities. Mining operations have a projected shortage throughout the planning period.

5.27.14.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following plan is recommended for Palo-Pinto County-Other entities. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: Not determined (ND). Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer (Erath County):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $14,768,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,872/ac-ft.

Table 5.27-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(28)	(29)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1	1	2	2	2	2
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(24)	(25)	(25)	(26)	(26)	(27)
Trinity Aquifer Development (Erath County)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	649	502	399	265	189	189
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,215,000	$940,000	$109,000	$72,000	$52,000	$52,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,872	$1,872	$273	$273	$273	$273
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	625	477	374	239	163	162

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.27.15 Irrigation

5.27.15.1 Description of Supply

Palo Pinto County Irrigation obtains its water supply from the Trinity Aquifer and the BRA. Based on the available supply, Palo Pinto County Irrigation is projected to have a shortage between 2030 and 2080.

5.27.15.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Palo Pinto County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $269,900 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,279/ac-ft.

2. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer (Erath County):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $39,990,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,911/ac-ft.

Table 5.27-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(1,501)	(1,505)	(1,509)	(1,512)	(1,519)	(1,534)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	90	151	211	211	211	211
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$115,100	$193,100	$269,900	$269,900	$269,900	$269,900
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(1,411)	(1,354)	(1,298)	(1,301)	(1,308)	(1,323)
Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer (Erath County)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,672	1,708	1,768	1,684	1,725	1,725
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,195,000	$3,264,000	$569,000	$542,000	$555,000	$555,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,911	$1,911	$322	$322	$322	$322
Turkey Peak Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,175	2,115	2,115	2,115	2,115	2,115
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,499,000	$6,320,000	$6,320,000	$6,320,000	$6,320,000	$6,320,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,988	$2,988	$2,988	$2,988	$2,988	$2,988
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	2,436	2,469	2,585	2,498	2,532	2,517

5.27.16 Livestock

Palo Pinto County Livestock water is supplied through local water supplies and the BRA. Livestock shortages are projected throughout the planning horizon. Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Irrigation. The projected unmet needs result from contracts not being fully allocated due to limited source availability as determined by using the Brazos G RWPG's adopted methodology for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan, which is consistent with the specific assumptions and methods required for regional water planning. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent to or worse than the drought of record, with the full implementation of all existing water rights in the basin. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online. Notably, BRA contract supplies are reported by BRA as firm supplies.

1. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

Table 5.27-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto – Livestock

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(95)	(103)	(110)	(117)	(124)	(131)
Leave Needs Unmet	(95)	(103)	(110)	(117)	(124)	(131)

5.28 Robertson County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.28-1 lists each water user group in Robertson County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.28-1 Robertson County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Bremond	235	262	Projected surplus
City of Calvert	260	309	Projected surplus
City of Franklin	966	1,012	Projected surplus
City of Hearne	1,614	1,775	Projected surplus
Robertson County WSC	86	111	Projected surplus
Twin Creek WSC	467	508	Projected surplus
Wellborn SUD	239	(6,553)	See Brazos County (total projected shortage includes both Brazos and Robertson Counties)
Wickson Creek SUD	1,150	(2,876)	See Brazos County (total projected shortage includes both Brazos and Robertson Counties)
County-Other	(55)	52	Projected shortage
Manufacturing	4,557	4,546	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	(7,967)	(9,101)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Mining	12,087	15,087	Projected surplus
Irrigation	(13,417)	(13,886)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	1,654	1,654	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; SUD – special utility district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.28.1 City of Bremond

5.28.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Bremond obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 391 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City.

5.28.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Bremond. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 183 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II (Section 2.0).
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $21,204 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.28-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bremond

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	235	239	244	250	256	262
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	12	27	31	30	29	28
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,208	$18,468	$21,204	$20,520	$19,836	$19,152
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	247	266	275	280	285	290

5.28.2 City of Calvert

5.28.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Calvert obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 529 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City.

5.28.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Calvert. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 235 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II (Section 2.0).
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $64,296 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.28-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Calvert

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	260	268	276	287	298	309
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	22	47	71	94	90	86
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$15,048	$32,148	$48,564	$64,296	$61,560	$58,824
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	282	315	347	381	388	395

5.28.3 City of Franklin

The City of Franklin obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 1,247 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for the City of Franklin. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 133 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.28.4 City of Hearne

5.28.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Hearne obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 2,843 ac-ft/yr. The City also provides supplies to Robertson County Manufacturing. No shortages are projected for the City of Hearne.

5.28.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Hearne. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 152 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II (Section 2.0).
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $29,412 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.28-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hearne

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,614	1,640	1,668	1,702	1,737	1,775
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	43	39	37	36	35	32
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$29,412	$26,676	$25,308	$24,624	$23,940	$21,888
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	1,657	1,679	1,705	1,738	1,772	1,807

5.28.5 Robertson County WSC

5.28.5.1 Description of Supply

Robertson County WSC obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 614 ac-ft/yr. The entity also provides supplies to Robertson County Steam and Electric. Robertson County WSC has no projected shortage throughout the planning period.

5.28.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Robertson County WSC. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 143 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $5,477,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $442/ac-ft.

Table 5.28-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Robertson County WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	86	100	107	113	115	111
Groundwater Development – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	86	162	239	315	392	392
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$586,000	$586,000	$201,000	$201,000	$201,000	$201,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,495	$1,495	$513	$513	$513	$513
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	172	262	346	428	507	503

5.28.6 Twin Creek WSC

5.28.6.1 Description of Supply

Twin Creek WSC obtains its water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at 692 ac-ft/yr. A surplus is projected for Twin Creek WSC throughout the planning period.

5.28.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the Twin Creek WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 223 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II (Section 2.0).
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $49,932 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.28-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Twin Creek WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	467	473	480	489	498	508
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	17	40	60	73	69	66
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$11,628	$27,360	$41,040	$49,932	$47,196	$45,144
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	484	513	540	562	567	574

5.28.7 County-Other

5.28.7.1 Description of Supply

Robertson County-Other entities obtain water supply from groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. Shortages are projected in 2030 of 55 ac-ft/yr, decreasing to 17 ac-ft/yr by 2050. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's usage is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.28.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Robertson County-Other. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 143 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Groundwater Development – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,055,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,120/ac-ft.
    e. Recommended project is designed for supply of 75 ac-ft/yr modeled available groundwater (MAG) Limited. Alternative strategy represents the full project volume.

Table 5.28-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for County-Other Robertson

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(55)	(37)	(17)	5	28	52
Groundwater Development – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	11	22	32	43	53	53
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$84,000	$84,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,120	$1,120	$133	$133	$133	$133
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(44)	(15)	15	48	81	105
Groundwater Development – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	75	75	75	75	75	75

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$84,000	$84,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,120	$1,120	$133	$133	$133	$133

5.28.8 Manufacturing

Water supply for manufacturing in Robertson County is obtained by purchase from the City of Hearne and from Carrizo-Wilcox wells operated by the manufacturing entity. Manufacturing is projected to have a surplus of 4,557 ac-ft/yr in 2030, decreasing to 4,546 ac-ft/yr by 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.28.9 Steam-Electric

5.28.9.1 Description of Supply

Robertson County Steam-Electric entities obtain water supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, contracts with the Brazos River Authority, and groundwater purchased from Robertson County WSC. Steam-Electric is projected to experience a water supply shortage beginning in 2030 of 7,967 ac-ft/yr and increasing to 9,101 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.28.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Robertson County Steam-Electric.

1. Purchase from Walnut Creek Mine Reuse:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II (Section 3.0 & 3.2).
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2050.
    c. Annual Cost: $4,500,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $500/ac-ft.

Table 5.28-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Robertson County Steam-Electric

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(7,967)	(8,194)	(8,421)	(8,647)	(8,874)	(9,101)
Purchase Water from Walnut Creek Mine - Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	-	-	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	-	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	$4,500,000	$4,500,000
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(7,967)	(8,194)	579	353	126	(101)

5.28.10 Mining

Mining operations in Robertson County are supplied by Carrizo-Wilcox Groundwater. Surpluses are projected for Robertson County Mining throughout the planning period.

5.28.11 Irrigation

5.28.11.1 Description of Supply

Robertson County Irrigation is supplied by the Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, Sparta, and Brazos River Alluvium Aquifers. Current pumping in the Brazos River Alluvium greatly exceeds the MAG for Robertson County. Irrigation is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030 and continuing through 2080.

5.28.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Robertson County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: See Volume II (Section 2.0).
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $1,038/ac-ft.
2. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. New supplies for irrigation would be cost prohibitive to develop and most farms would switch to dry-land crops or allow fields to go fallow during a prolonged drought.
    b. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    c. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.

Table 5.28-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Robertson County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(13,417)	(13,405)	(13,665)	(13,781)	(13,886)	(13,886)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,198	3,664	5,129	5,129	5,129	5,129
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$ 2,280,943	$ 3,802,264	$ 5,322,547	$ 5,322,547	$ 5,322,547	$ 5,322,547
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(11,219)	(9,741)	(8,536)	(8,652)	(8,757)	(8,757)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(11,219)	(9,741)	(8,536)	(8,652)	(8,757)	(8,757)

5.28.12 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.29 Shackelford County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.29-1 lists each water user group in Shackelford County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in decades 2030 and 2080. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.29-1 Shackelford County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2040 (ac-ft/yr)	2070 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Albany	193	437	Projected surplus.
Fort Griffin SUD			See Stephens County
Hamby WSC			See Jones County
Stephens Regional SUD			See Stephens County
Callahan County WSC			See Callahan County
County-Other	3	20	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	–	–	No projected demand
Steam-Electric	–	–	No projected demand
Mining	–	–	No projected demand
Irrigation	322	322	Projected surplus
Livestock	136	136	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; SUD – special utility district; WSC water supply corporation

5.29.1 City of Albany

5.29.1.1 Description of Supply

Water supply for the City of Albany is from Hubbard Creek Reservoir, owned by the West Central Texas Municipal Water District at 1,333 to 1,400 ac-ft/yr and from Lake McCarty at 75 to 0 ac-ft/yr based on yields from 2030 to 2080, respectively. The City of Albany sells water to Fort Griffin SUD.

5.29.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 37 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 276 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $116,280 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $158,102 in 2030.

Table 5.29-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Albany

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	193	250	306	344	387	437
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	28	64	92	78
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$0	$0	$19,152	$43,776	$62,928	$53,352
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	121	109	96	88	78	67
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$158,102	$152,992	$40,881	$37,474	$33,216	$28,532
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	314	359	430	496	557	582

5.29.2 County-Other

Water supplies for entities within County-Other include 25 ac-ft/yr from a minor unnamed aquifer and water from Moran Lake ranging from 50 to 0 ac-ft/yr from 2030 to 2080, respectively. Projections indicate sufficient water supply for County-Other, and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 90 gpcd is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.29.3 Manufacturing

No Manufacturing demand is projected for the county.

5.29.4 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand is projected for the county.

5.29.5 Mining

No Mining demand is projected for the county.

5.29.6 Irrigation

Irrigation obtains water supply from the Cross Timbers Aquifer at 350 ac-ft/yr. There are some irrigation rights located along the Clear Fork of the Brazos River; however, there is no surface water availability for those rights during a repeat of the drought of record. Supplies are projected to be sufficient to meet demands, and no water supply changes or conservation are recommended.

5.29.7 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply, Cross Timbers Aquifer groundwater, and local Brazos run of the river rights. Supply is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Shackelford County Livestock water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.30 Somervell County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.30-1 lists each water user group in Shackelford County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.30-1 Somervell County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Glen Rose	(211)	(226)	Projected shortage - see plan below
Somervell County Water District	262	234	Projected surplus
County-Other	246	243	Projected shortage - see plan below
Manufacturing	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
Steam-Electric	(14,376)	(16,238)	Projected shortage - see plan below
Mining	(866)	(1,198)	Projected shortage - see plan below
Irrigation	354	343	Projected surplus
Livestock	(21)	(21)	Projected shortage - see plan below.

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year

5.30.1 City of Glen Rose

5.30.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Glen Rose obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer. Based on the available groundwater supply, the City of Glen Rose is projected to have a shortage from 2030 through 2080. No additional local groundwater supply from the Trinity Aquifer is projected to be available to the City.

5.30.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for City of Glen Rose. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 199 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $118,332 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

2. Purchase Supply from Somervell County Water Supply Project:
    a. The project will treat raw water from the Wheeler Branch Off-Channel Reservoir and transmit the treated water to customers of the Somervell County Water District. Phases 1-4 of the project are complete and are located in the immediate vicinity of Glen Rose.
    b. Cost Source: Somervell County Water District Water Rate.
    c. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $175,000.
    e. Unit Cost: $1,059/ac-ft ($3.25/1000 gallons).

Table 5.30-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Glen Rose

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(211)	(229)	(237)	(234)	(230)	(226)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	46	111	173	173	172	171
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$31,464	$75,924	$118,332	$118,332	$117,648	$116,964
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(165)	(118)	(64)	(61)	(58)	(55)
Somervell County Water Supply Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	165	118	64	61	58	55
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$175,000	$125,000	$68,000	$65,000	$61,000	$58,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,059	$1,059	$1,059	$1,059	$1,059	$1,059
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.30.2 Somervell County Water District

5.30.2.1 Description of Supply

Somervell County Water District obtains its supply through groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer and from the Wheeler Off-Channel Reservoir. No shortages are projected for the Somervell County Water District.

5.30.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Somervell County Water District to help meet the needs of adjacent water users, including County-Other entities and the City of Glen Rose. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 240 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $432,396 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

2. Somervell County Water Supply Project:
    a. The project will treat raw water from the Wheeler Branch Off-Channel Reservoir and transmit the treated water to customers of the Somervell County Water District. Phases 1 – 4 are complete and provide 1,400 ac-ft/yr of supply. Remaining phases will supply an additional 600 ac-ft/yr.
    b. Cost Source: Volume II.
    c. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    d. Total Project Cost (Phase 7A): $19,575,000.
    e. Annual Cost: $2,091,000.

Costs are shown for the additional supply of water made available by the remaining phases, which are planned for completion by 2030. Costs shown are for new infrastructure only, and do not include existing debt service for existing phases of the project or for costs for supply from Wheeler Branch Reservoir.

Table 5.30-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Somervell County Water District

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	262	215	195	207	220	234
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	125	282	444	598	619	614
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$85,500	$192,888	$303,696	$409,032	$423,396	$419,976
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	387	497	639	805	839	848
Additional Demands from Recommended Strategies from Others						
Glen Rose - Somervell County Water Supply Project	(165)	(118)	(64)	(61)	(58)	(55)
Somervell Steam-Electric - Somervell County Water Supply Project	(183)	(183)	(183)	(183)	(183)	(183)
Somervell County Water District - Somervell County Water Supply Project	(600)	(600)	(600)	(600)	(600)	(600)
Total Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	(561)	(404)	(208)	(39)	(2)	10
Somervell County Water Supply Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	600	600	600	600	600	600
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,091,000	$2,091,000	$714,000	$714,000	$714,000	$714,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$3,485	$3,485	$1,190	$1,190	$1,190	$1,190
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	39	196	392	561	598	610

5.30.3 County-Other

5.30.3.1 Description of Supply

Somervell County-Other obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer. Supply is projected to meet County-Other demands in Somervell County, and no changes are recommended to the water supply. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 109 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.30.4 Manufacturing

Somervell County Manufacturing obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer. Supply is projected to meet Manufacturing demands in Somervell County, and no changes are recommended to the water supply.

5.30.5 Steam-Electric

5.30.5.1 Description of Supply

Somervell County Steam-Electric obtains water supply from the Squaw Creek Reservoir, the Trinity Aquifer, and the Brazos River Authority through Lake Granbury. Somervell County Steam-Electric is projected to have shortages beginning in year 2030 and continuing through year 2080. Local groundwater currently supplies potable water for plant staff and high-quality process water for boiler feed at the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station.

5.30.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Somervell County Steam-Electric. Conservation was not applied to this plan because the steam-electric facilities are assumed to be built with technologies minimizing water use as much as practicable.

1. Somervell County Water Supply Project:
    a. Cost Source: Somervell County Water District Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $194,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,059/ac-ft ($3.25/1000 gallons).
2. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Significant demand is associated with the plan to expand the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station; however, there are no longer plans to move forward with this expansion. Therefore, these needs are left unmet.
    b. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    c. Date to be Implemented: 2030.

Table 5.30-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Somervell County – Steam-Electric

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(14,376)	(14,762)	(15,148)	(15,534)	(15,920)	(16,238)
Somervell County Water Supply Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	183	183	183	183	183	183
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$194,000	$194,000	$194,000	$194,000	$194,000	$194,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,509	$1,509	$1,509	$1,509	$1,509	$1,509
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(14,193)	(14,579)	(14,965)	(15,351)	(15,737)	(16,055)

5.30.6 Mining

5.30.6.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Somervell County are supplied by Trinity Aquifer groundwater and water from the Brazos River Authority. Demands for Mining are projected to increase significantly resulting in shortages beginning in 2030.

5.30.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Somervell County-Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.
2. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.

Table 5.30-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Somervell County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(866)	(962)	(1,037)	(1,101)	(1,155)	(1,198)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	33	64	80	74	70	68
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(833)	(898)	(957)	(1,027)	(1,085)	(1,130)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(833)	(898)	(957)	(1,027)	(1,085)	(1,130)

Notes:
Nd – note determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.30.7 Irrigation

Somervell County Irrigation water is supplied by purchases from the Brazos River Authority and Trinity Aquifer groundwater and is projected to have a surplus throughout the planning period. No changes in water supply are recommended.

5.30.8 Livestock

Livestock water is obtained through local livestock supplies and Trinity Aquifer groundwater and is projected to have a shortage throughout the planning period. No additional local groundwater supply from the Trinity Aquifer is projected to be available. Needs remain unmet in the planning period. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent to or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought.

1. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.

Table 5.30-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Somervell County – Livestock

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)

5.31 Stephens County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.31-1 lists each water user group in Stephens County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.31-1 Stephens County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Breckenridge	774	1,071	Projected surplus
Fort Belknap WSC			See Young County
Fort Griffin SUD	2	2	Projected shortage (2040-2070) - see plan below.
Possum Kingdom WSC			See Palo Pinto County
Staff WSC			See Eastland County
Stephens Regional SUD	(42)	(121)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	23	42	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
Steam-Electric	–	–	No projected demand
Mining	1,086	1,069	Projected surplus
Irrigation	(122)	(122)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	121	121	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; SUD – special utility district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.31.1 City of Breckenridge

5.31.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Breckenridge obtains water from Hubbard Creek Reservoir through the West Central Texas Municipal Water District and from Lake Daniel. Projections indicate a surplus of water for the City of Breckenridge, and no change in supply is recommended.

5.31.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Breckenridge. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 161 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $62,244 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.31-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Breckenridge

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	774	830	905	956	1,005	1,071
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	69	91	83	79	74	66
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$47,196	$62,244	$56,772	$54,036	$50,616	$45,144
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	843	921	988	1,035	1,079	1,137

5.31.2 Fort Griffin SUD

5.31.2.1 Description of Supply

Fort Griffin SUD purchases treated surface water from the City of Albany and distributes to a number of counties. Of those counties, Stephens has the highest demand and is considered the SUD's primary county. The projections in Table 5.31-1 and Table 5.31-3 represent cumulative water supply shortages. Fort Griffin SUD also has a contract for 353 ac-ft/yr from the BRA, but does not have infrastructure to utilize that supply.

5.31.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Fort Griffin SUD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 171 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $25,308 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Alternative: Build Infrastructure to Utilize BRA Supply:
    a. Cost: Not determined.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.

Table 5.31-3. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fort Griffin SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	2	(5)	(15)	(20)	(1)	2
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	16	33	34	37	33	33
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$10,944	$22,572	$23,256	$25,308	$22,572	$22,572
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	18	28	19	17	32	35

Notes:
(1) Alternative: Build Infrastructure to Utilize BRA Supply.

5.31.3 Stephens Regional SUD

5.31.3.1 Description of Supply

Stephens Regional SUD is located in multiple counties (Eastland, Shackelford, Palo Pinto, Stephens and Throckmorton and Stephens). The values shown in Table 5.31-1 and Table 5.31-4 represent the cumulative totals for Stephens Regional SUD in all the counties it serves. The current supply comes through the Brazos River Authority (BRA) for supply from Possum Kingdom Reservoir. The WUG also provides supply to the City of Woodson (Throckmorton County-Other).

5.31.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Stephens Regional SUD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 178 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $82,764 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.31-4. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Stephens Regional SUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(42)	(106)	(107)	(109)	(114)	(121)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	42	106	107	109	114	121
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$28,728	$72,504	$73,188	$74,556	$77,976	$82,764
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.31.4 County-Other

Water supply for county-other entities is obtained from local groundwater. Projections indicate adequate water supply and no changes are recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 97 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.31.5 Manufacturing

The City of Breckenridge provides supply to meet Stephens County Manufacturing needs. No shortages are projected throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.31.6 Steam-Electric

Stephens County has no projected demand for Steam-Electric.

5.31.7 Mining

Mining operations in Stephens County obtain supply from Possum Kingdom Reservoir through the BRA and from the Cross Timbers Aquifer. No shortage is projected and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.31.8 Irrigation

5.31.8.1 Description of Supply

Stephens County Irrigation obtains 31 ac-ft/yr of groundwater supply from the Cross Timbers Aquifer. Irrigation is projected to have a shortage of supply through 2080.

5.31.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Stephens County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $17,800 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,618/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Other Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $277,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $733/ac-ft.
3. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.

Table 5.31-5. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Stephens County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(122)	(122)	(122)	(122)	(122)	(122)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5	8	11	11	11	11
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,100	$12,900	$17,800	$17,800	$17,800	$17,800
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(117)	(114)	(111)	(111)	(111)	(111)
Groundwater Development – Other Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	30	30	30	30	30	30
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$22,000	$22,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$733	$733	$100	$100	$100	$100
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(87)	(84)	(81)	(81)	(81)	(81)

5.31.9 Livestock

Stephens County Livestock obtains water from local supply and is projected to meet demands through 2080. No changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.32 Stonewall County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.32-1 lists each water user group in Stonewall County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief description of each water user group has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.32-1 Stonewall County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Aspermont	(37)	18	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	17	33	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	–	–	No projected demand
Steam-Electric	–	–	No projected demand
Mining	174	174	Projected surplus
Irrigation	16	14	Projected surplus
Livestock	55	55	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr- acre-feet per year

5.32.1 City of Aspermont

5.32.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Aspermont obtains water through the purchase of treated surface water under contract from the North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority (NCTMWA) and through local groundwater production from the Seymour Aquifer. The City is contracted to purchase up to 118 ac-ft/yr from the NCTMWA; however, due to availability of supplies, this contract is prorated to provide a maximum of only 23 ac-ft/yr during the planning period. Additionally, no additional local groundwater supply from the Seymour Aquifer is projected to be available to the City. Needs remain unmet in the 2030 decade. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG), the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to recommended strategies coming online.

5.32.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategy is recommended for City of Aspermont. Associated costs are included for each strategy. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 331 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

c. Annual Cost: maximum of $66,348 in 2080.
d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.32-2. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Aspermont

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(37)	(28)	(19)	(8)	4	18
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	21	42	60	77	90	97
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$14,364	$28,728	$41,040	$52,668	$61,560	$66,348
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(16)	14	41	69	94	115
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(16)	14	41	69	94	115

5.32.2 County-Other

Stonewall County-Other entities obtain their groundwater supply from the Blaine Aquifer. A surplus is projected throughout the planning period and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered as a strategy for implementation; however, the entity's per capita usage of 107 is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.32.3 Manufacturing

No Manufacturing demand exists or is projected for the county.

5.32.4 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the county.

5.32.5 Mining

5.32.5.1 Description of Supply

Groundwater supply for Mining in Stonewall County is obtained from the Blaine Aquifer. Projections indicate a decrease in water demand for Mining, and no shortages are projected during the planning period.

5.32.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to supplement water supply for Mining. Associated costs for this strategy are included below.

1. Groundwater Development (Blaine Aquifer):
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: by 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $1,394,000.
   d. Unit Cost: Max of $374/ac-ft.

Table 5.32-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Stonewall County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	174	174	174	174	174	174
Groundwater Well Development – Blaine Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	372	372	372	372	372	372
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$139,000	$139,000	$41,000	$41,000	$41,000	$41,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$374	$374	$110	$110	$110	$110
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	546	546	546	546	546	546

5.32.6 Irrigation

Stonewall County Irrigation entities obtain groundwater supply from the Blaine and Seymour Aquifers and run of the river supplies from the Brazos River Authority. A surplus in supply is projected and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.32.7 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Blaine Aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Stonewall County Livestock water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.33 Taylor County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.33-1 lists each water user group (WUG) in Taylor County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the WUG and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.33-1 Taylor County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Abilene	4,496	(10,934)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Hamby WSC			See Jones County
Hawley WSC			See Jones County
City of Lawn	0	(4)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Merkel	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
North Runnels WSC			See Region F Plan
Potosi WSC	(857)	(1,682)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
S U N WSC	(14)	(124)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steamboat Mountain WSC	(653)	(1,951)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Tye	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
View Caps WSC	(120)	(238)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	371	181	Projected surplus.
Manufacturing	(49)	(865)	No projected surplus or shortage
Steam-Electric	–	–	No projected demand
Mining	(380)	(437)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Irrigation	(547)	(547)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	154	154	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.33.1 City of Abilene

5.33.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Abilene obtains its water supply from surface water from Fort Phantom Hill Reservoir, Fort Phantom Hill Indirect Reuse, Brazos River Authority (BRA) Main Stem System (Possum Kingdom Reservoir), Hubbard Creek Reservoir and O.H. Ivie (Region F) Reservoir. Abilene also has a wastewater reuse system for non-potable use with water stored in Lake Kirby. The City supplies several neighboring communities, and projected demands indicate shortages beginning in 2060. This WUG is located in Taylor and Jones Counties. The City requested that a project to expand their existing WTP capacity by 23.2 million gallons per day be included in this Plan. The expansion is not shown below because the water supply will come from the Cedar Ridge Reservoir WMS; the expansion project is included in Volume II of the Regional Water Plan. The quantity shown in Table 5.33-1 and Table 5.33-2 represents the cumulative totals for the City of Abilene. Abilene's water usage utilized for demand projections is 183 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

5.33.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water supply plan is recommended to meet water needs for the City of Abilene and the entities supplied by the City.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $5,305,104 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Subordination – OH Ivie (Non-System Portion):
    a. Cost Source: See 2026 Region F Regional Water Plan.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $0/ ac-ft (City has agreement for the water; assume existing infrastructure sufficient).
3. West Texas Water Partnership:
    a. Cost Source: See 2026 Region F Regional Water Plan.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Project Cost: see Region F Water Plan.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $2,267/ ac-ft
4. Cedar Ridge Reservoir:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $540,102,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,654/ ac-ft.

Table 5.33-2 City of Abilene Demands and Supplies

Projected Demands	Year (ac-ft/yr)					
Major Water Contract Holders	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
City of Abilene	26,848	28,860	30,633	32,411	34,391	36,611
Existing Contractual Sales						
City of Ballinger	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250
City of Baird	77	77	77	77	77	77
Blair WSC (Taylor County-Other)	77	77	77	77	77	77
City of Buffalo Gap (Taylor County-Other)	153	153	153	153	153	153
City of Clyde	307	307	307	307	307	307
City of Lawn	153	153	153	153	153	153
City of Merkel	353	353	353	353	353	353
City of Tye	184	184	184	184	184	184
Eula WSC	61	61	61	61	61	61
Hamby WSC	308	308	308	308	308	308
Hawley WSC	384	384	384	384	384	384
Potosi WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
Steamboat Mountain WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
S.U.N. WSC (Taylor County-Other)	230	230	230	230	230	230
Tuscola-Taylor County WCID No. 1 (Taylor County-Other)	92	92	92	92	92	92
View Caps WSC	199	199	199	199	199	199
Taylor County Manufacturing	671	671	671	671	671	671
Total Contract Demands	**5,113**	**5,113**	**5,113**	**5,113**	**5,113**	**5,113**
Total Existing Demands	**31,961**	**33,973**	**35,746**	**37,524**	**39,504**	**41,724**
Recommended Strategies[1]						
Baird (Purchase Additional Supply)	206	173	142	139	137	134
Clyde (Purchase Additional Supply)	100	–	–	–	–	–
Potosi WSC (Purchase Additional Supply)	857	1,012	1,149	1,309	1,485	1,682
S U N WSC (Purchase Additional Supply)	14	29	49	68	92	124
Steamboat Mountain WSC (Purchase Additional Supply)	653	893	1,103	1,358	1,641	1,951
View Caps WSC (Purchase Additional Supply)	109	133	153	174	198	225
Jones County-Other (Purchase Additional Supply)	167	122	102	112	121	121
Taylor County-Manufacturing (Purchase Additional Supply)	49	76	775	402	308	865
Roscoe (Cedar Ridge)	–	90	96	101	107	107

Projected Demands	Year (ac-ft/yr)					
Major Water Contract Holders	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Sweetwater (Cedar Ridge)	–	1,668	1,731	1,787	1,839	1,839
Taylor County-Other (Cedar Ridge)	–	96	113	125	197	197
Taylor County-Irrigation (Cedar Ridge)	–	1,152	1,152	1,152	1,152	1,152
Taylor County-Mining (Cedar Ridge)	–	206	188	172	159	159
Nolan County-Mining (Cedar Ridge)	–	186	166	147	131	131
Total Recommended Strategies	**2,155**	**5,836**	**6,919**	**7,046**	**7,567**	**8,687**
Total Demands	**34,116**	**39,809**	**42,665**	**44,570**	**47,071**	**50,411**
Supply Source						
Lake Abilene(2)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Kirby(3)	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRA Main Stem System(4)	19,418	19,242	18,579	17,952	17,358	16,795
Lake O.H. Ivie (Colorado River MWD)(5)	4,721	4,588	4,456	4,324	4,191	4,059
Fort Phantom Hill(6)	2,888	2,884	2,880	2,875	2,871	2,867
Fort Phantom Hill Reuse(7)	7,840	7,840	7,840	7,840	7,840	7,840
West Central Texas MWD (Hubbard)	10,720	8,360	6,000	3,640	1,300	1,300
Total Supply	**45,587**	**42,914**	**39,755**	**36,631**	**33,560**	**32,861**
Projected Balance						
Potential Water Balance/(Shortage) (current contracts and supplies)(8)	*11,471*	*3,105*	*(2,910)*	*(7,939)*	*(13,511)*	*(17,550)*

Notes:

(1) WUG needs after conservation and/or Water Loss Reduction.

(2) Lake Abilene is not considered a dependable supply by the City and is currently not used.

(3) Lake Kirby is used primarily to store reuse water for the City's reuse customers. Reuse demands are not included in the water demand projections for the City.

(4) BRA supplies to Abilene are reduced by 11% from contracted amounts for advanced treatment (RO) required for this water source. Supplies are assumed to be reduced by 24% beginning in the 2050 decade to account for reductions in supply due to increased future severe droughts.

(5) Updated yields with subordination, 16.54% of the projected yield of Ivie. Reduced by 6% for RO efficiency. 2030 2040 are the supply numbers provided by Region F while 2050 2080 are from the City's Purpose and Need memorandum supporting the permitting of Cedar Ridge Reservoir.

(6) Fort Phantom Hill Reservoir Supply is 2 year safe yield less 2,500 ac-ft/yr (Clyde Water Right).

(7) Fort Phantom Hill Reuse is indirect potable reuse into the reservoir from Abilene's advanced treatment plant, the Hamby Water Reclamation Facility.

(8) Potential Water Balance/(Shortage) values show the potential water balance if the City was fulfilling the total demands of all contracts and was able to access all supplies granted under the City's existing supply contracts. Due to the water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines Table 5.33-3 shows the water balance used in the Brazos G Regional Water Plan and the Texas Water Development Board's Data Base 27 (DB27).

Table 5.33-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Abilene

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)[1]	4,496	4,306	1,466	(1,460)	(6,907)	(10,934)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,995	5,139	6,489	6,866	7,285	7,756
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,365,000	$3,515,000	$4,438,000	$4,696,000	$4,983,000	$5,305,000
Subordination – OH Ivie (Non-System Portion)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	803	778	753	786	821	849
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
West Texas Water Partnership Supply						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	8,400	8,400	8,400	8,400	8,400
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	$19,042,800	$19,042,800	$3,200,400	$3,200,400	$3,200,400
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	$2,267	$2,267	$381	$381	$381
Cedar Ridge Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	18,889	16,300	13,200	10,100	10,100
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	$31,242,000	$26,960,000	$21,833,000	$16,705,000	$3,788,000
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	$1,654	$1,654	$1,654	$1,654	$375
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	7,294	37,512	33,408	27,792	19,699	16,171

Notes:
(1) WUG The Projected Surplus/(Shortage) shown here are used in the Texas Water Development Board's Data Base 27 (DB27). The values differ from Table 5.33 2 due to the water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines.

5.33.2 City of Lawn

5.33.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Lawn obtains its water from a contract with the City of Abilene at 153 ac-ft/yr. Shortages are projected beginning in 2050.

5.33.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water supply plan is recommended to meet water needs for the City of Lawn. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 277 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $4,788 in 2040
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.

Table 5.33-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Lawn

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	4	7	7	6	5	4
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,736	$4,788	$4,788	$4,104	$3,420	$2,736
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	4	7	0	0	0	0

5.33.3 City of Merkel

The City of Merkel obtains surface water from local sources and from the City of Abilene at 353 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected, and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 117 gpcd is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

5.33.4 North Runnels WSC

See the Region F plan.

5.33.5 Potosi WSC

5.33.5.1 Description of Supply

Potosi WSC purchases water from the City of Abilene at 307 ac-ft/yr, and shows a projected shortage starting in 2030. This WUG is located in multiple counties (Taylor and Callahan). The shortages shown in Table 5.33-1 and the table below represent the cumulative totals for Potosi WSC.

5.33.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Potosi WSC. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 139 gpcd is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene:
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $0 (Current infrastructure assumed to be adequate).
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gal).

Table 5.33-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Potosi WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(857)	(1,012)	(1,149)	(1,309)	(1,485)	(1,682)
Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	857	1,012	1,149	1,309	1,485	1,682
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,983,100	$2,341,800	$2,658,800	$3,029,000	$3,436,300	$3,892,100
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.33.6 S U N WSC

5.33.6.1 Description of Supply

S U N WSC purchases water from the City of Abilene at 230 ac-ft/yr and shows a projected shortage starting in 2030. This WUG is located in multiple counties (Fisher, Jones, and Taylor). The shortages shown in Table 5.33-1 and the table below represent the cumulative totals for S U N WSC.

5.33.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for S U N WSC. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 97 gpcd is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase Additional Water Supply from Abilene:
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $0 (Current infrastructure assumed to be adequate).
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.33-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for S U N WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(14)	(29)	(49)	(68)	(92)	(124)
Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	14	29	49	68	92	124
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$32,400	$67,100	$113,400	$157,400	$212,900	$286,900
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.33.7 Steamboat Mountain WSC

5.33.7.1 Description of Supply

Steamboat Mountain WSC purchases water from the City of Abilene at 307 ac-ft/yr and shows a projected shortage starting in 2030.

5.33.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Steamboat Mountain WSC. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate of 123 gpcd is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene:
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $0 (Current infrastructure assumed to be adequate).
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.33-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Steamboat Mountain WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(653)	(893)	(1,103)	(1,358)	(1,641)	(1,951)
Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	653	893	1,103	1,358	1,641	1,951
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,511,000	$2,066,400	$2,552,300	$2,679,600	$3,797,300	$4,514,600
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS /9 ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.33.8 City of Tye

The City of Tye purchases water from the City of Abilene at 184 ac-ft/yr, and this is sufficient to meet the City's projected demands throughout the planning horizon. No change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.33.9 View Caps WSC

5.33.9.1 Description of Supply

View Caps WSC purchases water from the City of Abilene at 199 ac-ft/yr and shows a projected shortage starting in 2030.

5.33.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for View Caps WSC. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 150 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: maximum of $8,892 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ ac-ft.
2. Water Supply from Abilene (BRA System Operations Supply):
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2020.
    c. Project Cost: $0 (Current infrastructure assumed to be adequate).
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.33-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the View Caps WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(120)	(143)	(164)	(186)	(211)	(238)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	11	10	11	12	13	13
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$7,524	$6,840	$7,524	$8,208	$8,892	$8,892
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(109)	(133)	(153)	(174)	(196)	(225)
Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	109	133	153	174	198	225
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$252,200	$307,800	$354,000	$405,000	$458,200	$520,700
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.33.10 County-Other

5.33.10.1 Description of Supply

County-Other Taylor obtains water supply from Abilene, Steamboat Mountain WSC, and Sweetwater. The water supply entities for Taylor County-Other show a projected surplus throughout the planning period.

5.33.10.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to supplement supply for County-Other entities. Conservation was considered; however, the entities' current per capita use rate of 104 gpcd is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Supply from Abilene (Cedar Ridge Reservoir):
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $0 (Current infrastructure assumed to be adequate).
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gallons).

Table 5.33-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Taylor County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	371	325	252	206	174	181
Purchase from Abilene (Cedar Ridge Reservoir)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	96	113	125	197	197
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	$222,100	$261,500	$289,300	$455,900	$455,900
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	371	421	365	331	371	378

5.33.11 Manufacturing

5.33.11.1 Description of Supply

Taylor County-Manufacturing receives water at 671 ac-ft/yr from the City of Abilene in 2030 and 2040 and supply from the Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer. Shortages are projected for Manufacturing in Taylor County throughout the planning period.

5.33.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Taylor County-Manufacturing. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

1. Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene:
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    b. Date to be 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Not enough information to cost delivery.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gal).
2. Leave Needs Unmet.

Table 5.33-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Taylor County-Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(49)	(76)	(775)	(804)	(834)	(865)
Purchase Additional Supply from Abilene						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	49	76	775	402	308	865
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$113,400	$175,900	$1,793,400	$930,200	$712,700	$2,001,600
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	(402)	(526)	0

5.33.12 Steam-Electric

The water supply entities for Taylor County Steam-Electric show no projected demand.

5.33.13 Mining

5.33.13.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Taylor County obtain water from the Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer at 134 ac-ft/yr. Mining is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030.

5.33.13.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Taylor County-Mining. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: not determined.
2. Purchase from Abilene (Cedar Ridge Reservoir):
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: Not enough information to cost delivery.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gallons).
3. Leave Needs Unmet

Table 5.33-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Taylor County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(380)	(398)	(413)	(424)	(432)	(437)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	12	20	26	24	23	22
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(368)	(378)	(387)	(400)	(409)	(415)
Purchase from Abilene (Cedar Ridge Reservoir)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	206	188	172	159	159
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	$476,700	$435,000	$398,000	$367,900	$367,900
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(368)	(172)	(199)	(228)	(250)	(256)

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.33.14 Irrigation

5.33.14.1 Description of Supply

Taylor County Irrigation is supplied by groundwater from the Edwards-Trinity Aquifer at 355 ac-ft/yr and Trinity Aquifer at 14 ac-ft/yr. Irrigation is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030.

5.33.14.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Taylor County-Irrigation. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $196,000 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,719/ ac-ft.
2. Purchase from Abilene (Cedar Ridge Reservoir):
    a. Cost Source: Abilene Water Rate.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: Not enough information to cost delivery.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,314/ ac-ft ($7.10/1,000 gal).
3. Leave Needs Unmet

Table 5.33-12 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Taylor County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(547)	(547)	(547)	(547)	(547)	(547)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	49	82	114	114	114	114
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$84,200	$141,000	$196,000	$196,000	$196,000	$196,000
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(498)	(465)	(433)	(433)	(433)	(433)
Purchase from Abilene (Cedar Ridge Reservoir)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	–	1,152	1,152	1,152	1,152	1,152
Annual Cost ($/yr)	–	$2,665,700	$2,665,700	$2,665,700	$2,665,700	$2,665,700
Unit Cost ($/ ac-ft)	–	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314	$2,314
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(498)	687	719	719	719	719

5.33.15 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and Trinity Aquifer groundwater and is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Taylor County Livestock water supply are recommended.

5.34 Throckmorton County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.34-1 lists each water user group in Throckmorton County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. For each water user group with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.34-1 Throckmorton County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Fort Belknap WSC			See Young County
Fort Griffin SUD			See Stephens County
Stephens Regional SUD			See Stephens County
City of Throckmorton	(96)	(105)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	85	88	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	—	—	No projected demand
Steam-Electric	—	—	No projected demand
Mining	(8)	(8)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Irrigation	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
Livestock	120	120	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; SUD – special utility district; WSC – water supply corporation

5.34.1 City of Throckmorton

5.34.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Throckmorton obtains its water supply through diversions from Lake Throckmorton authorized under a water right held by the City; projected availability of supply under this water right is limited to 50 ac-ft/yr at the beginning of the planning period and decreases to zero by 2080. Should Lake Throckmorton become unreliable, the City has a connection to receive supply from Graham through Fort Belknap WSC. Water supply shortages are projected for the City of Throckmorton throughout the planning period.

5.34.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water supply plan is recommended for the City of Throckmorton. The entity's water usage utilized for demand projections is 216 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Needs remain unmet in 2030 and 2040. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the

unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $26,676 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Supply from New Throckmorton Reservoir:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
        i. Project requires a subordination agreement with the Brazos River Authority.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    c. Project Cost: $89,139,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $6,111/ac-ft.

Table 5.34-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Throckmorton

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(96)	(95)	(97)	(99)	(103)	(105)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	12	24	36	39	38	35
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,208	$16,416	$24,624	$26,676	$25,992	$23,940
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(84)	(71)	(61)	(60)	(65)	(70)
New Throckmorton Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	731	731	731	731
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$4,467,000	$4,467,000	$4,467,000	$4,467,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$6,111	$6,111	$6,111	$6,111
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(84)	(71)	670	671	666	661

5.34.2 County-Other

The entities in Throckmorton County-Other receive their water supply through groundwater production from the Cross Timbers Aquifer, through diversions of local surface water authorized under a water right, and through purchases of treated surface water supplies under contract from Stephens Regional SUD. Future water supply is projected to be available from Stephens Regional SUD, only, in the amount of 99 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected and no change in water supply is recommended. Conservation was also considered; however, the entity's per capita usage of 86 is below the selected goal 140 gpcd.

5.34.3 Manufacturing

No Manufacturing demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.34.4 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists or is projected for the County.

5.34.5 Mining

5.34.5.1 Description of Supply

Mining in Throckmorton County obtains water supply through groundwater production from the Cross Timbers and Seymour local aquifers. Projections show Mining will experience water supply shortages in each decade of the planning period.

5.34.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Mining. Conservation is recommended. Associated costs are included for each strategy.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: not determined.
2. Cross Timbers Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $510,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $476/ac-ft.

Table 5.34-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Throckmorton County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	6	10	12	11	9	8
Annual Cost ($/yr)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(2)	2	4	3	1	0
Groundwater Development – Cross Timbers Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	84	84	84	84	84	84
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$40,000	$40,000	$4,000	$4,000	$4,000	$4,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$476	$476	$48	$48	$48	$48
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	82	86	88	87	85	84

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.34.6 Irrigation

5.34.6.1 Description of Supply

Irrigation in Throckmorton County is supplied by Seymour Aquifer water. Water demands for irrigation are projected to remain constant throughout the planning period and no water supply shortages are projected.

5.34.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to supplement water supplies for Mining. Conservation is recommended. Associated costs are included for each strategy:

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $28,800 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,619/ac-ft.
2. Cross Timbers Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $565,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $303/ac-ft.

Table 5.34-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Throckmorton County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5	8	11	11	11	11
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$13,100	$21,000	$28,800	$28,800	$28,800	$28,800
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	5	8	11	11	11	11
Groundwater Development – Cross Timbers Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	152	152	152	152	152	152
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$46,000	$46,000	$6,000	$6,000	$6,000	$6,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$303	$303	$39	$39	$39	$39
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	157	160	163	163	163	163

5.34.7 Livestock

Livestock demand is met by local water supply and is projected to meet needs through 2080. No changes in Throckmorton County Livestock water supply are recommended.

5.35 Washington County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.35-1 lists each water user group in Washington County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.35-1 Washington County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Brenham	482	(195)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Central Washington County WSC	125	17	Projected surplus
Chappell Hill WSC	159	164	Projected surplus
Corix Utilities Texas, Inc	(745)	(1,333)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
West End WSC	0	0	See Region H Plan
County-Other	19	383	Projected surplus
Manufacturing	(119)	(259)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	-	-	No projected demand
Mining	(650)	(650)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Irrigation	258	258	Projected surplus
Livestock	220	220	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply

5.35.1 City of Brenham

5.35.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Brenham obtains its water supply through a contract with the Brazos River Authority for 974 ac-ft/yr of water supply from Lake Somerville.

5.35.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended for Brenham. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 230 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $1,112,184 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

2. Groundwater Development – Gulf Coast Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2070.
    c. Project Cost: $7,484,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,496 ac-ft/yr.

Table 5.35-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Brenham

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	482	389	236	71	(80)	(195)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	342	778	1,217	1,622	1,624	1,626
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$233,928	$532,152	$832,428	$1,109,448	$1,110,816	$1,112,184
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	824	1,167	1,453	1,693	1,544	1,431
Groundwater Development – Gulf Coast Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	250	250
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	-	-	-	$624,000	$624,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	-	-	-	-	$2,496	$2,496
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	824	1,167	1,453	1,693	1,794	1,681

5.35.2 Central Washington County WSC

Central Washington County WSC obtains water from the Gulf Coast Aquifer System at 605 ac-ft/yr. It is projected to have a surplus through the year 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.35.2.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Central Washington County WSC. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 24 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 123 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $96,272 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Gulf Coast Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $1,080,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,075/ac-ft.

Table 5.35-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Central Washington County WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	125	103	129	95	58	17
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	46	48	46	49	52	56
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$95,606	$96,272	$15,314	$16,312	$17,311	$18,643
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	171	151	175	144	110	73
Groundwater Development - Gulf Coast Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	80	80	80	80	80
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$0	$86,000	$86,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$0	$1,075	$1,075	$125	$125	$125
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	171	231	255	224	190	153

5.35.3 Chappell Hill WSC

Chappell Hill WSC obtains water from the Gulf Coast Aquifer System at 268 ac-ft/yr. It is projected to have a surplus through the year 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.35.3.1 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Chappell Hill WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 198 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $20,520 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.35-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Chappell Hill WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	159	159	158	160	162	164
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	9	19	30	29	28	28
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,156	$12,996	$20,520	$19,836	$19,152	$19,152
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	168	178	188	189	190	192

5.35.4 Corix Utilities

5.35.4.1 Description of Supply

Corix Utilities Texas Inc. obtains its water supply from surface water from Lower Colorado River Authority at 1,140 ac-ft/yr and other groundwater sources at 175 ac-ft/yr from Ellenberger-San Saba, 1,063 ac-ft/yr from Gulf Coast Aquifer, and other alluvial sources. Shortages are projected for Corix Utilities from 2030 to 2080. This water user group is split between several regions (Region G, F, and K), and several counties. The quantity shown in Table 5.35-1 and 5.35-5 represents the cumulative totals for Corix Utilities.

5.35.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet needs for Corix Utilities. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 170 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $452,808 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.35-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Corix Utilities

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(745)	(892)	(997)	(1,097)	(1,212)	(1,333)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	278	590	611	624	643	662
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$190,152	$403,560	$417,924	$426,816	$439,812	$452,808
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)						
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(467)	(302)	(386)	(473)	(569)	(671)

5.35.5 County-Other

Washington County-Other is projected to have a surplus through the year 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended. Conservation was considered; however, the entity's current per capita use rate is below the selected target rate of 140 gpcd.

5.35.6 Manufacturing

5.35.6.1 Description of Supply

Water supply for manufacturing in Washington County is obtained by from the Gulf Coast Aquifer at 369 ac-ft/yr and from Brenham at 208 ac-ft/yr. Washington County Manufacturing is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030.

5.35.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for Washington County Manufacturing. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented:2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $105/ac-ft.
2. Gulf Coast Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,499,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $673/ac-ft.

Table 5.35-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Washington County – Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(119)	(145)	(172)	(200)	(229)	(259)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	21	36	52	54	56	59
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,205	$3,780	$5,460	$5,670	$5,880	$6,195
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(98)	(109)	(120)	(146)	(173)	(200)
Groundwater Development – Gulf Coast Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	300	300	300	300	300	300
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$202,000	$202,000	$26,000	$26,000	$26,000	$26,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$673	$673	$87	$87	$87	$87
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	202	191	180	154	127	100

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.35.7 Steam-Electric

No Steam-Electric demand exists nor is projected for the county.

5.35.8 Mining

5.35.8.1 Description of Supply

Mining operations in Washington County are supplied by Brazos River Alluvium groundwater at 78 ac-ft/yr. Demands for Mining are projected to increase significantly resulting in shortages beginning in 2030.

5.35.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Washington County-Mining. Conservation is recommended.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $200/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Gulf Coast Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented:2030.
    c. Project Cost: $2,733,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $357 /ac-ft.

Table 5.35-7. Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Washington County – Mining

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(650)	(650)	(650)	(650)	(650)	(650)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	22	36	51	51	51	51
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,400	$7,200	$10,200	$10,200	$10,200	$10,200
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(628)	(614)	(599)	(599)	(599)	(599)
Groundwater Development – Gulf Coast Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	650	650	650	650	650	650
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$232,000	$232,000	$40,000	$40,000	$40,000	$40,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$357	$357	$62	$62	$62	$62
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	22	36	51	51	51	51

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on each location.

5.35.9 Irrigation

Irrigation obtains water from the Gulf Coast Aquifer at 416 ac-ft/yr and Brazos River Alluvial Aquifer at 93 ac-ft/yr. There is a projected surplus of water supplies and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.35.10 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

5.36 Williamson County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.36-1 lists each water user group (WUG) in Williamson County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the WUGs and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.36-1 Williamson County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)[1]		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
City of Bartlett	(2)	12	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Bell-Milam Falls WSC			See Bell County
Block House MUD	290	420	Projected surplus
Brushy Creek MUD	(790)	(914)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Cedar Park	(2,575)	(2,921)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Fern Bluff MUD	(2)	(111)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Florence	(112)	(209)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Georgetown	(12,370)	(163,402)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Granger	59	(26)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Hutto	(1,400)	(12,601)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Jarrell-Schwertner	(3,511)	(6,308)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Jonah Water SUD	(2,201)	(19,652)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Leander	(9,578)	(17,375)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Liberty Hill	842	(1,416)	Projected shortage
Manville WSC	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
Noack WSC	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage
Paloma Lake MUD 1	(128)	(138)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Paloma Lake MUD 2	(103)	(111)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
City of Pflugerville	977	(7,502)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Round Rock	3,400	(11,964)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Sonterra MUD	(936)	(9,638)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Southwest Milam WSC			See Milam County
City of Taylor	(2,090)	(10,996)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Vista Oaks MUD	117	105	Projected surplus
Walsh Ranch MUD	68	66	Projected surplus
Williamson County MUD 10	133	129	Projected surplus
Williamson County MUD 11	(106)	(2,714)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Williamson County WSID 3	(118)	(1,963)	Projected shortage – see plan below.
Williamson-Travis Counties MUD 1	223	210	Projected surplus
County-Other	(3,034)	(29,043)	Projected shortage - see plan below.

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)[1]		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Manufacturing	11,662	11,258	Projected surplus
Steam-Electric	—	—	No projected demand
Mining			Region K
Irrigation	(224)	(226)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	13	13	Projected surplus

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; MUD – municipal utility district; WSC – water supply corporation; WSID – water, sewage, irrigation, and drainage

5.36.1 City of Bartlett

5.36.1.1 Description of Supply

The City of Bartlett obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer which is projected to provide a supply of 326 ac-ft/yr through the planning period. Based on the available groundwater supply, the City of Bartlett is projected to have shortages through the year 2030. This WUG is located in multiple counties (Williamson and Bell). The shortages shown in Table 5.36-1 and Table 5.36-2 represent the cumulative totals for the City of Bartlett.

5.36.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Bartlett. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 44% and recommends water loss mitigation. For this planning process the entity's per capita usage is estimated to be 183 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) which is above the 120 gpcd target adopted for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $71,136 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $125,920 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,321/ac-ft.

3. Alternative: Purchase Supply from Jarrell-Schwertner WSC:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $672,375.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,445/ac-ft.
4. Alternative: Trinity Aquifer Development (Bell County):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $248,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $902/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-2 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Bartlett

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(2)	3	5	7	10	12
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	25	57	89	104	103	103
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$17,100	$38,988	$60,876	$71,136	$70,452	$70,452
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	96	95	94	94	92	93
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$125,920	$125,478	$41,614	$41,614	$40,728	$41,171
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,312	$1,321	$443	$443	$443	$443
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	119	155	188	205	205	208

5.36.2 Blockhouse MUD

5.36.2.1 Description of Supply

Blockhouse MUD obtains its water supply from the City of Cedar Park at 1,098 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected for Blockhouse MUD and no changes in the water supply are recommended.

5.36.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Blockhouse MUD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 130 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

5. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $23,940 in 2030.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-3 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Blockhouse MUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	290	321	347	372	396	420
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	35	30	29	28	28	26
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$23,940	$20,520	$19,836	$19,152	$19,152	$17,784
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	325	351	376	400	424	446

5.36.3 Brushy Creek MUD

5.36.3.1 Description of Supply

Brushy Creek MUD obtains its water supply from a contract with the Brazos River Authority for water from Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir and from local groundwater. Brushy Creek MUD has a projected shortage beginning in 2030 of 790 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 914 ac-ft/yr by 2080. Brushy Creek MUD has contracted for 4,000 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 3,334 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 3,229 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines.

5.36.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Brushy Creek MUD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 185 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $903,564 in 2060.
2. Increase Contract with Brazos River Authority (BRA) – Contingent on wholesale water provider (WWP) WMSs:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Cost of water purchase.
    d. Unit Cost: $912/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Brushy Creek MUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(790)	(819)	(851)	(872)	(893)	(914)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	298	704	1,101	1,321	1,321	1,321
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$203,832	$481,536	$753,084	$903,564	$903,564	$903,564
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(492)	(115)	250	449	428	407
Increase contract with BRA						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	500	500	-	-	-	-
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$456,000	$456,000	-	-	-	-
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$912	$912	-	-	-	-
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	8	385	250	449	428	407

5.36.4 City of Cedar Park

5.36.4.1 Description of Supply

The City of Cedar Park is located in Williamson County and part of Travis County (Region K) and provides wholesale water to entities in Williamson and Travis Counties. The City has a 23,000 ac-ft/yr contract from Lower Colorado River Authority (LCRA) for Highland Lakes supply. Cedar Park is a participant in the Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority to develop additional supplies from the Highland Lakes in Region K. The project is under construction and the remaining phases are under development. Based on the available surface water supply and contractual commitments to supply water to wholesale customers, the City of Cedar Park is projected to have a shortage throughout the planning period. Table 5.36-4 includes additional information on existing contracts and water supplies for the City of Cedar Park. Table 5.36-5 presents the water supply plan for the portion of Cedar Park in Brazos G.

5.36.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Cedar Park. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 191 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Maximum of $5,297,580 in 2060.
    d. Unit Cost: $560/ac-ft.

2. Brushy Creek Regional Utility Authority (RUA) Water Supply Project:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $16,397,000 (city's portion of cost for Phase 3).
    d. Unit Cost: $642/ac-ft.
3. Reuse:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $15,412,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,111/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Cedar Park

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(2,575)	(2,803)	(2,921)	(2,921)	(2,921)	(2,921)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,690	3,859	6,106	7,745	7,745	7,745
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,155,960	$2,639,556	$4,176,504	$5,297,580	$5,297,580	$5,297,580
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(885)	1,056	3,185	4,824	4,824	4,824
Brushy Creek RUA Water Supply Project(1)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,677	1,677	1,677	1,677	1,677	1,677
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,977,000	$1,977,000	$823,000	$823,000	$823,000	$823,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$642	$642	$267	$267	$267	$267
Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,267,000	$1,267,000	$184,000	$184,000	$184,000	$184,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,131	$1,131	$164	$164	$164	$164
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,912	3,853	5,982	7,621	7,621	7,621

Notes:
(1) The LCRA contract is shown as a current supply to Cedar Park. This strategy provides additional flexibility to take supplies during drought by a deep water intake in Lake Travis.

5.36.5 Fern Bluff MUD

5.36.5.1 Description of Supply

Fern Bluff MUD has a contract from the City of Round Rock which can supply 1,175 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 1,161 ac-ft/yr in 2080.

5.36.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the Fern Bluff MUD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 194 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $317,376 in 2070.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Fern Bluff MUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(2)	(53)	(107)	(110)	(111)	(111)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	90	220	356	463	464	464
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$61,560	$150,480	$243,504	$316,692	$317,376	$317,376
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	88	167	249	353	353	353

5.36.6 City of Florence

5.36.6.1 Description of Supply

The City of Florence obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer, which provides a supply of 96 ac-ft/yr throughout the planning period. Based on the City's available groundwater supply, the City of Florence is projected to have a shortage through the year 2080.

5.36.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Florence. For this planning process the entity's per capita usage is estimated to be 136 gpcd which is above the 120 gpcd target adopted for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    i. Cost Source: Volume II.
    ii. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    iii. Annual Cost: maximum of $17,100 in 2080.
    iv. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

2. Purchase from Georgetown – Contingent on WWP WMSs:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $56,304.
    d. Unit Cost: $782/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Florence

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(112)	(126)	(144)	(163)	(185)	(209)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	18	18	20	21	23	25
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$12,312	$12,312	$13,680	$14,364	$15,732	$17,100
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(94)	(108)	(124)	(142)	(162)	(184)
Purchase from Georgetown						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	94	108	124	142	162	184
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$73,508	$84,456	$96,968	$111,044	$126,684	$143,888
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$782	$782	$782	$782	$782	$782
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.36.7 City of Georgetown

5.36.7.1 Description of Supply

The City of Georgetown obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Edwards-Balcones Fault Zone (BFZ) (Northern Segment) Aquifer and contracts with the Brazos River Authority for water from Lake Georgetown and Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir. The City of Georgetown has contracted for 46,907 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 38,092 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 36,895 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. 1,200 ac-ft/yr of the water contracted with BRA is from the Colorado Basin (Highland Lakes, HB1437). The City also has a contract with Leander for additional supplies of 1,200 ac-ft/yr. City of Georgetown supplies 163 ac-ft/yr to Manufacturing Williamson. Based on the available surface water and groundwater supplies, the City of Georgetown is projected to have a shortage from 2030 through the year 2080.

5.36.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for The City of Georgetown. Associated costs are included for each strategy. For this planning process the entity's per capita usage is estimated to be 173 gpcd which is above the 120 gpcd target adopted for Williamson County WUGs.

Georgetown has identified that the 120 gpcd target is not obtainable, requesting to use 140 gpcd as the target conservation rate and using the target gpcds identified in Georgetown's water plan for conservation goals in 2030 through 2050. The remaining unmet need beginning in 2040 results from

contracts not being fully allocated and MAG limitations resulting from the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. See Chapter 3.2.5 for additional information regarding BRA supplies. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online that will firm up supplies from the BRA.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $22,725,216 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Regional Groundwater Supply System – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Robertson County:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $462,725,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $968/ac-ft.
3. Lake Georgetown ASR – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $460,083,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $5,441/ac-ft.
4. Alternative: Reuse – Dove Springs:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $12,953,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $715/ac-ft.
5. Lake Whitney Reallocation (Purchase from BRA).
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: source supply 2030, delivery pipeline 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $678,755,000 (BRA in conjunction with customers).
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $2,563/ac-ft.
6. Lee/Bastrop County Groundwater Project:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $1,559,063,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $2,687/ac-ft.
7. Alternative: Groundwater Development – Trinity Hosston:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $46,116,000.

d. Unit Cost: maximum of $513/ac-ft.
e. Strategy is Recommended however there is zero supply available due to MAG limitations, Alternative Strategy has supply of 8,500 ac-ft/yr.

8. Water Reclamation:
   a. Cost Source: Georgetown Integrated Water Plan Section 5.9.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $494,826,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $1,791/ac-ft.
9. Alternative: Lee/Bastrop County Groundwater Project :
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $1,559,063,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $2,687/ac-ft.
10. Alternative: Regional Groundwater Supply System – Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Robertson County:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
   c. Project Cost: $462,725,000.
   d. Unit Cost: $968/ac-ft.
11. Alternative: North Option –River Intake
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: before 2040.
   c. Project Cost: $977,958,000.
   d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,887/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Georgetown

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(12,370)	(47,619)	(78,464)	(104,937)	(135,799)	(163,402)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	6,865	18,497	33,224
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$0	$0	$0	$4,695,660	$12,651,948	$22,725,216
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(12,370)	(47,619)	(78,464)	(98,072)	(117,302)	(130,178)
Additional Demands from Strategies Recommended for Others						
Supply to Florence (ac-ft/yr)	94	108	124	142	162	184
Total Needs Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	(12,464)	(47,727)	(78,588)	(98,214)	(117,464)	(130,362)
Regional Groundwater Supply System Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Robertson County						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	6,149	11,626	17,103	22,579	28,055	28,055
Annual Cost	$38,153,000	$38,153,000	$5,616,000	$5,616,000	$5,616,000	$5,616,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$6,205	$3,282	$328	$249	$241	$241

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Lake Georgetown ASR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	8,645	8,645	8,645	8,645	8,645
Annual Cost	—	$47,035,000	$47,035,000	$14,674,000	$14,674,000	$14,674,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$5,441	$5,441	$1,697	$1,697	$1,697
Lake Whitney Reallocation (Purchase from BRA)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$2,563,000	$2,563,000	$729,000	$729,000	$729,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$2,563	$2,563	$729	$729	$729
Lee/Bastrop County Groundwater Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	5,800
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$143,229,000	$143,229,000	$33,988,000	$33,988,000	$33,988,000	$28,159,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$20,461	$20,461	$4,855	$4,855	$4,855	$4,855
Groundwater Development – Trinity Hosston						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,431,000	$4,431,000	$1,186,000	$1,186,000	$1,186,000	$1,186,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$521	$521	$140	$140	$140	$140
Water Reclamation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,071	12,900	12,900	12,900	25,010	25,010
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$44,778,000	$44,778,000	$9,962,000	$9,962,000	$9,962,000	$9,962,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,791	$1,791	$398	$398	$398	$398
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	5,212	(5,100)	(30,484)	(44,634)	(46,298)	(60,396)

Table 5.36-9 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of Georgetown

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Regional Groundwater Supply System Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Robertson County						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	39,399	39,399	39,399	39,399	39,399	39,399
Annual Cost	$38,153,000	$38,153,000	$5,616,000	$5,616,000	$5,616,000	$5,616,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$968	$968	$143	$143	$143	$143
Reuse – Dove Springs						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,456	1,456	1,456	1,456	1,456	1,456
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,041,000	$1,041,000	$130,000	$130,000	$130,000	$130,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$715	$715	$89	$89	$89	$89
Lee/Bastrop County Groundwater Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	53,300	53,300	53,300	53,300	53,300	53,300
Annual Cost	$143,229,000	$143,229,000	$33,988,000	$33,988,000	$33,988,000	$33,988,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,687	$2,687	$638	$638	$638	$638
Groundwater Development – Trinity Hosston						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$4,431,000	$4,431,000	$1,186	$1,186	$1,186	$1,186
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$521	$521	$140	$140	$140	$140
North Option						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	$94,343,000	$94,343,000	$25,710,000	$25,710,000	$25,710,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	$1,887	$1,887	$514	$514	$514

5.36.8 City of Granger

5.36.8.1 Description of Supply

The City of Granger obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer. Based on the available groundwater supply, the City of Granger is projected to have shortages beginning in 2070 of 6 ac-ft/yr, increasing to 26 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.36.8.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Granger. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 145 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $26,676 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Granger

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	59	44	29	11	(6)	(26)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	13	29	32	34	36	39
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,892	$19,836	$21,888	$23,256	$24,624	$26,676
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	72	73	61	45	30	13

5.36.9 City of Hutto

5.36.9.1 Description of Supply

The City of Hutto obtains its water supply from Manville WSC (462 ac-ft/yr), City of Taylor (336 ac-ft/yr), and a groundwater system supply from Edwards-BFZ Aquifer, which supplies 505 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and

461 ac-ft/yr in 2080. The current supply from the groundwater system is limited by the MAG in Williamson County. Based on the available supplies, the City of Hutto is projected to have shortages starting in 2030.

5.36.9.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Hutto. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 107 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer – Purchase from Vista Ridge:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: Cost of purchase.
    d. Unit Cost: assume $1,000/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hutto

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(1,400)	(2,457)	(3,921)	(5,932)	(8,724)	(12,601)
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	648	1,226	1,803	2,380	2,958	2,958
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$648,000	$1,226,000	$1,803,000	$2,380,000	$2,958,000	$2,958,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(752)	(1,231)	(2,118)	(3,552)	(5,766)	(9,643)

Table 5.36-12 Alternative Plan Costs by Decade for City of Hutto

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000

5.36.10 Jarrell-Schwertner WSC

5.36.10.1 Description of Supply

Jarrell-Schwertner WSC obtains its water supply from the Edwards-BFZ (Northern Segment) Aquifer. The WSC also has a contract with BRA for supplies from Stillhouse Hollow Lake, Central Texas WSC, and Salado WSC. Jarrell-Schwertner WSC has contracted for 5,386 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 5,386 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 5,217 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Additionally, Jarrell-Schwertner WSC holds a contract with Central Texas WSC for 1,500 ac-ft/yr, with availability projected to decrease to 826 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 804 ac-ft/yr in 2080. A smaller contract with Salado WSC provides an additional 55 ac-ft/yr, contributing to the corporation's diversified water supply portfolio. Based on the available

water supply, Jarrell-Schwertner WSC is projected to have a shortage throughout the planning period. This WUG is located in multiple counties (Williamson and Bell) and the surplus/shortages shown in Table 5.36-1 and Table 5.36-13 represent the cumulative totals for Jarrell-Schwertner WSC.

5.36.10.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB and in coordination with Region K, the following water management strategies are recommended for the Jarrell-Schwertner WSC. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 21 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 125 gpcd. After the recommended water loss strategy, the gpcd is estimated to be lower than the goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs. No advanced water conservation strategy is recommended.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $293,676 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $500/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-13 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Jarrell-Schwertner WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(3,511)	(4,277)	(4,758)	(5,252)	(5,775)	(6,308)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	560	605	631	660	689	719
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$280,176	$293,676	$189,300	$198,000	$206,700	$215,700
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$500	$485	$300	$300	$300	$300
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(2,951)	(3,672)	(4,127)	(4,592)	(5,086)	(5,589)
Supply from WWP Strategies						
Central Texas WSC System Expansion						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	600	600	600	600	600	600
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$885,000	$1,965,600	$1,386,000	$976,800	$976,800	$976,800
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,475	$3,276	$2,310	$1,628	$1,628	$1,628
Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase II - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	45	45	45	45	45
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(2,306)	(3,027)	(3,482)	(3,947)	(4,441)	(4,944)

5.36.11 Jonah Water SUD

5.36.11.1 Description of Supply

Jonah Water SUD obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Edwards-BFZ (Northern Segment) Aquifer at 946 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 864 ac-ft/yr in 2080. This WUG also has a contract with the BRA for treated supply through the East Williamson County WTP which has contracts for 6,238 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 23,510 in 2080 which provides 3,091 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 2,994 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Based on the available groundwater and surface water supply, Jonah Water SUD is projected to have a shortage throughout the planning period.

5.36.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended for Jonah Water SUD. Associated costs are included for each strategy. Conservation is recommended to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 17 percent and recommends water loss mitigation. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 188 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs. The remaining unmet need resulting from contracts not being fully allocated is a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. Contract supplies from the BRA are firm supplies.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $5,574,600 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $183,300 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $893/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-14 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Jarrell-Schwertner WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(2,201)	(4,898)	(8,060)	(11,480)	(15,326)	(19,652)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	511	1,625	3,370	5,331	6,658	8,150
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$349,524	$1,111,500	$2,305,080	$3,646,404	$4,554,072	$5,574,600
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	162	230	311	400	499	611
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$144,587	$164,987	$93,300	$120,000	$149,700	$183,300
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$893	$717	$300	$300	$300	$300
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(1,528)	(3,043)	(4,379)	(5,749)	(8,169)	(10,891)

5.36.12 City of Leander

5.36.12.1 Description of Supply

The City of Leander is located in Williamson and Travis (Region K) County. This WUG obtains its water supply from contracts with the Lower Colorado River Authority for water from the Highland Lakes (Lake Travis and Lake Buchanan) at 31,000 ac-ft/yr which is limited by treatment capacity.

Based on the available surface water supply and treatment capacity, the City of Leander is projected to have a shortage from 2030 to 2080. Leander is a participant in the Brushy Creek RUA project with Cedar Park and Round Rock and will obtain future supplies from the Highland Lakes.

5.36.12.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB and in coordination with Region K, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Leander. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 124 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $690,156 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Brushy Creek RUA Water Supply Project:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost $52,855,469 (city's portion of project Phase 3 shared with Liberty Hill).
    d. Unit Cost: $642/ac-ft.
3. Contract Amendment with LCRA or Redistribution of Supplies through Brushy Creek RUA:
    a. Cost Source: Region K.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2070.
    c. Project Cost: None. Existing infrastructure assumed sufficient.
    d. Unit Cost: $844/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-15 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Leander

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(9,578)	(15,839)	(17,359)	(17,375)	(17,375)	(17,375)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	756	958	1,009	1,008	1,009	1,009
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$517,104	$655,272	$690,156	$689,472	$690,156	$690,156
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(8,822)	(14,881)	(16,350)	(16,367)	(16,366)	(16,366)
Brushy Creek RUA Water Supply Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	15,323	15,323	15,323	15,323	15,323	15,323

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,373,500	$6,373,500	$2,654,300	$2,654,300	$2,654,300	$2,654,300
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$642	$642	$267	$267	$267	$267
Contract Amendment with LCRA (Region K)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	1,400	1,400	2,600	2,600	4,041
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	6,501	1,842	373	1,556	1,557	2,998

5.36.13 Liberty Hill

5.36.13.1 Description of Supply

The City of Liberty Hill obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer at 105 ac-ft/yr. They also have a BRA contract for 2,572 ac-ft/yr out of the Highland Lakes (HB1437) and another contract with Leander for 600 ac-ft/yr. Highland Lake supplies are treated by the City of Leander, with a contracted 1,500 ac-ft/yr treatment capacity. The City of Liberty Hill is projected to have shortages beginning in 2060.

5.36.13.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB and in coordination with Region K, the following water management strategies are recommended for the City of Leander. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 23 percent and the Brazos G RWPG recommends water loss mitigation. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 111 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $79,276 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,014/ac-ft.
2. Reuse DPR – Liberty Hill:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost.
    d. Unit Cost: $642/ac-ft.
3. Brushy Creek RUA Water Supply Project:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost $1,802,000 (city's portion of project Phase 3 shared with Leander).
    d. Unit Cost: $642/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-16 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Liberty Hill

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	842	500	92	(352)	(853)	(1,416)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	64	93	128	165	207	255
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$64,891	$73,907	$39,794	$51,297	$64,354	$79,276
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,014	$795	$311	$311	$311	$311
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	906	593	220	(187)	(646)	(1,161)
Brushy Creek RUA Water Supply Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$217,300	$217,300	$90,500	$90,500	$90,500	$90,500
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$642	$642	$267	$267	$267	$267
Direct Potable Reuse						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,684	2,684	2,684	2,684	2,684	2,684
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$7,161,000	$7,161,000	$2,991,000	$2,991,000	$2,991,000	$2,991,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,668	$2,668	$1,114	$1,114	$1,114	$1,114
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	5,262	4,949	4,576	4,169	3,710	3,195

5.36.14 Manville WSC

Manville WSC is mostly located in Travis County (Region K); however, a portion of the service area is in Williamson County. The WSC obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Edwards and Trinity Aquifers as well as other minor aquifers. The full water plan for Manville WSC is discussed in the 2021 Region K Plan.

5.36.15 Noack WSC

5.36.15.1 Description of Supply

The Noack WSC obtains its water supply from City of Taylor at 152 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 175 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Based on the available supplies, the Noack WSC is projected to have no shortages through 2080.

5.36.15.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for the Noack WSC. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 189 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $41,724 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-17 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Noack WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	11	28	45	58	59	61
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$7,524	$19,152	$30,780	$39,672	$40,356	$41,724
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	11	28	45	58	59	61

5.36.16 Paloma Lake MUD 1

5.36.16.1 Description of Supply

Paloma Lake MUD 1 receives its water supply from a "needs met" contract with the City of Round Rock at 409 ac-ft/yr. Based on the available supplies, Paloma Lake MUD 1 is projected to have shortages through the year 2080. This entity will be a beneficiary of recommended seller strategy for City of Round Rock.

5.36.16.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for the Paloma Lake MUD 1. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 139 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $50,616 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-18 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Paloma Lake MUD 1

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(128)	(134)	(137)	(138)	(138)	(138)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	54	74	74	74	74	74
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$36,936	$50,616	$50,616	$50,616	$50,616	$50,616
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(74)	(60)	(63)	(64)	(64)	(64)

5.36.17 Paloma Lake MUD 2

5.36.17.1 Description of Supply

Paloma Lake MUD 2 receives its water supply from a "needs met" contract with the City of Round Rock which supplies 287 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 279 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Based on the available supplies, Paloma Lake MUD 2 is projected to have shortages through the year 2080. This entity will be a beneficiary of recommended seller strategy for City of Round Rock.

5.36.17.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet water needs for the Paloma Lake MUD 2. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 139 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $36,252 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-19 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Paloma Lake MUD 2

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(103)	(108)	(110)	(111)	(111)	(111)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	39	53	53	53	53	53
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$26,676	$36,252	$36,252	$36,252	$36,252	$36,252
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(64)	(55)	(57)	(58)	(58)	(58)

5.36.18 City of Round Rock

5.36.18.1 Description of Supply

The City of Round Rock obtains its water supply from groundwater from the Edwards-BFZ (Northern Segment) Aquifer and contracts with the Brazos River Authority for water from Lake Georgetown and Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir. The City of Round Rock has contracted for a total of 45,782 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, 20,928 ac-ft/yr originates from Brushy Creek RUA, the remainder from Lakes Georgetown and Stillhouse Hollow. In total BRA can supply 41,641 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 40,990 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. In addition, the City utilizes Direct Reuse supplies and receives out of Region supply from LCRA at 4,320 ac-ft/yr. Based on the available groundwater and surface water supply, existing contractual demands, and existing infrastructure the City of Round Rock is projected to have shortages from 2040 to 2080.

5.36.18.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for the City of Round Rock. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 139 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $3,453,516 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684 / ac-ft.
2. Brushy Creek RUA Water Supply Project:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: Before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $44,600,000 (city's portion Phase 3).
    d. Unit Cost: $642 / ac-ft.
3. (Alternative) Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 BRA sponsored:
    a. Cost Source: Borne by Brazos River Authority
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $3,465.
    d. Unit Cost: $77/ac-ft.
4. Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 Round Rock sponsored:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $127,257,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $6,337/ac-ft.
    e. This strategy would overdraft Lake Granger and supplement supplies with an annual average of 15,613 ac-ft/yr of groundwater from Milam, Burleson and/or Lee Counties (58,455 ac-ft/yr maximum groundwater in a single year). The strategy as presented provides 890 ac-ft/yr of supply due to MAG limitations on groundwater supplies.
5. (Alternative) Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 Round Rock sponsored:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $127,257,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $2,751/ac-ft.
6. (Alternative) Lake Granger ASR Round Rock sponsored:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $250,881,000 (sum of 3 phases).
    d. Unit Cost: Max of $4,146/ac-ft in 2030.

Table 5.36-20 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for City of Round Rock

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	3,400	(2,226)	(7,892)	(9,432)	(10,894)	(11,964)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,320	3,887	4,617	4,775	4,921	5,049
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,586,880	$2,658,708	$3,158,028	$3,266,100	$3,365,964	$3,453,516
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	5,720	1,661	(3,275)	(4,657)	(5,973)	(6,915)
Brushy Creek RUA Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	11,025	6,233	3,441	10,980	11,405	10,669
Annual Cost	$5,378,000	$5,378,000	$2,240,000	$2,240,000	$2,240,000	$2,240,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$642	$642	$267	$267	$267	$267
Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 (Groundwater) Round Rock						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	890	890	890	890	890	890
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$127,257,000	$127,257,000	$37,430,000	$37,430,000	$30,352,000	$30,352,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)[1]	$2,751	$2,751	$809	$809	$656	$656
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	16,745	7,894	166	6,323	5,432	3,754

Table 5.36-21 Alternative WMS Costs by Decade for City of Round Rock

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 (Groundwater) Round Rock - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	46,265	46,265	46,265	46,265	46,265	46,265
Annual Cost	$127,257,000	$127,257,000	$37,430,000	$37,430,000	$30,352,000	$30,352,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,751	$2,751	$809	$809	$656	$656
Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 (Groundwater) BRA - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	45	45	45	45	45
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Lake Granger ASR Round Rock						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,245	4,665	9,330	9,330	9,330	9,330
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$13,453,000	$18,055,000	$15,238,000	$11,854,000	$7,054,000	$7,054,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$4,146	$3,870	$1,633	$1,271	$756	$756

[1] Unit cost based on full project yield potentially available if not MAG limited.

5.36.19 Sonterra MUD

5.36.19.1 Description of Supply

Sonterra MUD obtains its water supply from groundwater from Edwards BFZ Aquifer at 221 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 201 ac-ft/yr in 2080. They also have surface water contract of 2,744 ac-ft/yr from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 1,137 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 2,744 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Based on the available supplies, Sonterra MUD is projected to have shortages throughout the planning horizon.

5.36.19.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended. Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 108 gpcd, which is below the selected goal of 120 gpcd. The remaining unmet need resulting from contracts not being fully allocated in 2030 is a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. Contract supplies from the BRA are firm supplies, however current contracts are not sufficient to meet projected demands. It is recommended to increase existing contracts for additional supplies.

1. Leave Needs Unmet.

Table 5.36-22 Projected Surplus/Shortage by Decade for Sonterra MUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(936)	(2,267)	(3,843)	(5,551)	(7,474)	(9,638)

5.36.20 City of Taylor

5.36.20.1 Description of Supply

The City of Taylor obtains its water supply from a contract with the Brazos River Authority for water from Lake Granger through the East Williamson County WTP. Shortages are projected for the City of Taylor from 2030 through 2080. The Brazos River Authority has set aside 3,452 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 4,729 ac-ft/yr in 2080 of surface water supplies for the City of Taylor, which can supply 2,054 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 1,988 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines.

5.36.20.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for the City of Taylor. The remaining unmet need resulting from contracts not being fully allocated in 2040 is a result of the conservative methodology of determining source supply volumes. Contract supplies from the BRA are firm supplies. Advanced conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 120 gpcd, which is equal to the selected goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs. A water loss reduction conservation strategy is recommended based on information provided in water loss audit reporting.

1. Conservation- Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $304,137 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. (Alternative) Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2:
    a. Cost Source: Borne by Brazos River Authority.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $3,465.
    d. Unit Cost: $77/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-23 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the City of Taylor

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(2,090)	(3,651)	(5,425)	(7,078)	(8,929)	(10,996)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	289	413	555	687	835	1,001
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$201,364	$239,039	$168,628	$208,734	$253,701	$304,137
Lake Granger Augmentation-Phase 2 (Groundwater) - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	45	45	45	45	45	45
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465	$3,465
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77	$77
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(1,801)	(3,238)	(4,870)	(6,391)	(8,094)	(9,995)

5.36.21 Vista Oaks MUD

5.36.21.1 Description of Supply

Vista Oaks MUD receives its water supply from a "needs met" contract with the City of Round Rock. Based on the available supplies, Vista Oaks MUD is projected to have no shortages through the year 2080.

5.36.21.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Vista Oaks MUD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 139 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $40,356 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-24 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Vista Oaks MUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	117	110	107	105	105	105
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	44	59	59	59	59	59
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$30,096	$40,356	$40,356	$40,356	$40,356	$40,356
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	161	169	166	164	164	164

5.36.22 Walsh Ranch MUD

5.36.22.1 Description of Supply

Walsh Ranch MUD receives its water supply from a "needs met" contract with the City of Round Rock which provides 196 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 194 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Based on the available supplies, Walsh Ranch MUD is projected to have adequate supplies throughout the year 2080.

5.36.22.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Vista Oaks MUD. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 139 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $11,628 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-25 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Walsh Ranch MUD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	68	67	67	66	66	66
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	13	17	17	17	17	17
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,892	$11,628	$11,628	$11,628	$11,628	$11,628
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	81	84	84	83	83	83

5.36.23 Williamson County MUD 10

5.36.23.1 Description of Supply

Williamson County MUD 10 obtains its water supply from the City of Round Rock at 722 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 718 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Based on the available supplies, Williamson County MUD 10 is projected to have surpluses through the year 2080.

5.36.23.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Williamson County MUD 10. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 139 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $55,404 in 2040.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-26 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County MUD 10

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	133	132	131	130	129	129
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	60	81	81	81	81	81
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$41,040	$55,404	$55,404	$55,404	$55,404	$55,404
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	193	213	212	211	210	210

5.36.24 Williamson County MUD 11

5.36.24.1 Description of Supply

Williamson County MUD 11 obtains its water supply from the City of Round Rock for 816 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 820 ac-ft/yr in 2080. Based on the available supplies, Williamson County MUD 11 is projected to have shortages through the year 2080.

5.36.24.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Williamson County MUD 11. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 139 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $330,372 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Brushy Creek RUA- Existing Contracts
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Cost: Born by project sponsors Liberty Hill, Cedar Park, and Round Rock.
    d. Unit Cost: $912/ac-ft

Table 5.36-27 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County MUD 11

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(106)	(505)	(974)	(1,487)	(2,064)	(2,714)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	93	181	245	315	394	483
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$63,612	$123,804	$167,580	$215,460	$269,496	$330,372
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(13)	(324)	(729)	(1,172)	(1,670)	(2,231)
Brushy Creek RUA- Existing Contracts						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	106	505	974	1,487	2,064	2,714
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$96,672	$460,560	$888,288	$1,356,144	$1,882,368	$2,475,168
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$912	$912	$912	$912	$912	$912
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	93	181	245	315	394	483

5.36.25 Williamson County WSID 3

5.36.25.1 Description of Supply

Williamson County WSID 3 obtains its water supply from Manville WSC at 884 ac-ft/yr. Based on the available supplies, Williamson County WSID 3 is projected to have shortages through the year 2080.

5.36.25.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Williamson County WSID 3. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 184 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.

c. Annual Cost: maximum of $330,372 in 2080.
d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-28 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County WSID 3

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(118)	(389)	(719)	(1,084)	(1,496)	(1,963)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	74	225	444	646	779	933
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$50,616	$153,900	$303,696	$441,864	$532,836	$638,172
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	(44)	(164)	(275)	(438)	(717)	(1,030)

5.36.26 Williamson-Travis Counties MUD 1

5.36.26.1 Description of Supply

Williamson-Travis Counties MUD 1 has demand in Williamson and Travis (Region K) counties and obtains its water supply from the City of Cedar Park for 989 ac-ft/yr. No shortages are projected throughout the planning period.

5.36.26.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Williamson-Travis Counties MUD 1. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 141 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 120 gpcd for Williamson County WUGs.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $330,372 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-29 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson-Travis Counties MUD 1

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	223	222	219	216	213	210
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	51	88	89	90	89	90
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$34,884	$60,192	$60,876	$61,560	$60,876	$61,560
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	274	310	308	306	302	300

5.36.27 County-Other

5.36.27.1 Description of Supply

Entities in Williamson County-Other obtain water supply from groundwater from the Trinity and Edwards (BFZ) Aquifers as well as other minor aquifers. Williamson County-Other also obtains a portion of its water supply from the City of Round Rock, the City of Taylor, City of Austin, and run-of-river rights. A portion of County-Other demand is located in the Region K portion of Williamson County. Entities in Williamson County-Other have contracted for 310 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 258 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 250 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Based on the available groundwater and surface water supply, Williamson County-Other is projected to have a shortage from 2030 through 2080. Balance and strategies represented in Table 5.36-1 and Table 5.36-30 represent the cumulative totals for Williamson County-Other in both regions.

5.36.27.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, and in coordination with Region K, the following water management strategies are recommended for Williamson County - Other.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $560/ac-ft.
    d. Annual Cost: maximum of $2,397,334 in 2070.
2. Lake Granger ASR:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: Costs borne by BRA.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,617/ac-ft .
3. Lake Whitney Reallocation (Purchase from BRA): These are project costs for intake, water treatment plant, pump station, and pipeline, but do not include BRA's costs for the reallocation water management strategy.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: source supply 2030, delivery pipeline 2040.
    c. Project Cost: $678,755,000 (BRA in conjunction with customers).
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $2,563/ac-ft.
4. Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $703,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $10,800/ac-ft.

5. BRA Highland Lake to County-Other:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: $300,000.
    d. Unit Cost: assumed $1,000/ac-ft.
6. Brushy Creek RUA-Existing Contracts.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Cost: Born by project sponsors Liberty Hill, Cedar Park, and Round Rock.
    d. Unit Cost: $912/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-30 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County–Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(3,034)	(9,962)	(13,981)	(18,311)	(23,215)	(29,043)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	590	1,788	2,237	2,778	3,433	4,255
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$403,560	$1,222,992	$1,530,108	$1,900,152	$2,348,172	$2,910,420
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation and Water Loss Reduction (ac-ft/yr)	(2,444)	(8,174)	(11,744)	(15,533)	(19,782)	(24,788)
Lake Granger ASR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	54	1,164	2,940	3,404	3,477	3,477
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$87,318	$1,882,188	$4,753,980	$5,504,268	$5,622,309	$5,622,309
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,617	$1,617	$1,617	$1,617	$1,617	$1,617
Storage Reallocation of Lake Whitney						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	0	12,000	12,000	12,000	26,000	26,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	-	$30,756,000	$30,756,000	$8,748,000	$18,954,000	$18,954,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	-	$2,563	$2,563	$729	$729	$729
BRA Highland Lake to County-Other						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	300	300	300	300	300	300
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
Trinity Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5	5	5	5	5	5
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$54,000	$54,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$10,800	$10,800	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Brushy Creek RUA-Existing Contracts						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,662	6,973	9,217	1,085	0	0
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,427,700	$6,359,400	$8,405,900	$989,500	-	-
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$912	$912	$912	$912	-	-
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	577	12,268	12,718	1,261	10,000	4,994

5.36.28 Manufacturing

5.36.28.1 Description of Supply

Williamson County Manufacturing entities obtain water supply from groundwater from the Edwards-BFZ (Northern Segment) Aquifer and the Trinity Aquifer, as well as from several municipal WUGs, including Cedar Park, Georgetown, Round Rock, and Taylor. Based on the available supplies, Williamson County Manufacturing is projected to experience a water supply surplus beginning in 2030 of 11,662 ac-ft/yr, decreasing to 11,258 ac-ft/yr by 2080.

5.36.28.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended for Williamson County - Manufacturing. Conservation is recommended to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $105/ac-ft.
2. Brushy Creek RUA-Existing Contracts.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Cost: Born by project sponsors Liberty Hill, Cedar Park, and Round Rock.
    d. Unit Cost: $912/ac-ft.
3. Alternative: Carrizo Aquifer Development – SLR to Williamson County Manufacturing
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $21,784,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $201/ac-ft.

Table 5.36-31 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County – Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	11,662	11,582	11,504	11,425	11,343	11,258
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	58	101	147	152	158	164
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,090	$10,605	$15,435	$15,960	$16,590	$17,220
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	11,720	11,683	11,651	11,577	11,501	11,422
Brushy Creek RUA-Existing Contracts						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	862	944	1,023	1,103	1,186	1,272
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$786,100	$860,900	$933,000	$1,006,000	$1,081,600	$1,160,100
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$912	$912	$912	$912	$912	$912
Alternative: Carrizo Aquifer Development – SLR to Williamson County Manufacturing						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,510,000	$2,510,000	$977,000	$977,000	$977,000	$977,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$201	$201	$78	$78	$78	$78
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation	12,582	12,627	12,674	12,680	12,687	12,694

Notes:
ND – not determined
(1) Costs to implement industrial conservation technologies will vary based on location.

5.36.29 Steam-Electric

There is no Steam-Electric demand or supply in Williamson County.

5.36.30 Mining

There is no Mining demand or supply in Williamson County within Region G.

5.36.31 Irrigation

5.36.31.1 Description of Supply

Williamson County Irrigation is supplied by groundwater from the Trinity and Edwards Aquifers and surface water from run of the river water rights. Williamson County Irrigation has contracted for 15 ac-ft/yr of surface water supplies from the Brazos River Authority, which can supply 13 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and 12 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. Irrigation is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030.

5.36.31.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet water needs for Williamson County-Irrigation.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 2.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Unit Cost: $1,528/ac-ft.
2. Leave Needs Unmet:
    a. Cost Source: Cost of not meeting needs – see Appendix G.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2050 – 2070.

Table 5.36-32 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Williamson County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(224)	(226)	(226)	(226)	(226)	(226)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	12	20	28	28	28	28
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$18,333	$30,556	$42,778	$42,778	$42,778	$42,778
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(212)	(206)	(198)	(198)	(198)	(198)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	212	206	198	198	198	198

Notes:
(1) Costs to implement irrigation conservation technologies will vary based on location.

5.36.32 Livestock

Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080 and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.37 Young County Water Supply Plan

Table 5.37-1 lists each water user group in Young County and their corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the water user groups and the plan for the selected water user are presented in the following subsections.

Table 5.37-1 Young County Surplus/(Shortage)

Water User Group	Surplus/(Shortage)		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
Fort Belknap WSC	(126)	(335)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
City of Graham	(1,565)	(1,575)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
County-Other	(140)	(210)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Manufacturing	(9)	(6)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Steam-Electric	(610)	(628)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Mining	9	9	Projected surplus.
Irrigation	(611)	(611)	Projected shortage - see plan below.
Livestock	185	185	Projected surplus.

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; WSC – water supply corporation

5.37.1 Fort Belknap WSC

5.37.1.1 Description of Supply

Fort Belknap WSC obtains its water supply through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the City of Graham for 419 ac-ft/yr; however, due to the estimated availability of supplies developed for the purposes of regional water planning, this contract is prorated to provide a maximum of only 389 ac-ft/yr during the planning period. This water user group is located in multiple counties (Young, Palo Pinto, Throckmorton, and Stephens). The quantities shown in Table 5.37-1 and Table 5.37-2 represents the cumulative totals for Fort Belknap WSC. Water supply shortages are projected for Fort Belknap WSC throughout the planning period and a portion of these municipal needs remain unmet from 2060 to 2080. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG), the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought.

5.37.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Fort Belknap WSC. The most recent water loss audit report shows a water loss of approximately 45 percent and water loss mitigation is recommended. Conservation was also considered,

but the entity's per capita usage of 124 is less than the selected goal of 140 gallons per capita per day (gpcd).

1. Water Loss Reduction:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $1,814,603 in 2040.
2. Purchase Additional Water from City of Graham:
    a. Strategy requires implementation of New Throckmorton Reservoir (see City of Throckmorton) project and Treated Water Purchase and Conveyance project (see City of Graham).
    b. Cost Source: Volume II.
    c. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    d. Annual Cost: $214,000.
    e. Unit Cost: $2,248/ac-ft.

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

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(126)	(170)	(226)	(277)	(286)	(335)
Water Loss Reduction						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	159	160	164	167	169	173
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,814,157	$1,814,603	$73,008	$74,343	$75,234	$77,014
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	33	(10)	(62)	(110)	(117)	(162)
Purchase Additional Water from City of Graham						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	95	95	95	95	95	95
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$214,000	$214,000	$214,000	$214,000	$214,000	$214,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,248	$2,248	$2,248	$2,248	$2,248	$2,248
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	128	85	33	(15)	(22)	(67)

Notes:
WMS – water management strategies

5.37.2 City of Graham

5.37.2.1 Description of Supply

The City of Graham obtains its water supply through diversions of surface water from Lake Graham and Lake Eddleman authorized under water rights held by the City; these diversions are projected to provide 789 ac-ft/yr in available supply at the beginning of the planning period and then decreasing to 366 ac-ft/yr at the end. The City also contracts with the Brazos River Authority to purchase raw surface water which is projected to provide up to 1,000 ac-ft/yr of water supply, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The City contracts to sell treated and raw water supply to Fort Belknap WSC, the City of Newcastle and Graham-East WSC (Young County-Other), the City

of Bryson (Jack County-Other), and Young County Manufacturing and Steam-Electric entities. Supply shortages are projected during the planning period. Projected municipal needs remain unmet from 2030 to 2070. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

5.37.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the City of Graham. Conservation is recommended to reduce the entity's usage to a goal of 140 gpcd. Water loss reduction was also considered, but the entity's efficiency meets or exceeds the selected goal of 15 percent water loss.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $822,168 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.
2. Treated Water Purchase and Conveyance (from Throckmorton):
    a. Strategy requires implementation of New Throckmorton Reservoir.
    b. Cost Source: Volume II.
    c. Date to be Implemented: before 2050.
    d. Project Cost: $89,139,000.
    e. Unit Cost: maximum $6,111/ac-ft.

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

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(1,565)	(1,543)	(1,445)	(1,486)	(1,593)	(1,575)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	209	449	674	905	1,130	1,202
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$142,956	$307,116	$461,016	$619,020	$772,920	$822,168
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(1,356)	(1,094)	(771)	(581)	(463)	(373)
Additional Needs in Recommended Strategies for Others						
Increase Contract to Fort Belknap WSC (ac-ft/yr)	(95)	(95)	(95)	(95)	(95)	(95)
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies	(1,451)	(1,189)	(866)	(676)	(558)	(468)

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Treated Water Purchase and Conveyance from Throckmorton (New Throckmorton Reservoir)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	549	549	549	549
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	$3,355,000	$3,355,000	$3,355,000	$3,355,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	$6,111	$6,111	$6,111	$6,111
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(1,451)	(1,189)	(317)	(127)	(9)	81

5.37.3 County-Other

5.37.3.1 Description of Supply

Entities in Young County-Other obtain their water supply through groundwater production from the Cross Timbers Aquifer and through purchases of treated surface water from the City of Graham. Projected supplies available through local groundwater production range from 251 ac-ft/yr at the beginning of the planning period to 281 ac-ft/yr at the end, while purchased supply availability ranges between 130 ac-ft/yr and 134 ac-ft/yr. Supply shortages are projected throughout the planning period. Needs remain unmet from 2040 to 2080. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs may be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online.

5.37.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet the projected water shortage for entities in Young County-Other. Conservation was also considered, but the entity's per capita usage of 110 is less than the selected goal of 140 gpcd.

1. Cross Timber Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $5,679,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum $3,133/ac-ft.

Table 5.37-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County-Other

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(140)	(159)	(169)	(200)	(195)	(210)
Cross Timbers Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	150	150	150	150	150	150
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$378,000	$378,000	$378,000	$378,000	$378,000	$378,000

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$3,133	$3,133	$467	$467	$467	$467
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	10	(9)	(19)	(50)	(45)	(60)

5.37.4 Manufacturing

5.37.4.1 Description of Supply

Young County Manufacturing is supplied through purchases of treated surface water under contract from the City of Graham and the City of Olney and through purchases of groundwater produced by entities in Young County-Other. Supply shortages are projected throughout the planning period.

5.37.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Manufacturing entities in Young County. Conservation is recommended.

1. Cross Timber Aquifer Development:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $932,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum $8,300/ac-ft.

Table 5.37-5 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County Manufacturing

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(9)	(8)	(9)	(6)	(2)	(6)
Cross Timbers Aquifer Development						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	10	10	10	10	10	10
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$83,000	$83,000	$17,000	$17,000	$17,000	$17,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$8,300	$8,300	$1,700	$1,700	$1,700	$1,700
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1	2	1	4	8	4

5.37.5 Steam-Electric

Young County Steam-Electric entities obtain their water supply through purchases of raw surface water under contract from the City of Graham and the Brazos River Authority. Shortages are projected and needs remain unmet throughout the planning period. No additional supply is available for Steam-Electric entities.

Table 5.37-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County Steam-Electric

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(610)	(633)	(659)	(633)	(596)	(628)
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(610)	(633)	(659)	(633)	(596)	(628)

5.37.6 Mining

Mining in Young County obtains water supply through local groundwater production from the Seymour and Cross Timbers Aquifers and is projected to meet demands through 2080. No changes in Young County Mining water supply are recommended.

5.37.7 Irrigation

5.37.7.1 Description of Supply

Irrigation in Young County obtains water supply through groundwater production from the Cross Timbers and Seymour Aquifers, and through purchases of Cross Timbers groundwater sourced from Region B. Supply projections show shortages throughout the planning period.

5.37.7.2 Water Supply Plan

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

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $38,700 in 2050.
    d. Unit Cost: $1,170/ac-ft.
2. Groundwater Development – Cross Timbers Aquifer:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Project Cost: $755,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $156/ac-ft.

Table 5.37-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Young County – Irrigation

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(611)	(611)	(611)	(611)	(611)	(611)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	15	25	35	35	35	35
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$16,600	$27,700	$38,700	$38,700	$38,700	$38,700
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after Conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(596)	(586)	(576)	(576)	(576)	(576)
Groundwater Development – Cross Timbers Aquifer						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	403	403	403	403	403	403
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$162,000	$162,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$403	$403	$25	$25	$25	$25
Leave Needs Unmet (ac-ft/yr)	(193)	(183)	(173)	(173)	(173)	(173)

5.37.8 Livestock

Livestock water supply in Young County is obtained primarily through local stock surface water impoundments and Cross Timbers Aquifer groundwater. Livestock water supply is projected to meet demands through 2080, and no changes in water supply are recommended.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.38 Wholesale Water Provider Supply Plan

Table 5.38-1 lists each wholesale water provider (WWP) that is not also a WUG in the Brazos G Area and its corresponding surplus or shortage in years 2030 and 2080. A brief summary of the WWP and the plan for the selected WWPs are presented in the following sub chapters. For each WWP with a projected shortage, a water supply plan has been developed and is presented in the following sub chapters. **Note that shortages shown reflect full contractual commitments compared to existing supplies.**

Table 5.38-1 WWP Surplus/(Shortage)

Wholesale Water Provider	Surplus/(Shortage)[1][2]		Comment
	2030 (ac-ft/yr)	2080 (ac-ft/yr)	
BRA (Lake Aquilla System)	1,453	(1,007)	Projected shortage – see plan below
BRA (Little River System)	(41,840)	(48,420)	Projected shortage – see plan below
BRA (Main Stem System)[3]	(35,044)	(46,164)	Projected shortage – see plan below
Aquilla Water Supply District	561	35	Projected surplus – see plan below
Bell County WCID No. 1	(8,270)	(9,900)	Projected shortage – see plan below
Bluebonnet WSC	(228)	(454)	Projected shortage – see plan below
Central Texas WSC	(5,953)	(5,869)	Projected surplus – see plan below
Eastland County WSD	(1,012)	(1,170)	Projected shortage – see plan below
FHLM WSC	0	0	See plan below
North Central Texas MWA	(1,722)	(1,678)	Projected shortage – see plan below
Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1	(3,763)	(4,880)	Projected shortage – see plan below
SFWQC	0	0	See plan below
Upper Leon River MWD	0	0	No projected surplus or shortage – see plan below
West Central Texas MWD	(235)	0	Projected shortage – see plan below

Notes:
ac-ft/yr – acre-feet per year; BRA – Brazos River Authority; MWD – municipal water district; SFWQC - Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation; WCID - water control and improvement district; WSC – water supply corporation; WSD – water supply district
(1) From Chapter 4.3 – Water Needs for Wholesale Water Providers
(2) Shortages shown above often include shortages from other WWPs. The shortages shown for individual WWPs should not be summed to a regional total.
(3) Includes demands from Region H.

5.38.1 BRA (Lake Aquilla System)

5.38.1.1 Description of Supply

The BRA (Lake Aquilla System) obtains water supply from Lake Aquilla. Based on the available surface water supply and contractual demands, the Lake Aquilla System is projected to have a surplus of 1,453 ac-ft/yr in the year 2030 decreasing to a shortage of 1,007 ac-ft/yr by year 2080. Chapter 3 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for the Lake Aquilla System. The supply from Lake Aquilla is not adequate in 2060 through 2080 to meet the total contractual obligations and is insufficient to meet all of the projected water demands of customers of the Lake Aquilla System. Contractual demands and supplies are shown in Table 5.38-2.

Table 5.38-2 Supplies and Demands for the BRA Lake Aquilla System

	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Existing Contractual Sales						
Cleburne	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300
Hilco United Services	150	150	150	150	150	150
Aquilla WSD	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953
Total Existing Demands	**11,403**	**11,403**	**11,403**	**11,403**	**11,403**	**11,403**
Total Supply	**12,856**	**12,364**	**11,872**	**11,380**	**10,888**	**10,396**
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	1,453	961	469	(23)	(515)	(1,007)

5.38.1.2 Water Supply Plan

Brazos G recommends that BRA or another entity pursue reallocation of a portion of the Lake Aquilla flood control storage to conservation storage. At this time BRA encourages Aquilla WSD to pursue this strategy.

5.38.2 BRA (Little River System)

5.38.2.1 Description of Supply

The BRA Little River System obtains its water supply from Lake Proctor, Lake Belton, Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir, Lake Georgetown, and Lake Granger. Based on the available surface water supply, existing contractual commitments and recommended water management strategies, the BRA Little River System is projected to have a shortage of 41,840 ac-ft/yr in the year 2030 and 48,420 ac-ft/yr in the year 2080. Shortages for the BRA Little River System are based on a comparison of supplies and current contractual commitments, not projected demands for those entities holding contracts with the BRA. Contractual demands and supplies are shown in Table 5.38-3.

Supplies from Lake Granger are allocated to meet BRA system demands, except for 13,000 ac-ft/yr specifically allocated to the East Williamson County Water Treatment Plant (EWCWTP), which supplies water to the City of Taylor, Jonah Water SUD, and Lone Star RWA. Currently supply is allocated equally to meet the individual customer demands of:

- Between 3,550 ac-ft/yr and 12,317 ac-ft/yr for the City of Taylor and its wholesale customers.
- 4,386 ac-ft/yr for Jarrell-Schwertner WSC in addition to another 1,000 ac-ft/yr contract Jarrell-Schwertner WSC holds.
- Between 6,238 and 23,510 ac-ft/yr for Jonah Water SUD.
- Between 2,093 and 10,739 ac-ft/yr for Sonterra MUD.

All of the supply BRA specifically designated to the EWCWTP has been allocated, with customer demands exceeding the supplies in 2030. Chapter 3 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for the Little River System.

Note that the shortages shown are based on full contractual commitments. Actual full use of those contracts is unlikely to occur until later years of the planning period and the shortages shown are more likely to occur later than shown here.

Table 5.38-3 WWP Surplus/(Shortage)

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Existing Contractual Demands	**251,143**	**251,143**	**251,143**	**251,143**	**251,143**	**251,143**
Supply Sources						
Lake Proctor	14,468	13,914	13,360	12,806	12,252	11,698
Lake Belton	100,257	100,257	100,257	100,257	100,257	100,257
Lake Stillhouse Hollow	65,568	65,282	64,996	64,710	64,424	64,138
Lake Georgetown	11,610	11,586	11,562	11,538	11,514	11,490
Lake Granger	17,400	16,948	16,496	16,044	15,592	15,140
Total Existing Supplies	**209,303**	**207,987**	**206,671**	**205,355**	**204,039**	**202,723**
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(41,840)	(43,156)	(44,472)	(45,788)	(47,104)	(48,420)
Additional Demands from Strategies Recommended for Others						
Supply to Central Texas WSC (ac-ft/yr)			4,400	11,600	13,300	14,800
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	(41,840)	(43,156)	(48,872)	(57,388)	(60,404)	(63,220)

Notes:
(1) Highland Lakes supplies (25,000 ac-ft/yr) and contracts (24,700 ac-ft/yr) pursuant to HB 1437 are not shown.

5.38.2.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G Regional Planning Group (RWPG), the following water supply plan is recommended to meet the projected shortages for BRA's Little River System. Needs for full contractual commitments remain unmet in 2030. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in

the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online that will develop additional supplies for the BRA and their contractual customers.

1. Sell Remaining Highland Lakes Supplies to County-Other entities:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $0.
    d. Unit Cost: Max of $145/ac-ft in 2030.
2. Lake Granger ASR:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $250,881,000 (sum of 3 phases).
    d. Unit Cost: Max of $4,146/ac-ft in 2030.
3. Belhouse Drought Preparedness Project:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: Before 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $101,598,000.
    d. Unit Cost: estimated $1,719/ac-ft based on 5,000 ac-ft/yr supplied.
4. (Alternative) Lake Granger Augmentation Phase I: This strategy would overdraft Lake Granger and supplement supplies with an annual average of 2700 ac-ft/yr of groundwater from Williamson County.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $116,732,000.
    d. Unit Cost: Max of $903/ac-ft in 2030.
5. (Alternative) Lake Granger Augmentation Phase II: This strategy would overdraft Lake Granger and supplement supplies with an annual average of 15,613 ac-ft/yr of groundwater from Milam, Burleson and/or Lee Counties (58,455 ac-ft/yr maximum groundwater in a single year). Strategy as presented is an Alternative Strategy due to modeled available groundwater (MAG) limitations on groundwater supplies.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $1,429,638,000.
    d. Unit Cost: Max of $2,751/ac-ft in 2030.

Table 5.38-4 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the BRA Little River System

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(41,840)	(43,156)	(44,472)	(45,788)	(47,104)	(48,420)
Sell Remaining Highland Lakes Supply						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	300	300	300	300	300	300
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$43,500	$43,500	$43,500	$43,500	$43,500	$43,500
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$145	$145	$145	$145	$145	$145

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Lake Granger ASR						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	3,245	4,665	9,330	9,330	9,330	9,330
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$13,453,000	$18,055,000	$15,238,000	$11,854,000	$7,054,000	$7,054,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$4,146	$3,870	$1,633	$1,271	$756	$756
Belhouse Drought Preparedness Project						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$8,595,000	$8,595,000	$1,451,000	$1,451,000	$1,451,000	$1,451,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$4,298	$4,2989	$726	$726	$726	$726
Lake Granger Augmentation – Phase I - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$13,448,000	$13,448,000	$5,234,000	$5,234,000	$5,234,000	$5,234,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$903	$903	$351	$351	$351	$351
Lake Granger Augmentation – Phase II(1) - Alternative						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	46,265	46,265	46,265	46,265	46,265	46,265
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$127,257,000	$127,257,000	$37,430,000	$37,430,000	$30,352,000	$30,352,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,751	$2,751	$809	$809	$656	$656
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(32,405)	(25,066)	(13,367)	(14,683)	(15,999)	(17315)

Notes:
(1) Strategy is MAG limited resulting in a recommended strategy supply of 890 ac-ft/yr. Unit cost of water based on alternative strategy supply of 46,265 ac-ft/yr.

5.38.3 BRA (Main Stem/Lower Basin System)

5.38.3.1 Description of Supply

The BRA (Main Stem/Lower Basin System) obtains water supply from Possum Kingdom Reservoir, Lake Granbury, Lake Whitney, Lake Somerville, and Lake Limestone, and the BRA's System Operations Permit. Based on the available surface water supply, the BRA Main Stem/Lower Basin System is projected to meet the projected contractual demands on the BRA Main Stem/Lower Basin System from Region O, Region H, Region C and Brazos G. Chapter 3 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for the Main Stem/Lower Basin System. Contractual demands and supplies are summarized in Table 5.38-5. System yield modeling indicates that the full System Operations yield exceeds the contractual demands but is constrained for regional planning to meet just the contractual demands shown in Table 5.38-6.

Actual full use of the contracts shown is unlikely to occur until later years of the planning period. In addition to the System Operations Permit, the BRA has a System Order that allows BRA to divert from each individual reservoir an annual amount greater than the reservoir's authorized diversion and assign the difference to another reservoir in the system. While this does not increase the authorized supply from the BRA system, it provides operational flexibility within the BRA's system.

Table 5.38-5 Supplies and Demands for the BRA Main Stem/Lower Basin System

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Contractual Demands						
System/Lakeside – Region O	961	961	961	961	961	961
System/Lakeside – Region C	2,730	2,730	2,730	2,730	2,730	2,730
System/Lakeside – Brazos G	203,465	203,465	203,465	203,465	203,465	203,465
System/Lakeside – Region H	163,450	163,450	163,450	163,450	163,450	163,450
System Operations – Brazos G	28,109	28,109	28,109	28,109	28,109	28,109
System Operations – Region H	64,977	64,977	64,977	64,977	64,977	64,977
Total Existing Contractual Demands(1)	**463,692**	**463,692**	**463,692**	**463,692**	**463,692**	**463,692**
Supply Sources						
Possum Kingdom Reservoir	151,330	150,466	149,602	148,738	147,874	147,010
Lake Granbury	58,822	57,846	56,870	55,894	54,918	53,942
Lake Whitney	18,336	18,336	18,336	18,336	18,336	18,336
Lake Somerville	42,000	41,616	41,232	40,848	40,464	40,080
Lake Limestone	65,074	65,074	65,074	65,074	65,074	65,074
System Operations	131,384	121,074	110,763	100,453	90,142	79,832
Total Existing Supplies	**466,946**	**454,412**	**441,877**	**429,343**	**416,808**	**404,274**
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	3,254	(9,280)	(21,815)	(34,349)	(46,884)	(59,418)
Additional Demands from Strategies Recommended for Others						
Supply to Williamson County-Other (ac-ft/yr)					12,000	26,000
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) Including Recommended Strategies (ac-ft/yr)	3,254	(9,280)	(21,815)	(34,349)	(58,884)	(85,418)

Notes:
(1) Total of contract demands does not include BRA reserved supplies.

5.38.3.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG, the following water supply plan is recommended to meet the projected shortages for the BRA Main Stem System:

1. Lake Whitney Reallocation: This strategy would reallocate storage in Lake Whitney from hydropower to other uses and would develop a total of 38,480 up to 93,355 ac-ft/yr of additional supply to the BRA.
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: before 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $44,678,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $23/ac-ft.
    e. This includes the reallocation of the power pool and unpermitted storage below elevation 520 ft-mean sea level. Additionally, the supply from Lake Whitney.

Table 5.38-6 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for the BRA Main Stem System

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	3,254	(9,280)	(21,815)	(34,349)	(58,884)	(85,418)
Lake Whitney Reallocation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	93,355	93,355	93,355	93,355	93,355	93,355
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,173,000	$2,173,000	$2,173,000	$2,173,000	$81,000	$81,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$23	$23	$23	$23	$1	$1
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	96,609	84,075	71,540	59,006	24,471	7,937

5.38.4 Aquilla Water Supply District

5.38.4.1 Description of Supply

Aquilla WSD (District) obtains up to 5,953 ac-ft/yr of raw water from Lake Aquilla through a contract with the BRA. The district supplies treated water to five wholesale customers. Chapter 3 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for Aquilla WSD. Based on contractual commitments, no shortages are projected in the planning horizon. Due to sedimentation reducing the yield of Lake Aquilla there is limited supply for additional contracts beyond 2080. However, the water demands of the five wholesale customers are increasing, with individual customers having projected water supply shortages by 2030. The existing customers of the District may, as part of their water supply development strategies, seek to increase their contracts to purchase water from the District.

5.38.4.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the following water management strategy is recommended to develop additional supplies for Aquilla WSD customers.

1. Lake Aquilla reallocation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: Before 2060.
    c. Total Project Cost: $29,173,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $774/ac-ft.

Table 5.38-7 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Aquilla WSD

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	561	561	561	549	292	35
Lake Aquilla Reallocation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	—	—	—	1,950	1,950	1,950
Annual Cost ($/yr)	—	—	—	$1,510,000	$1,510,000	$1,313,000

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	—	—	—	$774	$774	$673
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	561	561	561	2,499	2,242	1,985

5.38.5 Bell County WCID No. 1

5.38.5.1 Description of Supply

Bell County WCID No. 1 obtains its water supply from Lake Belton through contracts with the BRA totaling 62,509 ac-ft/yr. Using the Brazos G Water Authority Models (WAM) with the assumptions adopted by the Brazos G RWPG consistent with regional water planning rules and guidelines, the District's firm reliable supply from BRA is 51,817 ac-ft/yr. This amount is less than District customers' total projected demands of 75,247 ac-ft/yr by 2080. Notably, BRA contract supplies are reported by BRA as firm supplies. Chapter 4 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for Bell County WCID No.1.

The district has projected needs for its customers by 2030 based on contractual commitments and in 2080 based on its customers' projected demands. BRA strategies for the Little River System will firm up contracts to provide the full amount of supply during drought of record conditions, therefore no change in water source is recommended for Bell County WCID No. 1.

The District has entered into a contract to supply reuse supply to the City of Killeen. Bell County WCID is pursuing TCEQ Reclaimed Water Type I permits to utilize treated wastewater from wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) 1 and 2 and the South WWTP. The District has evaluated several wastewater reuse options as part of its Master Plan update. The reuse portion of the Master Plan identifies both near-term potential customers as well as other future customers that would utilize the total available reuse supply generated through the District's regional wastewater system.

5.38.5.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategy is recommended to meet the projected water shortage for Bell County WCID No.1. Needs for full contractual commitments remain unmet in the planning horizon. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online that will develop additional supplies for the BRA. The entities' water usage utilized for demand projections is 169 gpcd. The RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd.

The District is developing an ASR project in Bell County in coordination with Fort Cavazos (formerly Fort Hood). Information on this project is under development for incorporation into the final 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan.

1. Conservation:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Annual Cost: maximum of $38,988 in 2080.
    d. Unit Cost: $684/ac-ft.

2. Water Treatment Plant Expansion (Lake Belton):
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030 duplicate upgrade in 2060.
   c. Total Project Cost: $17,107,000 (each expansion).
   d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,332/ac-ft.
3. Reuse – Bell County WCID 1 North:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 3.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Total Project Cost: $33,258,000.
   d. Unit Cost: maximum of $1,590/ac-ft.
4. Reuse – Bell County WCID 1 South:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II, Chapter 3.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Total Project Cost: $20,221,000.
   d. Unit Cost: maximum of $2,282/ac-ft.
5. Central Texas Water Alliance Strategy (Alternative):
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
   c. Total Project Cost: $1,337,976
   d. Unit Cost: maximum of $19,026/ac-ft
   e. Strategy Supply: 30,276 ac-ft/yr

Table 5.38-8 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bell County WCID No.

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(8,270)	(8,596)	(8,922)	(9,248)	(9,574)	(9,900)
Conservation						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	8	18	28	38	48	57
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$5,472	$12,312	$19,152	$25,992	$32,832	$38,988
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after conservation (ac-ft/yr)	(8,262)	(8,578)	(8,894)	(9,210)	(9,526)	(9,843)
Water Treatment Plan Expansion (Lake Belton)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,680	1,680	1,680	3,360	3,360	3,360
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$2,237,000	$2,237,000	$1,033,000	$3,270,000	$3,270,000	$2,066,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,332	$1,332	$615	$973	$973	$615
Reuse – Bell County WCID 1 North						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,925	1,925	1,925	1,925	1,925	1,925
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$3,060,000	$3,060,000	$722,000	$722,000	$722,000	$722,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,590	$1,590	$375	$375	$375	$375

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Reuse – Bell County WCID 1 South						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	748	748	748	748	748	748
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$1,707,000	$1,707,000	$286,000	$286,000	$286,000	$286,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$2,282	$2,282	$382	$382	$382	$382
Alternative - Central Texas Water Alliance Strategy						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	30,276	30,276	30,276	30,276	30,276	30,276
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$576,031,000	$576,031,000	$481,903,000	$481,903,000	$481,903,000	$481,903,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$19,026	$19,026	$15,917	$15,917	$15,917	$15,917
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(3,909)	(4,225)	(4,541)	(3,177)	(3,493)	(3,810)

5.38.6 Bluebonnet Water Supply Corporation

5.38.6.1 Description of Supply

Bluebonnet Water Supply Corporation (WSC) obtains raw water from Lake Belton through contracts with the BRA totaling 8,301 ac-ft; however, the firm supply of those contracts is 7,104 in 2030, and decreases over the planning period, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. The WSC has projected shortages starting in 2030 based on contractual commitments. However, the BRA contractual amount is sufficient to meet all of Bluebonnet's contractual commitments. Projected customer demands for 2080 total 12,508 ac-ft/yr. Bluebonnet would need to develop additional water supplies should existing customers seek more water supply to meet their needs. Chapter 4 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for Bluebonnet WSC.

5.38.6.2 Water Supply Plan

Needs for full contractual commitments remain unmet in the planning horizon. These needs result from contracts not being fully allocated due to limited source availability as determined by using the Brazos G RWPG's adopted methodology for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G RWP, which is consistent with the specific assumptions and methods required for regional water planning. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent to or worse than the drought of record, with the full implementation of all existing water rights in the basin. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online. Notably, BRA contract supplies are reported by BRA as firm supplies.

1. Leave needs unmet:
    a. No infeasible strategy is recommended.

Table 5.38-9 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Bluebonnet WSC

Plan Element	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(228)	(271)	(317)	(362)	(408)	(454)
Firm up Supplies through BRA Little River System Strategies						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)		1,447	1,493	1,538	1,584	1,629
Annual Cost ($/yr)		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

5.38.7 Central Texas Water Supply Corporation

5.38.7.1 Description of Supply

Central Texas WSC obtains its water supply from Lake Stillhouse Hollow through contracts with the BRA totaling 11,295 ac-ft; however, the firm supply of those contracts is 9,413 ac-ft/yr in 2030, decreasing to 9,117 ac-ft/yr in 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines and as modeled in the Brazos G WAM. See Chapter 3.2.5 for additional information regarding BRA supplies. Central Texas WSC also has two wells in the Trinity Aquifer in Bell County for an estimated supply of 2,022 ac-ft/yr. Based on the available surface water and groundwater supply, currently contracted supplies, and projected demands for its current customers, Central Texas WSC is projected to have shortages beginning 2030, assuming that all demands can be treated and delivered through current infrastructure. Chapter 4 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for Central Texas WSC.

5.38.7.2 Water Supply Plan

Central Texas WSC provided the Brazos G RWPG a copy of their Master Water Plan published November 2024. Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to improve treatment capacity, water supply transmission and meet the projected water shortages for Central Texas WSC.

1. Water System Expansion:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be Implemented: Phased project WTP expansion, pumpstation, and transmission pipeline before 2030, additional transmission pipeline online before 2040.
   c. Total Project Cost: $85,081,000.
   d. Unit Cost: maximum of $3,276/ac-ft.
2. Purchase additional supplies from BRA:
   a. Cost Source: Volume II.
   b. Date to be implemented: 2050.
   c. Total Project Cost: Cost borne by BRA.
   d. Unit Cost: BRA Wholesale Water Contract Cost $100 estimated.

Table 5.38-10 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Central Texas WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(6,324)	(6,114)	(6,047)	(6,107)	(6,168)	(6,229)
Water System Expansion						
Supply From Plan Element(1) (ac-ft/yr)	3,641	7,281	7,281	7,281	7,281	7,281
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$5,339,000	$11,895,000	$8,400,000	$5,916,000	$5,916,000	$5,916,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,475	$3,276	$2,310	$1,628	$1,628	$1,628
Purchase additional supplies from BRA						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)			4,400	11,600	13,300	14,800
Annual Cost ($/yr)			$440,000	$1,160,000	$1,330,000	$1,480,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)			$100	$100	$100	$100
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(2,683)	1,167	1,234	1,174	1,113	1,052

Notes:
(1) Supply from Central Texas WSC Water System Expansion strategy represents additional treatment capacity of existing supplies and not an increase in source water supply.

5.38.8 FHLM Water Supply Corporation

5.38.8.1 Description of Supply

Various utilities in Falls, Hill, Limestone and McLennan Counties are dealing with elevated levels of arsenic in groundwater supplies and several have been pursuing water management strategies through FHLM WSC. FHLM WSC has recently contracted with the BRA for 1,934 ac-ft/yr that will eventually be used by member utilities to either replace or blend with existing groundwater supplies. FHLM WSC is also currently negotiating a water supply agreement with the City of Waco on behalf of EOL WSC and Axtel WSC, although the details of the potential agreement are not available. The projects to supply EOL and Axtel from the City of Waco are shown as water management strategies for those WUGs in the McLennan County section of this plan.

5.38.8.2 Water Supply Plan

FHLM WSC currently has no infrastructure to utilize the contracted water supply from BRA. It is recommended that the WSC develop infrastructure to divert and distribute contracted supplies to support blending of water supplies with other utilities. This project includes a balancing reservoir to manage the operation of inflows to a WTP. The reservoir is not necessary to ensure a reliable firm yield, nor is any firm yield gained from the reservoir. The firm supply for this strategy is derived from the contract for 1,934 ac-ft/yr of firm supply between FHLM and BRA, provided by BRA's System Operations supplies.

1. FHLM WSC BRA Sys Ops Facilities- Utilize BRA Contract:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $116,217,000.
    d. Unit Cost: maximum of $6,161/ac-ft.

Table 5.38-11 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for FHLM WSC

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	0	0	0	0	0	0
FHLM WSC Utilize BRA Contract						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	1,934	1,934	1,934	1,934	0	0
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$11,916,000	$11,916,000	$6,392,000	$6,392,000	$4,627,000	$4,627,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$6,161	$6,161	$3,305	$3,305	$2,392	$2,392
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,934	1,934	1,934	1,934	0	0

Strategy establishes reliable infrastructure for future customers with need for surface water for blending with groundwater supplies within the service area of Falls, Hill, Limestone and McLennan Counties. No specific end user is identified for the plan.

5.38.9 Eastland County WSD

Eastland County WSD obtains its water supply from Lake Leon and Eastland Lake and provides water to the Cities of Eastland and Ranger, and to manufacturing interests in Eastland County. The supplies from these two sources are not sufficient to meet the District's contractual commitments but are ample to meet the projected demands for Eastland and Ranger, which are only about 20 percent of the contractual supplies. No changes in water supply are recommended. Chapter 4 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for Eastland County WSD.

5.38.10 North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority

5.38.10.1 Description of Supply

North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority (MWA) owns and obtains its water supply from Millers Creek Reservoir. Based on the available surface water supply, shortages are expected through 2080. Chapter 4 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for North Central Texas MWA.

5.38.10.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the North Central Texas MWA. Needs for full contractual commitments remain unmet in the 2030 and 2040 decades. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought prior to the recommended strategies coming online that will develop additional supplies for the BRA.

1. Lake Creek Reservoir:
    a. Cost Source: Volume II. Project requires a subordination agreement with the BRA, and as indicated by both North Central Texas MWA and BRA, this may be difficult to obtain.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2050.
    c. Total Project Cost: $236,072,000.
    d. Unit Cost: $3,227/ac-ft.

Table 5.38-12 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for North Central Texas MWA

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(1,722)	(1,737)	(1,724)	(1,709)	(1,695)	(1,678)
Lake Creek Reservoir						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)			6,090	6,090	6,090	6,090
Annual Cost ($/yr)			$19,652,000	$19,652,000	$4,695,000	$4,695,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)			$3,227	$3,227	$771	$771
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	(1,722)	(1,737)	4,366	4,381	4,395	4,412

5.38.11 Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No. 1

5.38.11.1 Description of Supply

Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District owns and operates Lake Palo Pinto, which is used to supply water to entities in Palo Pinto and Parker Counties. A portion of its supply is used in Region C. The district has rights to 18,500 ac-ft/yr for municipal and steam electric power uses. Treated water is supplied to the City of Mineral Wells (and its customers) and Lake Palo Pinto Area Water Supply Corporation. Projected demands based on contractual commitments indicate shortages through 2080. Chapter 4 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for Palo Pinto County MWD No.1.

5.38.11.2 Water Supply Plan

Working within the planning criteria established by the Brazos G RWPG and TWDB, the following water management strategies are recommended to meet the projected water shortage for the Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No.1.

1. Lake Palo Pinto Expansion (Turkey Peak):
    a. Cost Source: Volume II.
    b. Date to be Implemented: 2030.
    c. Total Project Cost: $200,789,000.
    d. Unit Cost: Max of $1,202/ac-ft.

Table 5.38-13 Recommended Plan Costs by Decade for Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No.1

Plan Element	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(3,763)	(4,004)	(4,199)	(4,410)	(4,622)	(4,880)
Lake Palo Pinto Expansion (Turkey Peak Dam)						
Supply From Plan Element (ac-ft/yr)	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730
Annual Cost ($/yr)	$6,887,000	$6,887,000	$5,713,000	$5,713,000	$917,000	$917,000
Unit Cost ($/ac-ft)	$1,202	$1,202	$997	$997	$160	$160
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) after recommended WMS (ac-ft/yr)	1,967	1,726	1,531	1,320	1,108	850

5.38.12 Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation

The SFWQC was formed to develop a project to reduce salinity in the Brazos River Basin by constructing a series of wells to intercept highly saline water that emerges in a series of seeps and springs in the upper Brazos Basin. The project would develop a series of wells, desalt the water captured by the wells, make a commercial application of the resulting salt and sell the fresh water produced to municipal utilities in the area. No progress towards this project or additional information was found regarding the SFWQC, so this project is not recommended for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan.

5.38.13 Upper Leon River MWD

Upper Leon River MWD obtains its water supply through a contract with the BRA for 6,437 ac-ft/yr of water from Lake Proctor; however the firm supply of those contracts is 5,365 ac-ft/yr in 2030 and decreases to 5,196 ac-ft/yr by 2080, based on water availability analyses prescribed under water planning guidelines. No shortages are projected for the Upper Leon River MWD and no changes in water supply are recommended. Chapter 4 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for Upper Leon River MWD.

5.38.14 West Central Texas MWD

5.38.14.1 Description of Supply

West Central Texas MWD owns and obtains its water supply from Hubbard Creek Reservoir. Based on the available surface water supply constrained to a 2-year safe yield estimate, West Central Texas MWD is projected to have a shortage in 2030. Needs for full contractual commitments remain unmet in 2030. These needs will only occur during a drought equivalent or worse than the drought of record. While not a strategy recommended by the Brazos G RWPG, the impacts of the unmet needs can be mitigated through demand management in the event of a serious drought. Chapter 4 includes additional information on contracts and water supplies for West Central Texas MWD.

Table 5.38-14 Supplies and Demands for the West Central Texas Municipal Water District

	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Existing Contractual Sales						
Abilene	10,720	8,360	6,000	3,640	1,300	1,300
Albany	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400
Anson	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600
Breckenridge	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900
Total Existing Demands	**15,620**	**13,260**	**10,900**	**8,540**	**6,200**	**6,200**
Total Supply	**15,385**	**13,260**	**10,900**	**8,540**	**6,200**	**6,200**
Projected Surplus/(Shortage) (ac-ft/yr)	(235)	0	0	0	0	0

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.39 Water Conservation Recommendations

Regional water planning guidelines require each Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) to consider water conservation to meet projected shortages. The Brazos G RWPG adopted the following water conservation recommendations for the 2026 Plan, which are further described in Volume II, Section 2.

- Municipal water user groups (WUGs) with per capita rates exceeding 140 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) were recommended to reduce per capita consumption by 1 percent annually through 2080 until a 140 gpcd rate is attained. This recommendation applies to all municipal WUGs with and without projected water supply needs (shortages). For WUGs in Williamson County (excepting the City of Georgetown), a more aggressive conservation goal of 120 gpcd by 2080 is recommended. Conservation can be achieved through a variety of best management practices, many of which are listed in Section 2 of Volume II.
- Irrigation WUGs with identified needs were recommended to reduce water use by voluntary targets of 3 percent by 2030, 5 percent by 2040, and 7 percent from 2050-2080. A list of best management practices is included in Volume II, Section 2.
- Manufacturing and mining WUGs with identified needs were recommended to reduce water use by voluntary targets of 3 percent by 2030, 5 percent by 2040, and 7 percent from 2050-2080. A list of best management practices is included in Volume II, Section 2.
- Conservation recommendations were not made for steam-electric users due to the widely differing water use amongst the different facilities.
- Conservation recommendations were not made for livestock WUGs.

Expected savings from the above water conservation recommendations can be seen for each WUG in the preceding individual county and WWP plans (Sections 5.1 through 5.38) and in Volume II, Section 2.

The Brazos G RWPG suggests that WUGs in the region review the lists of BMPs and look to identify WUGs at a relevant size with similar water supply type and consider voluntary implementation of those best management practices, if applicable.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) has prepared model water conservation plans (WCPs) for municipal public water suppliers, wholesale providers, industrial and mining entities, and agricultural users to provide guidance and suggestions to entities with regard to the preparation of WCPs. Not all items in the model plan will apply to every system's situation, but the overall model plan can be used as a starting point for most entities. For WUGs wishing to develop a new WCP, Brazos G suggests considering best management practices from local WCPs for entities similar in size, as discussed previously, in addition to the TCEQ Model WCPs. The TCEQ model WCPs can be found on TCEQ's website at the following link:

https://www.tceq.texas.gov/permitting/water_rights/wr_technical-resources/conserve.html

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.40 Major Projects

Regional water planning guidelines require each RWPG to include a new sub-section documenting the implementation status and anticipated timeline for certain types of recommended WMSs. The implementation status must be provided for the following types of recommended WMSs with any online decade:

- All reservoir strategies (including major and minor reservoirs).
- All seawater desalination strategies.
- Direct potable reuse strategies that provide greater than 5,000 ac-ft/yr of supply in any planning decade.
- Brackish groundwater strategies that provide greater than 10,000 ac-ft/yr of supply in any planning decade.
- Aquifer storage and recovery strategies that provide greater than 10,000 ac-ft/yr in any decade.
- All water transfers from out of state.
- Any other innovative technology projects the RWPG considers appropriate.

The sub-section must demonstrate the feasibility, based on key milestones achieved and anticipated timing of future milestones, of each recommended strategy to be fully implemented by the online decade in the regional plan.

Information acquired by the Brazos G RWPG has been compiled and is presented in Chapter 9 and Appendix M, and included as a digital deliverable in the required TWDB format. Table 5.40-1 below presents for reference the information on the WMSPs identified in SARA Report 124 that meet the criteria for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Plan.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 5.40-1 Implementation Status of Certain WMS Projects Reference Information (volumes in ac-ft/yr)

WMS Project ID	Region	WMS Project Name	Capital Cost	Online Decade	Project Sponsors	Impl. of Certain Project Review Label	Project Components	Project Related WMSType List	Project Related WUG Type List	Related WMS Supply Total 2030	Related WMS Supply Total 2040	Related WMS Supply Total 2050	Related WMS Supply Total 2060	Related WMS Supply Total 2070	Related WMS Supply Total 2080
1901	G	Brushy Creek Reservoir- Marlin	$59,720,000	2040	Marlin	New reservoir	Diversion and control structure; New surface water intake; New water supply reservoir; Transmission pipeline; Pump station	New major reservoir	Municipal Utility	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
1853	G	Bryan ASR (Carrizo-Wilcox)	$110,082,000	2030	Bryan	Aquifer storage and recovery >10,000 AFY	New conventional well; New ASR or AR well; New conventional WTP	Aquifer storage and recovery	Municipal Utility	6,000	6,000	6,000	8,500	10,500	14,626
1897	G	Cedar Ridge Reservoir	$540,102,000	2040	Abilene	New reservoir	New water supply reservoir	New major reservoir	Irrigation; Mining; Municipal Collective Reporting; Municipal County-Other; Municipal Utility; Unassigned Water Volumes	0	25,547	25,541	25,536	25,531	25,531
1890	G	Coryell County Off Channel Reservoir-BRA	$120,699,000	2050	Multi County WSC	New reservoir	New water supply reservoir	New major reservoir	Municipal Utility; Unassigned Water Volumes	0	0	3,190	3,190	3,190	3,190
5447	G	Georgetown Reclamation	$494,826,000	2030	Georgetown	Direct potable reuse >5,000 AFY	New advanced WTP	Direct potable reuse	Municipal Utility	3,071	12,900	12,900	12,900	25,010	25,010
1891	G	Groesbeck Off Channel Reservoir-Groesbeck	$35,278,000	2040	Groesbeck	New reservoir	New surface water intake; New water supply reservoir; Transmission pipeline	Other surface water	Municipal Utility	0	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750
1854	G	Lake Granger ASR	$250,881,000	2030	Brazos River Authority	Aquifer storage and recovery >10,000 AFY	New ASR or AR well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; New conventional WTP	Aquifer storage and recovery	Municipal County-Other; Municipal Utility; Unassigned Water Volumes	7,600	11,900	11,900	11,900	11,900	11,900
1896	G	NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir	$236,072,000	2050	North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority	New reservoir	New water supply reservoir	New major reservoir	Municipal Utility; Unassigned Water Volumes	0	0	6,090	6,090	6,090	6,090
1898	G	New Throckmorton Reservoir	$102,539,000	2050	Throckmorton	New reservoir	New water supply reservoir	New major reservoir	Municipal Utility	0	0	1,280	1,280	1,280	1,280
1899	G	Turkey Peak Reservoir	$200,789,000	2030	Palo Pinto County MWD 1	New reservoir	New water supply reservoir	New major reservoir	Irrigation; Municipal Utility; Unassigned Water Volumes	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730	5,730

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

5.41 Documentation of Implementation Status and Anticipated Timeline for Certain Types of Recommended Water Management Strategies

By rule, the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) requires both within the Initially Prepared Plan (IPP) and Final Regional Water Plans (RWPs), the inclusion of a new sub-section documenting the implementation status of certain large water management strategies (WMSs) (31 TAC §357.34(g)). The implementation status must be provided for the following types of recommended WMSs with any online decade.

- All reservoir strategies (including major and minor reservoirs).
- All seawater desalination strategies.
- Direct potable reuse strategies that provide greater than 5,000 acre-feet per year of supply in any planning decade.
- Brackish groundwater strategies that provide greater than 10,000 acre-feet per year of supply in any planning decade.
- Aquifer storage and recovery strategies that provide greater than 10,000 acre-feet per year of supply in any planning decade.
- All water transfers from out of state.
- Any other innovative technology projects the regional water planning group (RWPG) considers appropriate.

It should be noted that TWDB rules also require that the new subsection include the following items:

1. A table documenting the status of key milestones such as when the sponsor took an affirmative vote or other action to make expenditures necessary to construct or file applications for permits, state water right, diversion, or discharge permit status, Federal 404 permit status, planning, design, and construction status, and expenditures to date. Planning groups are required to use a WMS status table template, provided by the TWDB, to collect this information.
2. A simple graphic, showing the full planning horizon, and displaying separate timeline/schedules for each project that includes major anticipated/estimated, future implementation milestones (e.g., feasibility, design, permitting, acquisition) and construction milestones (e.g., anticipated start and completion dates) either graphically as timeframe periods (e.g., Gantt bars) or as single milestones representing estimated end-dates of key activities (e.g., issuance target date of 404 permit or water right), as well as those milestones already achieved.

The timeline for Federal permitting of new water supply reservoirs in Texas remains highly uncertain, often spanning over a decade or more due to extensive environmental reviews, interagency coordination, and evolving regulatory requirements under laws like Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This unpredictability poses a significant challenge for implementing WMS projects recommended in the Regional Water Plan, as delays can disrupt regional water supply strategies and inflate costs. This unpredictability complicates long-term water supply planning and can jeopardize timely implementation of critical infrastructure.

A request for information related to key milestones pertaining to the following 9 large water management strategies was conducted through multiple surveys, follow-up emails, and phone calls. These projects

include Brushy Creek Reservoir, Bryan Aquifer Storage & Recovery (Carrizo-Wilcox), Cedar Ridge Reservoir, Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir, Georgetown Reclamation, Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir, NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir, New Throckmorton Reservoir, and Turkey Peak Reservoir.

Tables 5.41-1 through 5.41-9 present estimated implementation schedules for the 9 major projects. These schedules are subject to change based on the timing of any of the key milestones represented on Table 5.41-10. Table 5.41-6 presents the estimated implementation schedule for the Georgetown Reclamation Project. No additional information is available to the regional group at the time of this publication.

Table 5.41-1 Brushy Creek Reservoir

Task	2025	2026	2028	2030	2032	2034	2036	2038	2040
Property Acquisition (already owned by City of Marlin)									
Feasibility Assessment									
Environmental & Archaeological Studies, Mitigation Planning									
TCEQ & USACE Permitting (404, TPDES, water right compliance)									
Engineering Report, Cost Update, and Final Design									
Dam & Reservoir Construction									
Pump Station & Pipeline Construction									
Startup, Testin, Validation									
Deliver Water									

Table 5.41-2 Bryan Aquifer Storage & Recovery (Carrizo-Wilcox)

Task	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Property Acquisition (Already owned by City of Bryan)						
Feasibility Assessment – Completed						
Site Selection & Hydrogeologic Characterization						
Pilot Testing & Water Compatibility Analysis						
Permitting (TCEQ Class V Injection Well)						
Preliminary Engineering Report & Cost Updates						
Final Design of ASR Wells & Pumping System						
Construction Phase						
Startup, Testing, Validation						
Deliver Water						

Table 5.41-3 Cedar Ridge Reservoir

Task	2025	2026	2028	2030	2032	2034	2036	2038	2040
Feasibility/Preliminary Design – Completed									
Property Acquisition									
Environmental Studies & Cultural Mitigation									
TCEQ & USACE Permitting (404, TPDES, water right compliance)									
Final Design									
Construction									
Reservoir Filling & Integration into Abeline System									

Table 5.41-4 Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir

Task	2025	2026	2028	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Feasibility Assessment and Site Selection								
Hydrologic Modeling and Yield Analysis								
Environmental Impact Studies								
Wildlife Habitat and Species Assessments								
Cultural Resources Survey and Coordination								
Land Acquisition and Easement Negotiations								
Mitigation Planning								
TCEQ & USACE Permitting (404, TPDES, water right compliance)								
Reservoir Design and Engineering								
Construction Phase								
Startup and Commissioning								

Table 5.41-5 Georgetown Reclamation

Task	2024	2026	2028	2030
Feasibility/Preliminary Design				
Permitting				
Design				
Property Acquisition				
Construction				

Table 5.41-6 Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir

Task	2025	2026	2028	2030	2034	2036	2038	2040
Feasibility Assessment and Site Selection								
Site Selection and Preliminary Design								
Environmental Impact Studies								
Cultural Resources Survey and Coordination								
Land Acquisition and Easement Negotiations								
TCEQ & USACE Permitting (404, TPDES, water right compliance)								
Engineering and Final Design								
Construction Phase								
Startup and Commissioning								

Table 5.41-7 NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir

Task	2025	2026	2028	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Feasibility Assessment and Site Selection								
Hydrologic Modeling and Yield Analysis								
Environmental Impact Studies								
Wildlife Habitat and Species Assessments								
Cultural Resources Survey and Coordination								
Land Acquisition and Easement Negotiations								
Mitigation Planning								
TCEQ & USACE Permitting (404, TPDES, water right compliance)								
Reservoir Design and Engineering								
Construction Phase								
Startup and Commissioning								

Table 5.41-8 New Throckmorton Reservoir

Task	2025	2026	2028	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
Feasibility Assessment and Site Selection								
Hydrologic Modeling and Yield Analysis								
Environmental Impact Studies								
Wildlife Habitat and Species Assessments								
Cultural Resources Survey and Coordination								
Land Acquisition and Easement Negotiations								
Mitigation Planning								
TCEQ & USACE Permitting (404, TPDES, water right compliance)								
Reservoir Design and Engineering								
Construction Phase								
Startup and Commissioning								

Table 5.41-9 Turkey Peak Reservoir

Task	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Feasibility Assessment – Completed						
Hydrologic Modeling – Completed						
Environmental Impact and Assessment Studies – Completed						
Widllife Habitat and Species Mitigation Planning – Completed						
Cultural Resources Survey and Coordination – Completed						
Permitting (TCEQ, USACE)						
Final Design						
Land Acquisition and Easement Negotiations						
Utility Relocation and Roadway Planning						
Construction Phase						
Startup and Commissioning						

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 5.41-10 Implementation Status Chart for Major Water Management Strategies

Water Management Strategy/Project Name	Project Sponsor	WMS Project Sponsor Region	Online Decade	Capital Cost	Anticipated Footprint Acreage (acres)	Sponsor Authorization	Permitting Status (As Applicable)									Planning, Design, And Construction Status						Total Funds Expended To Date
							State Water Right Status				Federal 404 Permit Status (If Applicable)		Desalination Permit Status		Other Key Permits	Geotech/ Design	Land Acquisition		Construction			
						Date(s) that the sponsor took an affirmative vote or other action to make expenditures necessary to construct or file applications for state or federal permits (date(s))	Anticipated (or actual) TCEQ application filed (date)	Anticipated (or actual) State Water Right Permit Administratively Complete (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Draft State Water Right Permit Issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Date Final State Water Right Permit Issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) application for permit filed (date)	Anticipated (or actual) permit issuance (date)	Anticipated (or actual) diversion permit issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Discharge/Disposal Permit Issued (date)	Summary of other permits and status (summary)	Generally describe the types and amount (as %s) of geotechnical/ reconnaissance/ engineering feasibility or other technical, testing, and/or design work etc. performed to date (summary)	Percent Land Acquisition Completed (%)	Anticipated land acquisition completion (date)	Anticipated start of construction (Date)	Percent construction completed (%)	Anticipated construction completion (date)	Rough approximation of the total expenditures, to date, on ALL activities related to project implementation to date (millions of $s)
Brushy Creek Reservoir- Marlin	Marlin	G	2040	$54,402,000	697	Action Taken	N/A	N/A	N/A	State permit acquired and is continuing to renew permit, originally completed 3/6/1993, current water right completed 5/8/2024, newest renewal application submitted 4/16/2024	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	As of April 2024, they have been working with NRCS and to begin 404 permitting process with USACE, no exact dates	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A	0%	N/A	N/A
Bryan ASR (Carrizo-Wilcox)	Bryan	G	2030	$110,082,000	39	Action Taken	Application submitted, 4/19/2022	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Unknown	N/A	100%	N/A	Unknown	0%	Unknown	N/A

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Water Management Strategy/Project Name	Project Sponsor	WMS Project Sponsor Region	Online Decade	Capital Cost	Anticipated Footprint Acreage (acres)	Sponsor Authorization	Permitting Status (As Applicable)									Planning, Design, And Construction Status						Total Funds Expended To Date
							State Water Right Status				Federal 404 Permit Status (If Applicable)		Desalination Permit Status		Other Key Permits	Geotech/ Design	Land Acquisition		Construction			
						Date(s) that the sponsor took an affirmative vote or other action to make expenditures necessary to construct or file applications for state or federal permits (date(s))	Anticipated (or actual) TCEQ application filed (date)	Anticipated (or actual) State Water Right Permit Administratively Complete (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Draft State Water Right Permit Issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Date Final State Water Right Permit Issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) application for permit filed (date)	Anticipated (or actual) permit issuance (date)	Anticipated (or actual) diversion permit issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Discharge/Disposal Permit Issued (date)	Summary of other permits and status (summary)	Generally describe the types and amount (as %s) of geotechnical/ reconnaissance/ engineering feasibility or other technical, testing, and/or design work etc. performed to date (summary)	Percent Land Acquisition Completed (%)	Anticipated land acquisition completion (date)	Anticipated start of construction (Date)	Percent construction completed (%)	Anticipated construction completion (date)	Rough approximation of the total expenditures, to date, on ALL activities related to project implementation to date (millions of $s)
Cedar Ridge Reservoir	Abilene	G	2040	$371,000,000	6635	June 26, 2008 City resolution 24-2008 authorized permitting preparation. August 11, 2011 City resolution 14-2011 authorizing filing of state and federal permits.	Application Filed, 8/8/2011	10/23/2012	2025	2025	Application Filed, 12/27/ 2013	By 2030	N/A	N/A	N/A	Preliminary geotechnical/geological feasibility completed 2008-2009 (estimated geotechnical investigation at 30%). Phase 1A reconnaissance/background cultural resources investigation completed 2011 (estimated cultural resources at 30%).	0%	By 2030	By 2035	0%	2038	$12,751,141 (Owner's contracted Engineer eHT/subs) - $11,603,460 EIS 3PC Stantec- $1,147,68)
Coryell County Off Channel Reservoir-BRA	Multi County WSC	G	2050	$120,699,000	445	No Action, Sponsor identified	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	N/A	N/A	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	0%	Unknown	Unknown

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Water Management Strategy/Project Name	Project Sponsor	WMS Project Sponsor Region	Online Decade	Capital Cost	Anticipated Footprint Acreage (acres)	Sponsor Authorization	Permitting Status (As Applicable)									Planning, Design, And Construction Status						Total Funds Expended To Date
							State Water Right Status				Federal 404 Permit Status (If Applicable)		Desalination Permit Status		Other Key Permits	Geotech/ Design	Land Acquisition		Construction			
						Date(s) that the sponsor took an affirmative vote or other action to make expenditures necessary to construct or file applications for state or federal permits (date(s))	Anticipated (or actual) TCEQ application filed (date)	Anticipated (or actual) State Water Right Permit Administratively Complete (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Draft State Water Right Permit Issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Date Final State Water Right Permit Issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) application for permit filed (date)	Anticipated (or actual) permit issuance (date)	Anticipated (or actual) diversion permit issued (date)	Anticipated (or actual) Discharge/Disposal Permit Issued (date)	Summary of other permits and status (summary)	Generally describe the types and amount (as %s) of geotechnical/ reconnaissance/ engineering feasibility or other technical, testing, and/or design work etc. performed to date (summary)	Percent Land Acquisition Completed (%)	Anticipated land acquisition completion (date)	Anticipated start of construction (Date)	Percent construction completed (%)	Anticipated construction completion (date)	Rough approximation of the total expenditures, to date, on ALL activities related to project implementation to date (millions of $s)
Georgetown Reclamation	Georgetown	G	2030	$494,826,000	11.5	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Groesbeck Off Channel Reservoir-Groesbeck	Groesbeck	G	2040	$23,599,000	146	Unknown	Unknown	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir	North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority	G	2050	$236,072,000	2866	Action Taken	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	N/A	N/A	Have previous water rights permit from Millers Creek Lake/Reservoir from 2/20/1985	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	0%	Unknown	0.5
New Throckmorton Reservoir	Throckmorton	G	2050	$102,539,000	1161	No Action	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	N/A	N/A	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	0%	Unknown	0
Turkey Peak Reservoir	Palo Pinto County MWD 1	G	2030	$200,789,000	2176	Action Taken	Application submitted, date unknown	N/A	N/A	5/5/2014	N/A	2/12/2018	N/A	N/A	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	2023	2025	0%	2028	N/A

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

CHAPTER 6 CONSISTENCY WITH LONG-TERM PROTECTION OF THE STATE'S WATER, AGRICULTURAL, AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The 2026 Plan is consistent with long-term protection of the State's water resources, agricultural resources, and natural resources and is developed based on guidance principles outlined in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 358 – State Water Planning Guidelines. The 2026 Plan was produced with an understanding of the importance of orderly development, management, and conservation of water resources and is consistent with all laws applicable to water use for the State and regional water planning areas. Furthermore, the Plan was developed according to principles governing surface water and groundwater rights. Availability of water for new surface water supplies considered environmental flow needs as defined by the environmental flow standards adopted in the Brazos Basin and incorporated into the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Brazos Water Availability Model (WAM Run 3), and protection of existing water rights. For groundwater, the 2026 Plan recognizes principles for groundwater management in Texas, and estimates of groundwater availability take into account the modeled available groundwater (MAG) as determined and required by the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB).

The 2026 Plan identifies actions and policies necessary to meet the Brazos G Area's near and long-term water needs by developing and recommending feasible water management strategies (WMS) to meet needs with reasonable cost, good water quality, and sufficient protection of agricultural and natural resources of the State. The Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) has recommended WMS that consider the public interest of the State, wholesale water providers (WWPs), protection of existing water rights, and opportunities that encourage voluntary transfers of water resources while balancing economic, social, and ecological viability. When needs cannot be met economically with feasible WMS, socioeconomic impact analyses was performed by the TWDB and incorporated into the Final Plan. This socioeconomic impact analysis provides an estimate of the economic loss associated with not meeting these needs. This analysis was included in the Final Plan in Appendix G.

The 2026 Plan considers environmental information resulting from site-specific studies and ongoing development of water projects when evaluating WMS. Cumulative effects of WMS on Brazos River instream flows and inflows to the Gulf of Mexico were considered, as documented later in this chapter. A list of endangered and threatened species in the Brazos G Area for each county was obtained from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) and possible impacts to these species and/or their habitats were considered for each water management strategy evaluated.

The 2026 Plan consists of initiatives to respond to continuing drought conditions in the western part of the Region and makes use of relatively low-impact strategies such as reuse of wastewater return flows. As a further drought protection provision, the Brazos G RWPG adopted use of safe yield analyses for purposes of determining water supply for municipal supply reservoirs upstream of Possum Kingdom Reservoir.

The use of safe yield analyses anticipates that a future drought may occur that is greater in severity than the worst drought of record and reserves a certain amount of water in storage (i.e., a 6-month, or 1- or 2-year supply) for such an event. Use of safe yield in the upper Brazos Basin is justified based on the severity of the recent drought. Figure 6.1 presents the cumulative gaged streamflow for the United States Geological Survey gage located on the Clear Fork of the Brazos River near Nugent, TX. The figure shows how flows during the drought beginning in 1997 are significantly less than those of the previous drought of record (1950's drought). When the drought cumulative streamflows are compared to the 1950s droughts at the 14 years mark from the beginning of the drought, total streamflow is 53 percent of the total streamflow for the 1950s. Additionally, the duration of the drought is more than four years longer than the 1950s drought.



Figure 6.1 Cumulative Gaged Flows at Clear Fork of the Brazos near Nugent

The Brazos G RWPG conducted numerous meetings during the 2026 planning cycle, which were open to the public, and decisions were based on accurate, objective, and reliable information. The Brazos G RWPG coordinated water planning activities with local, regional and State agencies, and was committed to facilitating the initiatives and addressing the concerns of local and regional entities.

The Brazos G RWPG developed policy recommendations regarding State water policy after extensive consideration and deliberation, and these are presented in Chapter 8 of this report. The Brazos G RWPG considered recommendations of stream segments with unique ecological value by TPWD and sites of unique value for construction of reservoirs. At this time, the Brazos G RWPG recommends that no stream segments be designated as unique; and recommends that reservoir sites be recommended as unique if recommended as WMS and not previously recommended as unique (Chapter 8).

Other than small watercraft used primarily for recreation on lakes and rivers, the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area (BGRWPA) includes no use of water for navigation. No water management strategy considered by the Brazos G RWPG will affect navigation, either in the BGRWPA or in adjacent regions.

6.1 Cumulative Hydrologic Effects of Implementing the Brazos G Regional Water Plan

The following sections describe in more detail the hydrologic effects of the recommended WMS on surface water and groundwater resources.

6.1.1 Surface Water

Sophisticated hydrologic models have been employed to quantify the cumulative effects of implementation of the 2026 Plan through the year 2080. Surface water effects were quantified using the TCEQ Brazos WAM Run 3. The assumptions of WAM Run 3 include no return flows (unless included as a specific component to a strategy), as-permitted diversions and reservoir contents, Brazos River Authority (BRA) System Operations, and the environmental flow standards adopted by the TCEQ for the Brazos Basin.

The cumulative effects of the Plan can be quantified by comparing conditions prior to implementation of the Plan (base condition) to conditions with the Plan in place. The base condition against which to compare conditions with the Plan in place was streamflow computed by the Brazos WAM under the Run 3 assumptions.

The conditions with the Plan in place include the base condition assumptions, with the addition of any recommended strategies that could measurably affect streamflows, i.e., those that result in development of additional water supply. The recommended WMS, shown in Figure 6.2 and listed in Table 6.1, were incorporated into the model. Specific strategies not included in the analysis are direct reuse projects, conservation, strategies transferring water from one entity to another through new or increased purchases, and development of additional groundwater. The base condition assumes full utilization of water rights, and conservation or transfers of water will not impact the assumption of full utilization of water rights. Surface water/groundwater interactions are difficult to quantify, but reductions in streamflow due to increased utilization of groundwater resources are expected to be small. As a result, the Control of Naturally Occurring Salinity recommended strategy in the upper Brazos River Basin is not anticipated to significantly impact streamflow and is not included in the cumulative effects analysis.

The cumulative effects of the 2026 Plan on streamflows were evaluated at the eight locations presented in Table 6.2. Each selected location is in the Brazos G portion of the Brazos River Basin, except the Brazos River at Richmond site. This location was included in the analysis to illustrate the impacts of Brazos G strategies on the lower part of the basin.



ID	Recommended Water Management Strategy
1	Lake Creek Reservoir
2	Throckmorton Reservoir
3	Cedar Ridge Reservoir
4	Turkey Peak Dam - Lake Palo Pinto Enlargement
5	BRA System Operations
6	Lake Whitney Reallocation
7	Lake Aquilla Reallocation
8	Clifton Reservoir Enlargement
9	Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir
10	Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir
11	Brushy Creek Reservoir
12	Belton-Stillhouse Pipeline
13	Lake Georgetown ASR
14	Lake Granger ASR
15	Lake Granger Augmentation

Figure 6.2 Location of Recommended WMS Included in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Table 6.1 Recommended WMS Included in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Recommended Water Management Strategy	WUG or WWP
Lake Creek Reservoir	North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority
Throckmorton Reservoir	City of Throckmorton
Cedar Ridge Reservoir	City of Abilene
Turkey Peak Dam – Lake Palo Pinto Enlargement	Palo Pinto County MWD No.1
Lake Waco Reallocation	City of Waco
Lake Whitney Reallocation	BRA - Multiple
Lake Aquilla Reallocation	BRA – Multiple
Bosque County Regional Project – Clifton Reservoir Enlargement	BRA - Multiple
Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir	BRA - Multiple
Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir	City of Groesbeck
Brushy Creek Reservoir	City of Marlin
Lake Georgetown Aquifer Storage and Recovery	BRA - Multiple

Recommended Water Management Strategy	WUG or WWP
Lake Granger Aquifer Storage and Recovery	BRA - Multiple
Lake Granger Augmentation	BRA - Multiple

Notes:
MWD – municipal water district; WUG – water user group

Table 6.2 Locations for Evaluating the Effects of Recommended Strategies on Streamflow and Inflows to the Brazos River Estuary

Location	WAM Control Point Identifier	Region Location (G/H)
Brazos River at South Bend	BRSB23	G
Brazos River near Glen Rose	BRGR30	G
Brazos River near Aquilla	BRAQ33	G
Bosque River near Waco	BOWA40	G
Little River near Cameron	LRCA58	G
Brazos River near Bryan	BRBR59	G
Brazos River near Hempstead	BRHE68	H
Brazos River at Richmond	BRRI70	H
Brazos River at Gulf of Mexico	BRGM73	H

Strategies requiring a new water right permit were simulated junior to all other appropriations in the Brazos River Basin including the BRA System Operations Permit. It was assumed during evaluation of most of the strategies that some form of priority calls agreement would be required between the BRA and the entity developing a new water supply project to more fully realize the yield potential of a project. These agreements were not included for new strategies in the cumulative impacts analysis, unless the entity sponsoring a strategy already has an agreement with the BRA. In all cases, the priorities of BRA's existing rights were honored, as simulated under system operations.

The existing priority calls agreements with the BRA and other water right holders were considered in this model run. The inclusion or exclusion of the subordination agreements does not affect the resulting streamflows at the selected locations in a substantive manner.

The cumulative effects of the recommended WMS on regulated streamflow were evaluated by comparing descriptive streamflow statistics for the base condition with those from the Plan condition at the selected evaluation locations.

Figure 6.3 through Figure 6.11 present these comparisons for regulated streamflow at each of the evaluation locations. Regulated flow is the total streamflow remaining in the stream after all existing water rights have been exercised and other water management activities have taken place. It represents the total flow passing a location (control point) after all water rights have appropriated the flows to which they are entitled.

Many locations on the main stem of the Brazos River exhibit reduced median monthly flows with the implementation of the 2026 Plan than with the base condition. The Bosque and Little River segments show increased median monthly flows from the base conditions with the full implementation of the Plan.

The median stream flow reductions of the Brazos River near South Bend are the result of the implementation of the Cedar Ridge, Lake Creek, and Throckmorton Reservoirs. The largest decrease would occur in May at 16 percent with all other months decreasing less than 14 percent . However, the streamflow frequency plot shows that the overall change to the flow regime is minor.

The Brazos River near Aquilla location shows decreases in median streamflow for nine of the 12 months. The range of differences at this location is a 35 percent decrease in February to a five percent increase in June, with three months having increased median flows. These differences are likely attributed to the reallocation of Lake Aquilla and have a minor impact to the overall flow regime as shown in the streamflow frequency figure. The Bosque River near Waco location controls a relatively small watershed compared to the other locations investigated in this analysis. Changes associated with this location are relatively negligible. The Little River near Cameron location reflects changes from projects recommended for implementation in the Little River watershed, specifically the Lake Granger Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) and Augmentation strategies and the Lake Georgetown ASR strategy. While monthly median flows exhibit increases up to 57 percent in August, little difference is apparent in the overall frequency of flows.

The four most downstream locations, Brazos River near Bryan, Brazos River near Hempstead, Brazos River at Richmond, and the Brazos River at the Gulf of Mexico are all located on the main stem of the Brazos River and the changes in streamflow at these locations show similar trends. These locations are located downstream in the basin and downstream from the majority of the recommended WMS. These locations have the potential to be impacted by the implementation of any of the proposed strategies. New reservoir and diversion projects will tend to reduce streamflow at these locations, while alterations in the BRA System Operations tends to increase streamflows as releases from upstream reservoirs pass these locations to satisfy demands at downstream locations. The Bryan location shows decreases in median streamflow for all 12 months by as much as 26 percent and Hempstead sees 11 months with decrease in median streamflow by as much as 20 percent . At the Richmond location, 11 months have a decrease in median flow by as much as 13 percent . As with the middle and upper basin streamflow locations, there is little difference in the overall frequency of flows at the lower basin locations. The Brazos River at the Gulf of Mexico location shows decreases in median streamflow in 11 months by as much as 47 percent .

Overall, the cumulative effects of the implemented Plan will have a slight to modest effect on streamflows in the Brazos Basin with both increases and decreases. Locations below new reservoirs or reservoirs with augmented supplies will generally experience reduced streamflows; although generally not to a significant level, and the detrimental effects of these reductions can be minimized with proper consideration of reservoir pass-through requirements to maintain flows necessary to meet the needs of the environment. In summary, none of the locations will experience significantly different streamflows with implementation of the recommended WMS in the 2026 Plan.

6.1.2 Groundwater

Recommended WMS involving additional development of groundwater would increase total groundwater usage by entities in the Brazos G Area by slightly more than 140,046 acre-feet per year (ac-ft/yr) by 2080. The greatest increase occurs in the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer where strategies involving groundwater development for Brazos G entities would increase pumping by about 93,181 ac-ft/yr over what is considered to be existing supplies. In the Carrizo-Wilcox, strategies include an additional 74,581 ac-ft/yr of pumping by 2080. Overall, the amount of groundwater identified for WMS is rather modest in comparison to the amount from all the other WMS. However, the development of groundwater is likely to be concentrated in a few areas, which could experience noticeable declines in groundwater levels. However, none of the strategies increase projected groundwater pumpage beyond the MAG established by county and aquifer. Thus, projected groundwater conditions are expected to be within the desired future conditions and within a range that the local groundwater conservation districts consider manageable.



Figure 6.3 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River at South Bend



Figure 6.4 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River near Glen Rose



Figure 6.5 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River near Aquilla



Figure 6.6 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Bosque River near Waco



Figure 6.7 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Little River near Cameron



Figure 6.8 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River near Bryan



Figure 6.9 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River near Hempstead



Figure 6.10 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River at Richmond



Figure 6.11 Effects of Plan Implementation on Streamflows – Brazos River at Gulf of Mexico

6.2 Summary of the Environmental Effects of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

Overall, the strategies recommended in the 2026 Plan will have limited negative effects on the environment. The largest localized impacts will be from new reservoirs. New reservoirs recommended as strategies in the 2026 Plan (Lake Creek Reservoir, Cedar Ridge Reservoir, Throckmorton Reservoir, Lake Palo Pinto Enlargement, Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir, City of Groesbeck Off-Channel, Brushy Creek Reservoir, Lake Aquilla Reallocation, Lake Granger Reallocation, and Lake Whitney Reallocation) will inundate more than 37,900 acres, reducing wildlife habitat, bottomland hardwood forestland and cultivated farmland as documented in the individual strategy evaluations (Volume II). Permitting for these projects will require mitigation land of at least equal ecological value, reducing the negative environmental consequences of the projects. Streamflows immediately downstream from these projects will decrease but permit requirements will also specify reservoir pass-through flows necessary to maintain ecological health in the downstream receiving stream. Decreased flows from the historical natural flows resulting from reservoirs, other water uses, and diversions can have an accumulative impact by lowering downstream flows.

Many elements of the 2026 Plan augment existing resources and delay or eliminate the need for new constructed projects. For example, reallocation of reservoir hydropower or flood storage pools offers a change in use of existing reservoir facilities and makes available additional supply that previously would have only been made available through construction of a major water supply project. Utilization of water from the Colorado River Basin's Highland Lakes System in Williamson County reduces the need for new major water supply projects to serve Williamson County needs. The utilization of reuse water by several WUGs and WWPs will extend supplies and could delay the need for new raw water projects. Augmentation of Lake Granger through conjunctive use with an ASR project maximizes the use of the existing reservoir facility.

Overall, the strategies recommended in the 2026 Plan maximize use of existing resources and reduce the need for several large, costly reservoir projects, minimizing impacts to the environment.

6.3 Impacts of Recommended WMS on Key Parameters of Water Quality and Moving Water from Rural and Agricultural Areas

The guidelines for 2026 Regional Water Plans include describing major impacts of recommended WMS on key parameters of water quality identified by the regional water planning group and consideration of third party social and economic impacts associated with voluntary redistribution of water from rural and agricultural areas.

6.3.1 Impacts of WMS on Key Parameters of Water Quality

The Brazos G RWPG has identified the following 11 key parameters of water quality to consider for recommended WMS:

- Chlorides.
- Sulfates.
- Total dissolved solids.

- Total suspended solids.
- Dissolved oxygen.
- pH range.
- Indicator bacteria (escherichia coli or fecal coliform).
- Temperature.
- Nitrates.
- Total phosphorous.
- Total nitrogen- ammonia.

The selection of key water quality parameters is based on Texas Surface Water Quality Standards Chapter 307, current water quality concerns identified in the BRA's Basin Highlights Report, water user concerns expressed during Brazos G RWPG meetings, and regional water quality studies. Total Phosphorous and Total Nitrogen were selected based on nutrient concerns in the North Bosque Watershed and will be considered throughout the Brazos G Region.

The major impacts of recommended WMS on key parameters of water quality were identified by the Brazos G RWPG pursuant to TAC Chapter 357-Regional Water Planning Guidelines. The recommended WMS for the Brazos G Region and effects of the key water quality parameters are presented in Table 6.3.

Water quality concerns affecting existing supplies are described in greater detail in Chapter 3.3, which also includes a summary of special water quality studies and activities in the Brazos River Basin. These identified water quality concerns present challenges that may need to be overcome before a WMS can be used as a water supply. For water quality parameters that cannot be fully addressed due to lack of available information or inconclusive water quality studies, the Brazos G RWPG recommends further studies prior to implementing a WMS.

6.3.2 Impacts of Voluntary Redistribution of Water from Rural and Agricultural Areas

Several opportunities for voluntary redistribution exist for the Brazos G Area, such as supplying groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Lee County to water users in Milam County. If there is increased groundwater pumping it could result in lowering of artesian levels in the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and, consequently, may increase costs to pump water for water supply for rural and agricultural users.

The remaining WMS recommended to meet water needs (Chapter 5) do not include transferring significant quantities of water needed by rural and agricultural users and, therefore, are not considered to impact them.

Table 6.3 Summary of WMS, Potential Water Quality Concerns, and WUGs Potentially Affected

Recommended WMS	Project Origination	Beneficiaries of Project	Potential Water Quality Concerns Affecting Use of Supply
Treated Effluent Reuse	Bell, Brazos, Johnson, McLennan, Williamson	Manufacturing (Bell and McLennan Counties) Mining (Johnson and McLennan Counties) Steam-Electric (Brazos and Johnson Counties); Municipal (Cities of Bryan, College Station, Cleburne, Waco, Bellmead, Lacy-Lakeview, Hewitt, Lorena, Harker Heights, Killeen, Brushy Creek MUD, Cedar Park, Cleburne, Liberty Hill, Georgetown and 439 WSC)	Indicator bacteria
Water Conservation	Varies	All municipal, industrial, and agricultural users with projected needs (shortages)*	Total dissolved solids, sulfates, and chlorides
Interbasin Transfer of Surface Water from Lower Colorado River Basin (Region K)			
BCRUA	Varies	Municipal (Leander, Liberty Hill, Round Rock, Florence, County-Other [Williamson], Corix Utilities and Cedar Park)	None identified
New Reservoirs			
Brushy Creek Reservoir	Falls	Municipal (City of Marlin)	None identified
Cedar Ridge Reservoir	Clear Fork	Municipal (City of Abilene, County-Other [Taylor], Merkel, Potosi WSC, Roscoe, Steamboat WSC, Sweetwater, The Bitter Creek WSC and Tye); Irrigation (Taylor County) Manufacturing (Nolan County); Mining (Nolan and Taylor Counties)	None identified
Clifton Lake	Bosque	Municipal (City of Clifton, Meridian, Valley Mills, Childress Creek WSC and County-Other [Bosque])	None identified
Coryell County OCR	Coryell	Municipal (Gatesville, Flat WSC, County-Other [Coryell] and Multi-County WSC)	None identified
Groesbeck OCR	Limestone	Municipal (City of Groesbeck)	None identified
Lake Creek Reservoir	Throckmorton and Baylor	Municipal (North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority, Haskell, Knox City and Munday)	Total dissolved solids, sulfates, and chlorides from Brazos River diversion
Throckmorton Reservoir	Throckmorton	Municipal (City of Throckmorton and Graham)	None identified
Wheeler Branch OCR	Somervell	Municipal (Somervell County Water District, Glen Rose and County-Other [Somervell]); Steam-Electric (Somervell)	None identified

Recommended WMS	Project Origination	Beneficiaries of Project	Potential Water Quality Concerns Affecting Use of Supply
Augmentation of Existing Surface Water Supplies			
Lake Aquilla Reallocation	Hill	BRA	None identified
Lake Whitney Reallocation	Bosque/Hill	BRA	None identified
Lake Waco Reallocation	Bell	City of Waco	None Identified
Lake Granger ASR	Williamson	BRA	Increasing trends in sulfates, chlorides, elevated nutrients, and sedimentation from total suspended solids
Lake Granger Augmentation	Williamson	BRA	Increasing trends in sulfates, chlorides, elevated nutrients, and sedimentation from total suspended solids
Lake Georgetown ASR	Williamson	BRA	Increasing trends in sulfates, chlorides, elevated nutrients, and sedimentation from total suspended solids
Turkey Peak Dam – Lake Palo Pinto Enlargement	Palo Pinto	Municipal (Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1, Santo SUD, Count-Other [Palo Pinto] and Mineral Wells); Irrigation (Palo Pinto County)	None identified
Bryan ASR	Brazos	Municipal (City of Bryan)	None identified
College Station ASR	Brazos	Municipal (City of College Station)	None identified
Johnson County ASR	Johnson	Municipal (Johnson County SUD)	None identified
McLennan County ASR	McLennan	Municipal (City of Mart, Waco and North Bosque WSC)	None identified

Recommended WMS	Project Origination	Beneficiaries of Project	Potential Water Quality Concerns Affecting Use of Supply
Groundwater Development			
Blaine Aquifer	Stonewall, Knox, Fisher, Nolan	Mining (Stonewall, Knox counties); Irrigation (Knox County); Municipal (The Bitter Creek WSC)	Chlorides and total dissolved solids
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Brazos, Lee, Robertson, Limestone, Milam, Burleson, Williamson, Bell, Burnet	Mining (Lee county); Manufacturing (Limestone County); Steam Power (Limestone); Municipal (Robertson County-Other, Bryan, Bistone MWSD, Hutto, Georgetown, College Station, Southwest Milam WSC, Rockdale, Robertson County WSM, Milam County-Other, Mexia)	Iron and manganese and temperature (deep wells only)
Edwards Aquifer	Bell, Nolan, Williamson	Irrigation (Bell and Williamson Counties); Manufacturing (Bell and Nolan Counties); Mining (Bell and Nolan counties); Municipal (Roscoe)	None
Trinity Aquifer	Bell, Bosque, Comanche, Coryell, Erath, Hamilton, Hood, Somervell, McLennan, Eastland, Williamson, Falls, Hill, Johnson, Palo Pinto	Mining (Hood, Somervell, Comanche, Eastland, Coryell, Bell, Palo Pinto counties); Manufacturing (Erath, Hamilton counties); Irrigation (Hamilton, Bosque, McLennan, Palo Pinto counties); Municipal (Bartlett, Comanche County-Other, Coryell County-Other, Erath County-Other, Hill County-Other, Hood County-Other, McLennan County-Other, Williamson County-Other, Acton MUD, Axtell WSC, Bell County WCID 2, Bethesda WSC, Brandon Irene WSC, Chalk Bluff WSC, Crawford, Double Diamond Utilities, East Crawford WSC, Gholson WSC, Godley, Gordon, Highland Park WSC, Itasca, Johnson County SUD, Levi WSC, Lipan, Parker WSC, Spring Valley WSC, Stephenville, Strawn, Tolar, Woodrow Osceola WSC, Woodway)	Chlorides and total dissolved solids
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Grimes, Washington, Lampasas	Irrigation (Grimes County); Manufacturing (Washington County); Mining (Grimes and Washington Counties); Municipal (Brenham, Central Washington County WSC, Corix Utilities and Grimes County-Other)	None identified
Seymour Aquifer	Kent, Jones, Fisher	Municipal (Kent County-Other, Jones County-Other, Fisher County-Other)	Chlorides and total dissolved solids
Sparta Aquifer	Burleson, Brazos, Grimes, Robertson	Manufacturing (Burleson County); Mining (Brazos County); Municipal (Wickson Creek SUD)	Iron and manganese
Woodbine Aquifer	Hill, Johnson	Irrigation (Hill County); Municipal (Hill County-Other, Bethesda WSC, Chatt WSC, Grandview, Johnson County SUD)	Chlorides, total dissolved solids, iron and manganese

Recommended WMS	Project Origination	Beneficiaries of Project	Potential Water Quality Concerns Affecting Use of Supply
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Brazos, Robertson	Mining (Brazos County); Municipal (Brazos County-Other, Willborn SUD)	Chlorides and total dissolved solids
College Station GW Desal	Brazos	College Station	Chlorides and total dissolved solids
Cross Timbers Aquifer	Throckmorton, Young	Municipal (Young County-Other); Irrigation (Throckmorton and Young Counties); Livestock (Young County); Manufacturing (Young County); Mining (Throckmorton and Young Counties)	None identified
Williamson County GW	Williamson, Bell, Coryell	Williamson County-Other, Elm Creek WSC, Hutto, Round Rock	None identified
Texas A&M Sparta Aquifer	Brazos	Texas A&M University	None identified
Queen City Aquifer	Burleson, Milam	Manufacturing (Burleson); Mining (Milam)	None identified
Marble Falls Aquifer	Lampasas	Irrigation	None identified
Falls County – Brazos River Alluvium	Falls	County-Other	None identified
Lee County - GW	Lee	County-Other	None identified

Notes:
(1) For municipal users with shortages, additional conservation was recommended only for WUGs exceeding their target gallons per capita per day (gpcd), which is 140 gpcd for most WUGs and 120 gpcd for selected WUGs in Williamson County:

6.3.3 Consistency with Protection of Agricultural Resources

Agriculture plays a vital role in the economy of the BGRWPA. With approximately 84 percent of the Region's land area being classified as farmland and approximately 35 percent of all water use in the Region dedicated towards agriculture, sufficient water supply is critical for the success of the Region's long-term agricultural sustainability (see Volume I Sections 1.8.4 & 1.9.7 for details). In particular, dairy farming in the Region is very important, with Erath and Comanche Counties accounting for almost 80 percent of dairy cows in the BGRWPA, as highlighted in Appendix E. Agriculture in the BGRWPA is heavily dependent on the six major and 11 minor aquifers found in the Region. As illustrated in Volume I Section 1.5.1.1, most of these aquifers have already been highly developed and have little potential for further development, making them vulnerable to depletion. WMS such as the Managed Aquifer Recharge Project in Haskell and Knox Counties and other ASR projects, as well as various groundwater strategies, will ensure that agricultural users are provided supplies of water across various counties throughout the BGRWPA.

As presented in Appendix P, most WMS in the Brazos G RWPA are estimated to have a small permanent acreage impact and minimal to no impact on agricultural acreage. Any potential impacts to agricultural acreage could be mitigated during planning and design of individual projects. Some projects, such as Williamson County Groundwater Strategies, the Managed Aquifer Recharge Project, the East Williamson County Water Supply Project, and the Somervell County Water Supply Project, could result in permanent impacts to significant areas of agricultural land, with individual projects affecting between 2,000 and over 21,000 acres. The Brush Control strategy, which spans nearly 49,000 acres, may also influence agricultural use depending on implementation. These strategies will require additional site-specific evaluation to assess potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures during project planning and permitting.

6.3.4 Consistency with Protection of Natural Resources

The BGRWPA contains many natural resources including threatened or endangered species, wildlife habitat, and navigation. Following is a brief discussion of how the 2026 Plan is consistent with the long-term protection of these resources. Appendix P also includes a summary of the recommended WMS in the BGRWPA and their potential impacts on natural resources.

Threatened/Endangered Species. A list of species (contained in Appendix 1-A) of special concern, including threatened or endangered species, located within the BGRWPA includes 12 species of birds, 5 amphibians , 4 reptiles, 6 fish, 5 mollusks, and 4 plants.

In general, most WMS in the BGRWPA will not affect threatened or endangered species. Development of new reservoirs as well as large-scale managed aquifer recharge projects in the region could affect threatened or endangered species and their habitats. These projects will require detailed environmental studies, including species impact assessments. If adverse impacts are identified, they must be mitigated in accordance with federal and state environmental regulations as a condition of project approval.

Wildlife Habitat. The BGRWPA is home to various biotic provinces that each contain unique habitat for wildlife. For example, the Texan biotic province is home to 49 species of mammals, 39 species of snakes, 16 lizard species, 2 land turtle species, 18 toad and frog species, and 5 salamander species (see Volume I, Section 1.9.6 for details). Most WMS located within this biotic province are anticipated to have minimal impacts, and where impacts may occur, mitigation measures will be employed to reduce or offset effects.

Navigation. No strategies identified in the BGRWPA were identified to have an impact on navigation.

6.4 Social and Economic Impacts of Not Meeting Projected Water Needs

Section 357.40(a) of the rules for implementing Senate Bill (SB1) requires that the social and economic impacts of not meeting regional water supply needs be evaluated by regional water planning groups. The purpose of this element of SB1 planning is to provide an estimate of the social and economic importance of meeting projected water needs or, conversely, to provide estimates of potential costs of not meeting the projected needs of each WUG. The social and economic effects of not meeting a projected water need can be viewed as the potential benefit to be gained from implementing a strategy to meet the particular need. The summation of all the impacts provides a view of the ultimate magnitude of the economic impacts of not meeting all the projected needs.

The TWDB performed a socioeconomic impact analysis for the Brazos G Area, which is attached as Appendix G. After the release of the full socioeconomic impact analysis, TWDB has noted manufacturing impact analyses are likely overestimated to some degree due to, among possible other factors, the abnormal manufacturing productivity data collection results accompanying the COVID-19 pandemic for the 2021 base year in TWDB's modeled results. However, TWDB noted that they could not correct these estimates due to the timing constraint. A more robust explanation is included as the addendum to the reissued impact report for inclusion in the final adopted Regional Water Plan. This addendum is also included in Appendix G.

Under these assumptions and limitations, notable findings from Addendum are summarized as follows:

Brazos G could face significant economic and social impacts if identified water needs are not met. In the event of a drought of record, the region may experience an annual income loss of approximately $9.2 billion by 2030, escalating to over $13 billion by 2080. Corresponding job losses could rise from approximately 41,068 in 2030 to more than 86,417 in 2080. These estimates reflect both direct and indirect effects across multiple sectors, including manufacturing, mining, irrigation, livestock, municipal water supply, and steam-electric power generation.

The economic impact of unmet water needs varies significantly by sector, with income losses ranging from approximately:

- $13-14 million in irrigation.
- $33-35 million in livestock.
- $1.9 – 3.0 billion in manufacturing.
- $6.2 – 6.4 billion in mining.
- $0.5 – 3.1 billion in municipal.
- $597 – 676 million in steam electric power generation.

As a result, even small shortages in high-value sectors such as manufacturing and mining can result in disproportionately large economic losses. However, TWDB's modeling was conducted at the regional level and applied to county-level needs, which may not always align with local economic profiles.

Tax revenue losses on production and imports could reach approximately $844 million by 2080, with additional local fiscal strain tied to slowed economic growth. Social impacts include potential out-migration of more than 12,000 individuals and loss of approximately 2,300 students from school enrollment across the region by 2080. Consumer surplus losses, representing diminished household well-being due to water restrictions, could grow from an estimated $212 million annually in 2030 to more than $4.1 billion by 2080.

These projections assume no mitigation strategies are implemented and are based on 2023 dollars. They provide a snapshot of the potential one-year impact in each decadal period, highlighting the growing severity of unmet water needs over time and reinforcing the importance of implementing effective WMS.

6.5 Needs Left Unmet in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

Table 6.4 and Table 6.5 summarizes the needs left unmet for the Brazos G primary WUGs, by water use category and by WUG. Additional details are discussed in Sections 6.5.1 and 6.5.2 below.

6.5.1 Municipal Needs Unmet in 2030

For a WMS or project to meet needs within the context of regional water planning, a project must be potentially feasible while not over-allocating a water source. The 2026 Brazos G RWP reflects realistic, economically viable strategies and projects with online dates that consider lack of action to date. This includes consideration of a strategy's feasibility in the real-world regulatory and water management context, noting the capability for WUGs to feasibly obtain supply beyond what is identified as available for the purposes of regional water planning.

It is appropriate, therefore, that the plans reflect the resulting unmet municipal needs that may arise because of such considerations. Such needs may arise that, in the event of drought, could only be addressed through drought restrictions – until such time that a project can be brought online. In the 2026 Brazos G RWP, needs remain unmet for a significant number of municipal WUGs because potentially feasible WMS and projects cannot come online by the decade in which the need arises, or a strategy may not realistically be feasible outside of the regional planning context. The unmet municipal needs identified for WUGs in the Brazos G Region are shown in Table 6.5.

For a regional water plan to be approved by the TWDB with any unmet municipal needs, TAC 357.50(j)(1-3) states that the regional water planning group includes adequate justification, including the following requirements:

> *"(1) documents that the RWPG considered all potentially feasible WMS, including Drought Management WMS and contains an explanation why additional conservation and/or Drought Management WMS were not recommended to address the need;"*

All potentially feasible WMS and water management strategy projects were considered to meet the needs identified herein, including drought management WMS. The Brazos G RWPG identified no additional potentially feasible strategies that could be implemented for these municipal WUGs beyond those identified herein. The Brazos G RWPG has already recommended advanced water conservation for WUGs

with baseline gpcd higher than their associated targets as water conservation is likely a cheaper alternative for many WUGs than acquiring new supplies.

The Brazos G RWPG does not recommend Drought Management as a recommended water management strategy to meet needs. Drought management measures reduce water demands during times of drought, and do not make more efficient use of existing resources. Applying drought management measures is equivalent to not meeting the projected water demands, per the explanation provided in Chapter 7, and the Brazos G RWPG prefers to show the needs projected for municipal WUGs as not being met during a drought equivalent to the drought of record rather than artificially showing them as met by reducing demands during drought.

Further, the Brazos G RWPG incorporated into its adopted process for identifying recommended WMS the assessment of feasibility as described by the TWDB for identifying infeasible strategies from the 2021 Brazos G RWP. This step was incorporated to further avoid recommending infeasible strategies in future plans. As such, if a WUG or WWP has not taken sufficient steps to make a project reasonably feasible of providing water by the online decade identified within the Plan, then a strategy may have been considered but deemed infeasible for recommendation, thus leaving an unmet need (unless another feasible strategy were identified). The Brazos G RWPG prefers to show the needs projected for municipal WUGs as not being met during a drought equivalent to the drought of record rather than artificially showing them as met by recommending an infeasible strategy.

> *"(2) describes how, in the event of a repeat of the Drought of Record, the municipal WUGs associated with the unmet need shall ensure the public health, safety, and welfare in each Planning Decade that has an unmet need; and"*

While the Brazos G RWPG does not recommend Drought Management as a water management strategy nor infeasible strategies to meet projected needs for municipal WUGs, the Brazos G RWPG recognizes that drought management measures will be implemented by utilities as outlined in their individual Drought Contingency Plans. These measures can prolong supply and reduce impacts to communities by limiting water use to only essential water uses in order to protect public health, safety and welfare.

The Brazos G Region is vast with many relatively isolated communities with limited water supply alternatives. If Drought Management or infeasible strategies were to be recommended, this could provide a false sense of security that "needs are met" when, in actuality, projected water demands would not be met. In the event of a drought worse than the drought of record, this approach could further imperil a community because the benefits of drought management have already been realized in the Plan and there are no additional management strategies that can be employed in response to the drought.

> *"(3) explains whether there may be occasion, prior to development of the next IPP, to amend the RWP to address all or a portion of the unmet need."*

For unmet needs in 2030, there will be limited opportunity or need to amend the 2026 Plan prior to development of the next initially prepared plan to address the unmet municipal needs. The 2026 Brazos G RWP identifies unmet municipal needs in all planning decades as well as the percentage of demand left unmet in 2030. Any amendments would have to be accomplished and include strategies that would come online prior to 2030, which is four years after the adoption of the 2026 RWP. Therefore, the identification of those strategies by the Brazos G RWPG is unlikely. However, entities in the Brazos G Region can either contact the Brazos G RWPG for additional assistance or develop their own strategies to meet their needs.

One particular instance where unmet needs may be met may occur with updates to the MAG related to Limestone County.

For unmet needs identified for later decades in the planning period, there will be the opportunity, prior to the development of the next initially prepared plan, to amend the 2026 Plan to address all or a portion of the unmet municipal need.

6.5.2 Non-Municipal Needs Unmet

The Brazos G RWPG has opted to leave certain projected needs unmet for some county-aggregated non-municipal WUGs in the 2026 Brazos G RWP for the following reasons. Table 6.5 lists those unmet non-municipal needs.

- Irrigation:
  - No economically viable supply can be developed.
- Livestock:
  - Small need in 2030 only.
- Manufacturing:
  - Small need in 2030 only.
- Mining:
  - No reasonable supply can be developed.
  - Mining customers are encouraged to explore reuse options to address their supply shortfalls. However, the Brazos G RWPG does not provide individual WMS for mining customers due to the absence of a sponsor. It is expected that mining customers will develop their own reuse strategies as the need arises.
- Steam-Electric:
  - No reasonable supply can be developed.

Table 6.4 Needs Left Unmet for Brazos G Primary WUGs by Use Category

WUG Type	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)						Percent of Overall Demands left Unmet in 2030
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Municipal	22,267	29,040	65,020	90,637	95,588	132,250	4%
Irrigation	45,563	35,948	31,439	28,708	30,891	31,139	14%
Livestock	900	908	915	922	929	936	2%
Manufacturing	257	268	275	694	828	319	2%
Mining	7,725	7,460	7,378	7,512	6,653	6,770	28%
Steam Electric Power	25,824	26,577	18,911	19,387	19,850	20,432	16%
Total Brazos G WUGs	**102,536**	**100,201**	**123,938**	**147,860**	**154,739**	**191,846**	**9%**

Table 6.5 Needs for WUGs Left Unmet in the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan

WUG Type	WUG Name	Counties	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)						Percent of Overall Demands left Unmet in 2030
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Municipal	Aspermont	Stonewall	16	0	0	0	0	0	7%
Municipal	Bell County WCID 3	Bell	252	548	1,083	1,619	1,750	1,880	15%
Municipal	Belton	Bell	0	0	0	0	294	817	0%
Municipal	Benjamin	Knox	21	19	0	0	0	0	37%
Municipal	Bistone Municipal Water Supply District	Limestone	0	58	143	147	127	197	0%
Municipal	Brandon Irene WSC	Hill	52	40	13	0	0	13	20%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Bell	Bell	31	0	0	0	0	0	1%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Comanche	Comanche	8,288	7,673	7,074	7,101	7,144	7,178	32%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Grimes	Grimes	8	4	1	1	1	1	5%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Hamilton	Hamilton	0	0	0	3	6	7	0%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Haskell	Haskell	6,562	0	0	0	0	0	13%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Johnson	Johnson	229	217	207	207	207	207	42%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Knox	Knox	8,837	8,513	6,466	3,831	6,024	6,237	24%
Irrigation	Irrigation, McLennan	McLennan	111	9	0	0	0	0	2%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Nolan	Nolan	9,287	9,056	8,441	8,199	8,038	8,038	72%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Robertson	Robertson	11,219	9,741	8,536	8,652	8,757	8,757	15%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Stephens	Stephens	87	84	81	81	81	81	57%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Taylor	Taylor	498	261	261	261	261	261	35%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Williamson	Williamson	212	206	198	198	198	198	53%
Irrigation	Irrigation, Young	Young	194	184	174	174	174	174	30%
Livestock	Livestock, Comanche	Comanche	784	784	784	784	784	784	23%
Livestock	Livestock, Palo Pinto	Palo Pinto	95	103	110	117	124	131	5%
Livestock	Livestock, Somervell	Somervell	21	21	21	21	21	21	14%
Manufacturing	Manufacturing, Eastland	Eastland	0	0	0	0	0	15	0%
Manufacturing	Manufacturing, Lampasas	Lampasas	37	45	49	58	61	53	16%

WUG Type	WUG Name	Counties	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)						Percent of Overall Demands left Unmet in 2030
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Manufacturing	Manufacturing, Limestone	Limestone	220	223	226	234	241	251	87%
Manufacturing	Manufacturing, Taylor	Taylor	0	0	0	402	526	0	0%
Mining	Mining, Burleson	Burleson	3,384	3,273	3,161	3,161	3,161	3,161	61%
Mining	Mining, Eastland	Eastland	213	221	199	214	200	200	66%
Mining	Mining, Haskell	Haskell	4	4	4	4	4	4	100%
Mining	Mining, Limestone	Limestone	2,923	2,892	2,858	2,878	1,953	2,019	83%
Mining	Mining, Somervell	Somervell	833	898	957	1,027	1,085	1,130	61%
Mining	Mining, Taylor	Taylor	368	172	199	228	250	256	72%
Municipal	Brushy Creek MUD	Williamson	481	108	0	0	8	28	12%
Municipal	Cego-Durango WSC	Falls	0	6	34	58	89	133	0%
Municipal	Central Texas College District	Bell, Coryell	145	128	111	93	75	75	84%
Municipal	Chatt WSC	Hill	0	0	2	3	4	10	0%
Municipal	Copperas Cove	Coryell, Lampasas	0	1,026	2,374	3,253	3,578	2,012	0%
Municipal	County-Other, Bell	Bell	473	564	598	536	427	275	62%
Municipal	County-Other, Comanche	Comanche	1	0	0	0	0	0	10%
Municipal	County-Other, Grimes	Grimes	199	229	255	265	268	261	30%
Municipal	County-Other, Hill	Hill	127	128	144	161	167	151	27%
Municipal	County-Other, Hood	Hood	618	1,100	1,954	2,791	3,192	3,463	15%
Municipal	County-Other, Johnson	Johnson	14	0	0	0	0	0	1%
Municipal	County-Other, Lee	Lee	5	2	0	0	0	0	2%
Municipal	County-Other, McLennan	McLennan	0	169	214	232	124	250	0%
Municipal	County-Other, Robertson	Robertson	44	15	0	0	0	0	21%
Municipal	County-Other, Williamson	Williamson	2,336	0	0	7,110	0	5,245	31%
Municipal	County-Other, Young	Young	41	56	66	94	88	103	11%

WUG Type	WUG Name	Counties	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)						Percent of Overall Demands left Unmet in 2030
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Municipal	Cross Country WSC	Bosque, McLennan	0	0	0	0	0	136	0%
Municipal	Crowley	Johnson	1	0	0	0	0	2	4%
Municipal	Dog Ridge WSC	Bell	0	1	73	122	178	240	0%
Municipal	Double Diamond Utilities	Hill, Johnson, Palo Pinto	381	311	274	230	160	93	15%
Municipal	Elm Creek WSC	Bell, Coryell, McLennan	95	115	132	107	85	117	14%
Municipal	Files Valley WSC	Hill	0	0	0	0	0	8	0%
Municipal	Florence	Williamson	18	18	20	21	23	25	9%
Municipal	Fort Belknap WSC	Stephens, Throckmorton, Young	0	0	0	17	23	68	0%
Municipal	Fort Gates WSC	Coryell	154	118	96	94	94	92	32%
Municipal	Fort Griffin SUD	Shackelford, Stephens, Throckmorton	9	5	5	4	2	0	30%
Municipal	Gatesville	Coryell	482	585	0	0	0	0	11%
Municipal	Georgetown	Bell, Williamson	0	5,215	30,559	44,713	46,384	60,494	0%
Municipal	Gholson WSC	Hill, McLennan	0	0	49	0	0	79	0%
Municipal	Godley	Johnson	0	0	0	0	27	55	0%
Municipal	Gordon	Erath, Palo Pinto	41	22	1	0	0	0	25%
Municipal	Graham	Young	1,451	1,189	317	127	9	0	59%
Municipal	Groesbeck	Limestone	542	0	0	0	0	0	93%
Municipal	Haskell	Haskell	538	473	0	0	0	0	89%
Municipal	Hilco United Services	Bosque, Hill	232	156	120	155	200	246	19%

WUG Type	WUG Name	Counties	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)						Percent of Overall Demands left Unmet in 2030
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Municipal	Hog Creek WSC	Bosque, McLennan	91	52	12	0	0	0	23%
Municipal	Hutto	Williamson	620	982	1,751	3,067	5,164	9,041	23%
Municipal	Itasca	Hill	1	1	1	1	0	1	7%
Municipal	Jarrell-Schwertner	Bell, Williamson	2,351	3,072	3,527	3,992	4,486	4,989	26%
Municipal	Jonah Water SUD	Williamson	1,690	3,273	4,690	6,149	8,668	11,502	27%
Municipal	Killeen	Bell	0	0	0	0	322	3,901	0%
Municipal	Knox City	Knox	182	183	0	0	0	0	74%
Municipal	Leander	Williamson	0	419	1,482	1,500	1,512	1,520	0%
Municipal	Levi WSC	Falls, McLennan	89	104	112	105	118	130	86%
Municipal	Mart	McLennan	66	0	0	0	0	0	14%
Municipal	McGregor	McLennan	39	0	0	0	0	0	1%
Municipal	Mexia	Limestone	767	729	685	657	636	603	75%
Municipal	Munday	Knox	202	183	0	0	0	0	89%
Municipal	Navarro Mills WSC	Hill	0	0	0	1	1	1	0%
Municipal	North Runnels WSC	Taylor	68	77	85	93	103	114	99%
Municipal	Paloma Lake MUD 1	Williamson	128	134	137	138	138	138	24%
Municipal	Paloma Lake MUD 2	Williamson	103	108	110	111	111	111	26%
Municipal	Prairie Hill WSC	Limestone, McLennan	194	173	165	169	176	194	70%
Municipal	Rio Vista	Hill, Johnson	1	1	1	1	7	47	1%
Municipal	Round Rock	Williamson	0	0	4,451	0	0	1,295	0%
Municipal	Somervell County Water District	Somervell	461	260	11	0	0	0	31%
Municipal	Sonterra MUD	Williamson	936	2,267	3,843	5,551	7,474	9,638	41%
Municipal	Stephenville	Erath	0	0	0	0	102	865	0%

WUG Type	WUG Name	Counties	Needs left Unmet (ac-ft/yr)						Percent of Overall Demands left Unmet in 2030
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	
Municipal	Taylor	Williamson	1,801	3,238	4,870	6,391	8,094	9,995	51%
Municipal	Texas A&M University	Brazos	3,392	1,086	0	0	0	0	33%
Municipal	Texas State Technical College	McLennan	139	0	0	0	0	0	7%
Municipal	The Grove WSC	Bell, Coryell	0	0	5	13	18	56	0%
Municipal	Thorndale	Milam	53	68	86	103	116	137	20%
Municipal	Throckmorton	Throckmorton	84	71	0	0	0	0	58%
Municipal	Waco	McLennan	0	0	0	0	0	32	0%
Municipal	Wickson Creek SUD	Brazos, Grimes, Robertson	0	0	0	0	0	39	0%
Municipal	Williamson County WSID 3	Williamson	40	155	359	643	966	1,333	4%
Steam Electric Power	Steam-Electric Power, Limestone	Limestone	3,054	3,171	3,287	3,403	3,517	3,648	13%
Steam Electric Power	Steam-Electric Power, Robertson	Robertson	7,967	8,194	0	0	0	101	17%
Steam Electric Power	Steam-Electric Power, Somervell	Somervell	14,193	14,579	14,965	15,351	15,737	16,055	20%
Steam Electric Power	Steam-Electric Power, Young	Young	610	633	659	633	596	628	73%

CHAPTER 7 DROUGHT RESPONSE INFORMATION, ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Droughts are of great importance to the planning and management of water resources in Texas. Although droughts can occur in all climatic zones, they have the greatest potential to become catastrophic in dry or arid regions such as West and Central Texas. It is not uncommon for mild droughts to occur over short periods of time in Texas; however, there is no certain way to predict how long or severe a drought will be while it is occurring. The only defense available in drought-prone areas such as the Brazos G Area is proper planning and preparation for worst-case scenarios. This requires understanding of drought patterns and the historical droughts in the Region.

Due to significant population growth throughout Texas, which is expected to continue in the Brazos G Area based on Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) projections, the demand for water has increased. With growing demand and the threat of climate change contributing to water scarcity, planning is even more important to prevent shortages, deterioration of water quality, and lifestyle/financial impacts on water suppliers and users. This chapter presents information on drought preparedness in the Brazos G Area, including regional droughts of record, drought uncertainties, example drought contingency plans (DCPs), drought triggers and actions, emergency interconnects, responses to local drought conditions, and methods to estimate available water supplies in the Region.

7.1 Droughts of Record in the Brazos G Area

Section 7.1 presents information on the droughts of records in the Brazos G Area.

7.1.1 Background

One of the best tools in drought preparedness is a thorough understanding of the drought of record (DOR), or the worst drought to occur for a particular area during the available period of hydrologic data. However, there are many ways that the "worst drought" can be defined (degree of dryness/severity, duration, relative soil moisture content, agricultural impacts, socioeconomic impacts, etc.). Regional water planning focuses on hydrological drought, which is typically the type of drought associated with the largest shortfalls in surface and/or groundwater supply. The frequency and severity of hydrological drought is often defined on a watershed or river basin scale, although it could be different from one area to the next, even within a planning region.

The Brazos G Area encompasses all or parts of 37 counties and stretches from Kent County in the northwest to Grimes County in the Southeast; this means that it is a very hydrologically, geographically, and physiographically diverse area. Therefore, Brazos G was divided into three smaller areas to assess the DOR. The northernmost area, referred to as Upper Brazos G, is made up of Palo Pinto, Stephens, and Eastland Counties and all counties to their northwest. The middle area, referred to as Mid Brazos G, contains all the counties south of Stephens and Palo Pinto and north of Milam and Robertson Counties. The southernmost area, referred to as Lower Brazos G, is made up of Milam, Robertson, Lee, Burleson, Brazos, Washington, and Grimes Counties. Figure 7.1 depicts these three areas.



Figure 7.1 Map of Brazos G Sub-Areas

Texas is divided into ten climate divisions by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), which are regions with consistent climatological behaviors. Figure 7.2 shows Brazos G in relationship to these climate divisions with the majority lying within Climate Division 3, but also intersecting Divisions 2, 4, 6, and 7. It is necessary to consider these divisions as numerous drought indices are calculated based on these divisions.



Figure 7.2 Map of Brazos G Climate Divisions

7.1.2 Current DOR

In terms of severity and duration, the devastating drought of the 1950s generally is considered the DOR for most of Texas, including most of the Brazos G Area. By 1956, 244 of the 254 counties in the State were considered disaster areas. At that time, the 1950s drought included the second, third, and eighth driest years on record (1956, 1954, and 1951, respectively). This drought lasted almost a decade in many places and affected numerous states across the Nation. The 1950s drought kick-started Texas's water supply planning effort and has been used by water resource engineers and managers as a benchmark drought for water supply planning. However, Texas has experienced two recent droughts centered around 2006 and 2011 that were significant enough to necessitate considering them as DORs for the Brazos G Area. In 2011, severely decreased precipitation resulted in substantial declines in streamflow throughout Texas. Record high temperatures also occurred June through August leading to an increase in evaporation rates. The evaporation was so great that by August 4, 2011, State climatologist John Nielson-Gammon declared 2011 to be the worst 1-year drought on record in Texas. The 2011 water year Statewide annual precipitation was 11.27 inches, more than 2 inches less than the previous record low of 13.91 inches in 1956. The remaining sections in Section 7.1 describe the methods for assessing drought severity and the drought conditions for different subareas within Brazos G Areas.

7.1.3 Drought Indicators

Several techniques can be used to assess the effect of a drought, assessing parameters such as severity, duration and spatial extent. As previously mentioned, there are numerous ways that the "worst drought" can be defined, and it is important to consider multiple methods of assessing a drought. The Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI), analysis of results from water availability modeling, analysis of historical naturalized streamflows, and evaluation of parameters used to develop groundwater availability models can be incorporated into planning efforts and are discussed in more detail below.

7.1.3.1 PDSI

The PDSI, first published in 1965, was one of the first comprehensive efforts using precipitation and temperature for estimating the moisture of a region. By incorporating monthly temperature and precipitation data along with the moisture capacity of soils, the PDSI accounts for the cumulative water balance from previous months, enabling more accurate tracking of drought over time. NOAA publishes weekly and monthly PDSI maps by climate division for the Contiguous United States, going as far back as 1895. This makes it a widely used and robust tool to monitor long term drought conditions. PDSI values can range from -10 to 10, with negative values indicating dry conditions. Ranges assigned to drought levels are summarized in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 PDSI Value Ranges

PDSI Value Range	Drought/Moisture Level
Less than -4	Extreme Drought
-4 to -3	Severe Drought
-3 to -2	Moderate Drought
-2 to 2	Mid-Range
2 to 3	Moderately Moist
3 to 4	Very Moist
Greater than 4	Extremely Moist

As stated earlier, most of Brazos G lies in Texas Climate Division 3. Figure 7.3 shows annual PDSI values for Texas Climate Division 3. While the 1908 drought and the more recent drought in the early 21st century were severe, the drought of the 1950s was the most intense over a longer period of time, supporting the continued use of this drought as the DOR for Brazos G. However, the eight most upstream counties in Brazos G are in Texas Climate Division 2. Figure 7.4 shows that the drought of the 1950s has, to this point, lasted longer than the most recent drought. The available information is not strong enough to change the DOR, but it is worth noting the intensity of 2011.



Source: NOAA, National Centers for Environmental Information. https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/monitoring/climate-at-a-glance/divisional/time-series/4103/pdsi/1/1/1895-2024

Figure 7.3 Historical Palmer Drought Severity Indices: Division 3



Source: NOAA, National Centers for Environmental Information. https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/monitoring/climate-at-a-glance/divisional/time-series/4102/pdsi/1/1/1895-2024

Figure 7.4 Historical Palmer Drought Severity Indices: Division 2

The differences between the two climate divisions further emphasizes the importance of dividing Brazos G into sub-areas. One way to address varying Climate Divisions and sub-regions is to incorporate a weighted average of Climate Division PDSI values within the sub-areas. Figure 7.5, Figure 7.6 and Figure 7.7 show the historical weighted PDSI values by sub-area. As can be seen in all of the sub-areas, the 1950s drought is longer and more intense than any other drought period. This indicates that the 1950s drought should be used as the DOR when considering the PDSI.



Figure 7.5 Historical Weighted Average Palmer Drought Severity Indices: Upper Brazos G



Figure 7.6 Historical Weighted Average PDSI: Mid Brazos G



Figure 7.7 Historical Weighted Average PDSI: Lower Brazos G

7.1.3.2 Water Availability Modeling

Engineers and planners often use surface water models to demonstrate the effects of historical droughts on water supply. Effects can be more readily observed on surface water than groundwater. Reservoir supplies that were not in place during historic droughts can be assessed using historic hydrology and these modeling tools. The primary tool used in regional planning in Texas to observe the performance of reservoirs under historic drought conditions is the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) water availability model (WAM). The WAM is the tool used to determine the available flow, firm yield, and safe yield of surface water projects in the regional water plan. Since the publishing of the 2021 Brazos G RWP, the TCEQ's official Brazos River Basin WAM (Brazos WAM) has been updated with an extended hydrology through the year 2018. This WAM forms the basis of the modeling performed for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G RWP. The official WAM has been modified to include reservoir sedimentation for reservoirs with storage capacity of 5,000 ac-ft or more and volumetric surveys with reported sedimentation rates. This updated Brazos WAM is referred to as the Brazos G WAM.

The Brazos G WAM was used to analyze the DOR for each reservoir in the Brazos G Area, as shown in Table 7.2. The DOR is considered for a reservoir as the period in which the critical month (month with lowest storage) occurs during a firm yield simulation. In the Middle Brazos G Area, nine out of 14 reservoirs still have the 1950s drought as their DOR and in the Lower Brazos G Area, four out of five have the 1950s drought as their DOR. This supports the continued use of the 1950s drought as the DOR for reservoirs in the Lower and Middle Brazos G Areas. However, with the extended years of data of the Brazos G WAM, the most recent drought that broke in 2015 is supported as the DOR for the Upper Brazos G Area. In the Upper Brazos G Area, eleven out of 14 reservoirs indicate the 2015 drought as their DOR and zero of the reservoirs indicated the 1950s drought as their DOR. This indicates that the 1950s drought is no longer the best representation of the DOR for the Upper Brazos G Area.

Table 7.2 DOR Based on Reservoir Firm Yield Analysis

Reservoir		County	Critical Year	Critical Month	New More Recent DOR?(1)
Upper Brazos G	Hubbard Creek Reservoir	Shackelford, Stephens	2015	4	Yes
	Lake Abilene	Taylor	2015	4	Yes
	Lake Cisco	Eastland	2015	4	Yes
	Lake Daniel	Stephens	2004	10	Yes
	Lake Davis	Knox	2004	11	Yes
	Lake Fort Phantom Hill	Jones	2015	4	Yes
	Lake Graham	Young	2004	2	Yes
	Lake Kirby	Taylor	2015	2	Yes
	Lake Leon	Eastland	2015	4	Yes
	Lake Palo Pinto	Palo Pinto	2015	2	Yes
	Lake Stamford	Haskell	2014	5	Yes
	Lake Sweetwater	Nolan	2015	3	Yes
	Millers Creek Reservoir	Throckmorton, Baylor	2015	5	Yes
	Possum Kingdom Lake	Stephens, Young, Palo Pinto	2015	4	Yes

Reservoir		County	Critical Year	Critical Month	New More Recent DOR?(1)
Middle Brazos G	Aquilla Lake	Hill	1957	3	No
	Belton Lake	Bell, Coryell	1957	2	No
	Granger Lake	Williamson	1956	11	No
	Lake Creek Lake	McLennan	1956	9	No
	Lake Georgetown	Williamson	2015	2	Yes
	Lake Granbury	Hood	2015	2	Yes
	Lake Mexia	Limestone	1952	1	No
	Lake Pat Cleburne	Johnson	1957	2	No
	Lake Waco	McLennan	1978	12	Yes
	Lake Whitney	Bosque, Hill, Johnson	1963	10	Yes
	Proctor Lake	Comanche	2015	2	Yes
	Squaw Creek Reservoir	Somervell, Hood	1957	3	No
	Stillhouse Hollow Lake	Bell	1957	2	No
	Tradinghouse Creek Reservoir	McLennan	1957	2	No
Lower Brazos G	Lake Limestone	Robertson, Leon, Limestone	1964	12	Yes
	Alcoa Lake	Milam	1956	9	No
	Gibbons Creek Reservoir	Grimes	1957	2	No
	Somerville Lake	Washington, Lee, Burleson	1957	2	No
	Twin Oak Reservoir	Robertson	1957	4	No

Notes:
(1) New more recent DOR relative to the 1950s drought.

7.1.3.3 Naturalized Streamflow

Naturalized streamflow data can be used as an indicator of drought. Streamflow as an indicator tends to be more sensitive to short-term drought than reservoir modeling due to its lack of storage. To analyze the health of runoff-dependent streams in the basin, naturalized streamflows were obtained from the Brazos WAM at the six locations shown in Figure 7.8. Naturalized flows represent flows that would have been in the stream naturally without the influences of water management activities such as diversions, reservoir operations and wastewater discharges.

Two monitoring sites were chosen for each of the three Brazos G sub-areas. In each area, one site is a tributary and one is on the main stem of the Brazos River. In Upper Brazos G, sites were chosen on the Clear Fork at Nugent and on the Brazos River near South Bend. Sites were chosen on the Leon River near Belton and on the Brazos River at Waco for Mid Brazos G. For Lower Brazos G, sites were chosen on the Little River at Cameron and on the Brazos River near Hempstead. These specific sites were selected due to the completeness of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) gage data upon which the flow naturalization is based.



Figure 7.8 Sites Selected for Naturalized Streamflow Analysis

Annual naturalized flows at the three main stem sites are shown graphically in Figure 7.9 and numerically in Table 7.3. These figures and table compare annual flows to the mean flow for the entire time period (1940-2023). The figures illustrate the amount of time the streams spent below the long-term mean flow during the three severe drought periods identified. As shown in Figure 7.9, in Upper Brazos G, the 2000s drought had the most total time spent below the long-term average while in the Mid and Lower Brazos G Areas, the 1950s drought had the most total time spent below the long-term average. On the other hand, Table 7.3 suggests that the percentages of days where the daily flows are lower than the mean flow are highest in the 2010s drought for Upper Brazos G Area and in the 1950s drought for the Middle and Lower Brazos G Areas.



Note: Shaded regions correspond to the 1950s, 2000s, and 2010s droughts.

Source: https://waterdata.usgs.gov/tx/nwis/current/?type=flow_res&group_key=county_cd

Figure 7.9 Annual Naturalized Flows at Three Sites on the Main Stem of the Brazos River

Table 7.3 Percent of Days the Brazos River is Below Mean Annual Flow for Three Drought Periods

Brazos G Sub-Area	Location	1950s drought	2000s Drought	2010s Drought
Upper	Brazos River at South Bend	93%	92%	96%
Middle	Brazos River near Waco	87%	80%	86%
Lower	Brazos River near Hempstead	86%	71%	82%

Notes:
(1) The percentages shown above reflect the periods that flow data are available from the USGS stream gages.

The severity of each drought is illustrated in Figure 7.10, which presents cumulative streamflows measured at each of the aforementioned locations. In the Figure, cumulative streamflows since drought initiation are compared for three drought periods: 1950 – 1957, 1993 – 2006, and 2008 – 2015. Similar to the findings from Table 7.3, although some flow data are missing, Figure 7.10 suggests that the cumulative flows in the 2010s drought for Upper Brazos G Area are generally lower, while the cumulative flows in the 1950s drought for the Middle and Lower Brazos G Areas are lower. This finding indicates that the 2010s drought should be considered to be the new DOR for streamflow (useful for evaluating run-of-river water rights) in the Upper Brazos G Area.



Note: Flow data for the first year during the 2000s drought was not available.





Note: Flow data for the first seven years during the 2000s drought was not available.

Figure 7.10 Cumulative Naturalized Streamflow for Three Drought Periods for Upper, Mid, & Lower Brazos G

A comparison of low-flow periods for each of the six selected stream locations was also performed and is shown in Figure 7.11. For this figure, a low-flow period is defined as any month where the monthly flow rate falls below the 10th percentile of the monthly flow rates recorded from 1940 to 2023. This comparison highlights each of the drought periods, showing which sites spent the most time in low-flow conditions. For all the streams selected in Upper, Mid, and Lower Brazos G, it appears that the most severe periods are the 1950s drought and the 2010s drought, while the conditions in the 2000 drought are less pronounced.



Note: Shaded regions correspond to the 1950s, 2000s, and 2010s droughts.

Figure 7.11 Comparison of Low-Flow Periods for Six Selected Locations

7.1.3.4 Groundwater

Groundwater systems continually adjust to changes in climate, water withdrawal, and land use. Certain aquifers are more drought sensitive than others based on a multitude of factors including land type, recharge rates, and discharge rates. Sensitivity analyses can provide information on how different variables affect aquifer conditions. An aquifer is susceptible to drought if a small change in the inflow or outflow greatly affects the water level of the aquifer. Sensitivities to drought for aquifers in Brazos G range from very low to high. A very low sensitivity implies that small changes in the inflow or outflow do not cause a significant change in aquifer conditions while a high sensitivity implies that small changes in the inflow or outflow cause a significant change aquifer conditions. Table 7.4 presents drought sensitivity assessments obtained from the TWDB groundwater availability modeling reports. The Edwards BFZ, Seymour, Trinity, Brazos River Alluvium, and Woodbine Aquifers were found to be the most drought susceptible with sensitivities ranging from moderate to high.

Table 7.4 Drought Sensitivity of Brazos G Aquifers

Aquifer Name	Aquifer Type	Drought Sensitivity		Counties	GMAs
		Outcrop	Subcrop		
Carrizo-Wilcox	Major	Low	Very Low	Brazos, Burleson, Falls, Grimes, Lee, Limestone, Milam, Robertson, Williamson	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16
Edwards (BFZ)	Major	High	High	Bell, Williamson	8, 9, 10, 13
Edwards-Trinity (Plateau)	Major	Low	Very Low	Nolan, Taylor	2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10
Gulf Coast	Major	Low	--	Brazos, Grimes, Washington	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16
Seymour	Major	Moderate	--	Fisher, Haskell, Jones, Kent, Knox, Stonewall, Throckmorton, Young	1, 6, 7
Trinity	Major	Moderate	Very Low	Bell, Bosque, Callahan, Comanche, Coryell, Eastland, Erath, Falls, Hamilton, Hill, Hood, Johnson, Lampasas, Limestone, McLennan, Milam, Palo Pinto, Somervell, Taylor, Williamson	6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13
Blaine	Minor	Low	Very Low	Fisher, Haskell, Jones, Kent, Knox, Nolan, Stonewall	1, 6, 7
Brazos River Alluvium	Minor	Moderate	--	Bosque, Brazos, Burleson, Falls, Grimes, Hill, McLennan, Milam, Robertson, Washington	8, 12, 14
Dockum	Minor	Low	Very Low	Fisher, Kent, Nolan	1, 2, 3, 6, 7
Ellenburger-San Saba	Minor	Very Low	Very Low	Lampasas	7, 8, 9
Marble Falls	Minor	Low	--	Lampasas	7, 8, 11
Queen City	Minor	Low	Very Low	Brazos, Burleson, Grimes, Lee, Milam, Robertson, Washington	11, 12, 13, 14, 15
Sparta	Minor	Very Low	Very Low	Brazos, Burleson, Grimes, Lee, Robertson, Washington	11, 12, 13, 14, 16
Woodbine	Minor	Moderate	Very Low	Hill, McLennan	8
Yegua-Jackson	Minor	Low	--	Brazos, Burleson, Grimes, Lee, Washington	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16

Notes:
(1) "--" indicates information not available.

The subcrop and outcrop areas of Brazos G aquifers are shown in Figure 7.12. The colors on the map represent the drought sensitivities with blue representing least sensitive and red representing most sensitive. The Edwards BFZ is the only Brazos G aquifer with a high sensitivity to drought in both its subcrop and outcrop. The Seymour Aquifer, Trinity Outcrop, Brazos River Alluvium Outcrop, and Woodbine Outcrop have a moderate sensitivity to drought. The remaining aquifers in Brazos G have a low or very low sensitivity to drought.



Figure 7.12 Drought Sensitivity of Brazos G Aquifers

7.1.4 Recent Droughts and New DORs

Three separate droughts were considered in this DOR analysis: the 1950s drought, the drought that lasted from 1993-2006, and the 2008-2015 drought. The 1950s drought was arguably the most devastating drought ever recorded in Texas and has been used by water planners and engineers as the DOR for many years. It included three of the driest years on record at the time it occurred: 1956 (2nd), 1954 (3rd), and 1951 (8th). As noted previously, the naturalized flows of the official WAM that serves as the basis for the Brazos G WAM have been extended through the year 2018, capturing each of these drought periods.

The Brazos WAM was used to evaluate the firm yields of the major reservoirs in the Brazos G Area. The analysis indicates that a new DOR has occurred for each reservoir in Upper Brazos G, with eleven out of 14having the 2008-2015 drought as their DOR and three out of 14with 1993-2006 as the DOR. This indicates that the 1950s drought should no longer be used as the DOR in Upper Brazos G and that the 2008-2015 drought should be used instead. In Mid Brazos G, nine out of 14 reservoirs still had the 1950s drought as their DOR, three out of 14had the 2008-2015 drought as their DOR, one had its critical year in 1963, and another had its critical year in 1978. In Lower Brazos G, four out of the five reservoirs had the 1950s drought as their DOR, one had the 2008-2015 drought as the DOR. This indicates that the 1950s drought should still be considered as the DOR in Mid and Lower Region G.

7.2 Uncertainty and Drought(s) Worse Than DOR

This section highlights Brazos G's approach to addressing uncertainty and preparing for extreme drought conditions and summarizes the measures to enhance resilience against droughts worse than the DOR (DWDOR).

7.2.1 Planning for Uncertainty

The Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) acknowledges the inherent uncertainties associated with planning factors such as population, demand, and supply during the planning process. In addressing these uncertainties and preparing for drought conditions, the RWP utilizes baseline water demand factors reflective of recent drought conditions to inform demand projections in the Brazos G Area. Additionally, supply projections, informed by the TCEQ WAM, reflect safe yields during drought conditions, as documented in Brazos G's 2026 Technical Memorandum. Given that the RWP is updated every five years, the Brazos G RWPG will closely monitor and review demand and supply conditions, ensuring ongoing preparedness.

7.2.2 Existing Measures for Preparation of the DWDOR

As discussed in Section 7.2.1, the demand projection in Chapter 2 reflects baseline demand during recent drought years, while the supply projection in Chapter 3 reflects safe yields under drought conditions. Although demand from the DWDOR is likely to exceed baseline demand, these projections serve as the initial benchmarks for the Brazos G RWPG to prepare for the DWDOR. Additionally, many water user groups (WUGs) within Brazos G have adopted a DCP, which includes measures such as a weekly irrigation schedule and fines. Based on the gallons per capita per day (gpcd) reduction during the 2010s drought shown in Figure 7.13, WUGs in Brazos G achieved a 27.5 percent reduction from 2012 to 2013, some of which could be attributed to conservation efforts and the natural replacement of inefficient fixtures.

These measures, including the implementation of a weekly irrigation schedule and fines, are strategically chosen because they have proven effective in reducing water demand during drought conditions while minimizing the burden on both human and financial resources. However, it should be noted that due to the permanent irrigation schedule and other conservation measures already in place in many WUGs in Brazos G, the recent gpcd has stabilized, indicating that achieving a similar magnitude of reduction in the future will be challenging. Consequently, while the current drought measures employed by many WUGs are expected to reduce water demand, the reduction may be less significant than what was observed during the 2010s. Since the baseline demand used in the 2026 RWP projection reflects the higher dry-year demand since 2010, it provides a buffer to address potential drought shortages.



Sources: TWDB provided spreadsheet dated March 2022 (CORRECTED - WUG_HistoricalData_2026RWPs.xlsx).

Figure 7.13 Drought Sensitivity of Brazos G Aquifers

7.2.3 Potential Additional Measures for DWDOR Resilience

Water providers in Brazos G may have other tools to address DWDORs that are not specifically addressed in this plan. For example, water providers with multiple sources may have the potential to gain extra yield from system operations of their supplies. Emergency interconnects and/or interim emergency purchases with other providers provide another potential option for water during a DWDOR.

In addition, as part of drought preparedness efforts, the Texas Section of the American Water Works Association (TAWWA) compiled the TAWWA Drought Planning Survey Results. This report outlines key findings regarding drought planning for Texas public water utilities. It highlights effective measures for demand management during droughts, such as monetary consequences like fines and fees, which are seen as effective but diminishing in impact over time. Additionally, designated watering schedules are considered the next most effective water-saving measure; however, many utilities surprisingly lack such schedules, even during drought periods. As discussed in Section 7.2.2, these drought measures have proven to be effective measures in reducing demand during droughts. Therefore, the Brazos G RWPG recommends that the WUGs within the Brazos G Area consider implementing these measures as part of their drought contingency planning if they are not already utilized.

7.3 Current Drought Preparations and Response

Section 7.3 describes the current drought preparations and responses in the Brazos G Area.

7.3.1 Current Drought Preparations and Response

This section describes the water user group level planning and basin responses in the Brazos G Area.

7.3.1.1 WUG Level Planning

WUGs in Brazos G can prepare for drought by participating in the regional planning process. The regional planning process attempts to meet projected water demands during a drought of severity equivalent to the DOR. WUGs that provide accurate information to the planning group and TWDB and consider recommendations accepted by the regional planning group should be able to supply water through drought periods. In addition, all wholesale water providers (WWPs) and most municipalities develop individual DCPs or emergency action plans to be implemented at various stages of a drought.

7.3.1.2 Basin Responses

Throughout Texas, including the Brazos River Basin, water rights are issued under the prior appropriation system. During times of shortage, curtailment of water rights has become necessary in recent droughts. Dow Chemical made priority water rights calls in the Brazos River Basin in 2009, 2011, 2012, and 2013. When a priority call is made, upstream water rights that are junior in priority to the water right making the call are required to forgo diversions and impoundment of water and allow streamflows to pass downstream to honor the priority of downstream senior rights. The priority calls affected most water rights in the basin. Partly in response to the priority calls and in response to the ongoing drought, the Brazos Watermaster Program was established by petition and subsequent order issued by the TCEQ Commissioners on April 21, 2014. The program has jurisdiction over the Lower Brazos River Basin including and below Possum Kingdom Reservoir. The Brazos Watermaster will monitor water use and streamflow and coordinate with water rights holders when flows need to be passed to honor senior water rights.

7.3.2 Assessment of Local DCPs

Predicting the timing, severity and length of a drought is an inexact science; however, it is safe to assume that drought is an inevitable component of the Texas climate. For this reason, it is critical to plan for these occurrences with policies outlining adjustments to the use, allocation and conservation of water in response to drought conditions. Drought and other circumstances that interrupt the reliable supply or water quality of a source often lead to water shortages. During a drought period, there generally is a greater demand on the already decreased supply as individuals attempt to maintain landscape vegetation through irrigation because less rainfall is available. This can further exacerbate a water supply shortage situation.

In accordance with the requirements outlined in the Texas Water Code (TWC) Chapter 11 and the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §288(b), wholesale water suppliers, retail public water suppliers (serving 3,300 connections or more), and irrigation districts must submit a revised and adopted DCP to the TCEQ every five years for approval. Retail public water systems (PWSs) with fewer than 3,300 connections must have their DCPs available during TCEQ inspections, but they are not required to submit their plan to TCEQ. The most recent deadline to submit updated DCPs to TCEQ was May 1, 2024.

TCEQ has developed model DCPs for wholesale and retail water providers to use as a guidance tool when preparing their respective DCPs. Although the model DCPs might not be applicable to every water system, they can serve as a starting point and an example for most entities to follow. Important DCP components that should be addressed in the plan include the following:

- Specific and quantified goals targeted for water use reduction.
- Drought response stages, including triggers to initiate and terminate each stage.
- Descriptions of drought indicators along with supply/demand management measures.
- Notification and enforcement procedures, including variance for granting exceptions.
- Public education and input into the plan.
- Coordination with RWPGs.

In order to minimize or mitigate the impact of water shortages due to emergency situations, including severe drought and equipment failure, the structure of DCPs is based on a variety of triggers that initiate a variety of responses depending on the 'stage' or severity of the situation. Stage one of DCPs typically represent a situation of mild water shortage, which results in initiating drought management measures on a voluntary basis. The last stage of usually represents an extreme water shortage for a community and triggers the most stringent mandatory drought management measures.

Local DCP information adopted by 11 wholesale and 87 retail water providers, as well as 13 groundwater conservation districts in the Region was reviewed and summarized for each stage, including drought triggers used for initiating specific drought responses. The total number of DCPs reviewed was 87, which also included the 37 entities' DCPs reviewed during the previous planning cycle. The Brazos River Authority (BRA) provided the Brazos G team with copies of DCPs received from approximately 96 wholesale and retail water providers, which includes DCPs that were adopted during previous cycle; however, follow-up calls were made to many of those entities along with the remaining wholesale and retail water providers to obtain copies of their recently updated DCPs. Approximately 55 percent of the wholesale and retail water providers adopted revised DCPs since 2020s.

A summary of drought triggers evaluated during the review of each DCP, included the following:

- Natural/manmade contamination.
- Demand/capacity based.
- Mechanical failure.
- Groundwater level.
- Groundwater production rate.
- Reservoir level.
- Supply based.
- Time period.
- Wholesale provider (initiated by).
- Other (i.e., contractual obligation, natural disaster, notification by executive leadership).

In addition, the following drought responses were reviewed based on the drought stage and associated triggers of the DCP:

- Assessment and identification of situation.

- Water rate change or surcharge.
- Irrigation schedule.
- Mandatory reduction.
- Notification of public agencies or specific users.
- Prohibited use.
- Public notification.
- Discontinue water diversions.
- Suspend service.
- Water allocation.
- Other (i.e., additional fees, temporary variance).

7.3.2.1 WUGs

Based on TWDB guidance outlined in this regional water planning cycle, drought triggers used for initiating drought responses are summarized for 86 retail water providers and presented in Table 7.5.

7.3.2.2 WWPs

DCPs for all WWPs in the Brazos G Area were also evaluated. Since the WWPs typically serve a number of cities and entities in the Region, they play a different role than the retail providers in how they monitor the onset of drought, as well as respond to their wholesale customers to address drought conditions. In addition, telephone discussions were conducted with a majority of the WWPs to better understand their plans on how they would address the impact of severe drought or contamination of their water supplies. A summary of their DCP triggers and responses is presented in Table 7.6.

7.3.2.3 Counterproductive Variations in Drought Response Strategies

Review of DCPs in the Brazos G Area identified instances where:

1. Neighboring utilities relying on the same source utilize different drought triggers, and
2. Neighboring utilities relying on different sources utilize the same trigger due to the convenience of the media sources available from the larger market (usually smaller suburban communities following the lead of the larger urban community).

Both of these situations can be counterproductive during times of drought and require education of utility customers regarding their source(s) of supply.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 7.5 Summary of DCPs for WUGs in the Brazos G Area

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses											Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other(1)	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other(2)	SW	GW
439 WSC	2023	1		√					√		√				√				√					√	
		2		√					√		√				√		√	√	√						
		3		√							√				√		√	√	√				√		
		4 – Emerg.	√	√	√						√				√	√	√	√	√				√		
Acton MUD	2024	1		√								√			√				√				√	√	√
		2		√								√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√								√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√				√				√			√		√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√	√	√			√				√				√	√	√	√				√		
		6 - Wtr Alloc.		√								√		√			√		√			√	√		
Bethesda WSC	2019	Dry										√			√				√				√	√	√
		1		√							√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		2		√					√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√				√		√	√				√	√	√	√				√		
Block House MUD	2024	1										√			√			√	√				√	√	
		2		√					√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3	√	√					√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.							√		√	√			√		√	√	√		√	√	√		
Bold Springs WSC	2020	1								√		√			√		√		√				√		√
		2					√					√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3					√					√				√	√	√	√				√		
		4					√					√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√							√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
Brushy Creek MUD	2024	1	√	√	√	√						√			√			√	√					√	
		2	√	√	√	√						√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√	√						√			√	√	√	√	√				√		
City of Abilene	2019	Voluntary								√					√				√				√	√	
		1		√				√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		2		√	√			√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3 - Emerg.		√	√			√	√			√		√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
		4 - Wtr Crisis	√		√							√		√		√	√	√	√			√	√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses											Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
City of Albany	2024	1		√				√	√		√				√		√		√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√		√				√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√		√			√			√	√	√			√	√		
		4 - Emerg.	√	√	√			√	√		√		√			√	√	√	√				√		
City of Anson	2019	1		√				√									√		√					√	
		2		√				√								√	√		√						
		3		√				√						√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√								√				√						√		
City of Bellmead	2023	1						√	√			√			√		√	√	√						√
		2						√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3						√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4 – Emerg.	√		√										√	√	√	√	√				√		
City of Belton	2024	1		√				√	√		√	√			√				√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√				√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√						√	√		√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Breckenridge	2024	1			√			√	√			√					√		√				√	√	
		2			√			√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3			√			√	√			√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√			√				√	√			√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Bryan	2019	1								√		√			√				√				√		√
		2		√								√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√		√		√			√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Burleson	2024	1	√	√	√		√				√	√			√	√	√		√				√	√	
		2													√	√	√	√	√				√		
		3													√	√	√	√	√				√		
City of Cedar Park	2024	1										√			√				√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√		√	√			√		√		√				√		
		3	√	√				√	√		√	√			√		√		√				√		
		4													√		√		√				√		
		5									√	√				√	√	√	√		√	√	√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses										Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
City of Cisco	2024	1						√	√			√					√		√				√	√	
		2						√	√			√			√	√	√	√	√			√	√		
		3 - Emerg.		√				√	√			√		√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Cleburne	2024	1	√	√	√			√	√			√	√			√	√	√	√				√	√	√
		2	√	√	√			√	√			√			√	√	√	√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√			√	√			√			√	√	√	√	√		√		√		
		4 - Emerg.	√	√	√			√	√			√			√	√	√	√	√		√		√		
City of College Station	2019	1		√	√					√	√	√			√		√	√	√				√		√
		2		√					√			√			√		√	√	√			√	√		
		3 - Emerg.	√		√							√				√	√	√	√		√	√	√		
City of Comanche	2011	1		√				√				√			√	√	√		√				√	√	
		2		√				√				√			√	√	√		√				√		
		3		√				√				√			√	√	√	√	√				√		
		Emerg.	√	√	√			√				√		√	√		√		√			√	√		
City of Copperas Cove	2015	1		√							√				√		√	√	√				√	√	
		2		√							√				√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√							√				√		√	√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√							√				√	√	√	√		√	√	√		
City of Eastland	2020	1			√			√							√			√	√					√	
		2													√		√	√							
		3															√	√							
		4															√	√							
City of Gatesville	2018	1		√					√		√				√				√				√	√	
		2		√							√				√		√	√	√				√		
		3 - Emerg.	√		√						√	√				√	√	√	√				√		
		4 - Pro Rata									√	√		√			√		√			√	√		
City of Georgetown	2023	1		√		√		√	√	√		√	√		√		√	√	√				√	√	√
		2		√		√		√	√	√		√	√		√		√	√	√				√		
		3 - Emerg.		√					√	√		√	√			√	√	√	√				√		
		4	√	√	√				√	√		√	√			√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Glen Rose	2024	1		√					√						√			√	√				√	√	
		2							√						√				√				√		
		3							√						√				√				√		
		4 – Emerg.			√				√						√	√			√				√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses											Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
City of Gordon	2024	1		√				√									√		√				√	√	
		2		√				√								√	√		√				√		
		3 - Emerg.		√				√						√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Graham	2019	1		√				√				√			√				√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√				√	√			√			√		√	√	√			√	√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√			√	√			√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Granbury	2024	1		√											√		√		√				√	√	√
		2		√											√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√											√		√	√	√				√		
		4							√						√	√	√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√		√		√			√		√		√	√	√	√			√			
City of Groesbeck	2025	1		√				√	√				√		√		√		√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√					√	√	√	√	√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√			√				√	√	√	√				√		
		4 – Emerg.	√		√				√			√				√	√	√	√				√		
City of Hamilton	2019	1						√							√								√	√	
		2			√			√							√								√		
		3						√							√			√					√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√			√						√	√	√						√	√		
City of Harker Heights	2024	1		√							√				√				√				√	√	
		2		√					√		√				√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√					√		√						√	√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.	√	√	√				√			√				√	√	√	√		√	√	√		
City of Hearne	2001	1					√									√	√		√				√		√
		2					√								√	√	√		√				√		
		3					√								√	√	√		√				√		
		4					√								√	√	√		√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√												√		√						

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses											Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
City of Hubbard	2018	1				√			√						√				√				√	√	√
		2				√			√						√		√	√	√				√		
		3				√			√						√		√	√	√				√		
		4				√			√						√		√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√									√			√	√	√			√			
City of Hutto	2022	1		√					√			√			√		√		√				√	√	
		2		√					√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√					√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4 – Emerg.	√	√	√				√			√				√	√	√	√				√		
		5 – Water allo.										√					√		√			√	√		
Gholson WSC	2024	1		√											√		√		√						√
		2		√											√	√	√	√	√				√		
		3		√											√	√	√	√	√				√		
		4		√											√	√	√	√	√				√		
		5 – Emerg.	√		√									√	√	√	√	√	√				√		
Lone Star Regional Water Authority (LSRWA)	2024	1		√		√			√			√					√		√				√		√
		2		√		√			√			√			√	√	√		√				√		
		3		√		√			√			√			√	√	√	√	√				√		
		4 – Pro- Rata	√		√	√			√			√		√			√		√			√	√		
Walsh Ranch MUD	2025	1									√	√	√		√		√		√				√	√	
		2			√						√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√				√		
		3	√		√						√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√				√		
City of Killeen	2019	1		√				√	√		√	√			√				√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√				√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√						√	√					√	√	√				√		
City of Lampasas	2024	1		√							√	√			√		√		√				√	√	
		2		√							√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√							√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√							√	√			√	√	√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√						√	√				√	√	√	√			√	√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses											Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
City of Leander	2024	1		√					√	√		√	√		√				√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√		√		√		√	√	√	√	√	√			√		
		3		√				√	√		√	√			√	√	√	√	√	√			√		
		4 – Emerg.	√	√	√			√	√		√	√				√	√	√	√				√		
City of Lexington	2022	1		√				√				√			√				√				√		√
		2		√				√	√			√			√			√	√				√		
		3		√				√				√		√	√	√		√	√				√		
		4		√				√						√	√	√	√	√	√				√		
		5 – Emerg.	√		√									√		√	√	√					√		
City of Liberty Hill	2012	1		√					√			√			√				√				√	√	√
		2		√					√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√				√		√	√				√	√	√	√				√		
City of Lorena	2024	1		√					√			√			√		√		√				√	√	
		2		√	√			√	√			√			√		√	√	√						
		3		√	√											√	√	√	√						
		4 – Emerg.	√		√											√	√		√						
City of Mexia	2024	1		√				√	√		√				√		√		√					√	√
		2		√				√	√		√				√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√	√			√	√		√			√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√								√			√	√		√				√		
City of Midlothian	2019	1	√	√	√			√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√	√	
		2	√	√	√			√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√			√	√		√	√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
		Emerg.	√	√	√							√		√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Mineral Wells	2024	1		√	√			√				√			√				√				√	√	
		2		√	√			√				√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√	√			√				√				√	√	√	√						
		4		√	√			√				√		√		√	√	√	√						
		5 – Emerg.	√		√							√	√	√		√	√	√	√						

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses											Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
City of Robinson	2019	1								√		√					√		√				√	√	√
		2						√	√	√		√			√		√		√				√		
		3		√				√	√	√		√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√				√	√	√		√			√		√	√	√				√		
		5		√	√			√	√	√		√			√		√	√	√				√		
		6						√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		7 - Emerg.	√		√				√			√		√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Rockdale	2019	1		√								√			√		√		√				√		√
		2		√								√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√								√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√								√			√		√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√	√	√							√				√	√	√	√				√		
City of Round Rock	2024	1		√				√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√				√	√	√
		2		√				√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√						
		3		√				√	√		√	√				√	√	√	√						
City of Rule	2013	1									√				√								√	√	√
		2									√				√			√					√		
		3									√				√			√					√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√									√				√				√	√		
City of Stamford	2012	1						√	√														√	√	
		2		√				√	√					√	√			√					√		
		3		√				√	√					√	√			√					√		
		4		√	√			√	√			√		√				√				√	√		
City of Sweetwater	2019	1		√			√	√											√				√	√	√
		2		√			√	√							√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√			√	√							√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√			√	√						√	√		√	√	√			√	√		
		Emerg.		√	√				√			√	√	√		√	√	√	√				√		
City of Taylor	2019	1		√											√				√				√	√	
		2		√											√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√											√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√											√		√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√	√	√				√			√					√	√	√				√		
		6 - Wtr Alloc.		√										√			√	√	√			√	√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses										Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
City of Temple	2019	1								√					√				√				√	√	
		2		√							√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√							√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√						√	√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
City of Thorndale	2024	1		√											√				√						√
		2		√				√							√			√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√			√				√			√		√	√	√						
		4	√	√	√			√				√			√		√	√	√						
		5 - Emerg.	√	√	√			√								√	√	√	√						
		6 - Wtr Allo.	√	√	√			√														√			
City of Thrall	2003	1								√					√	√			√				√		√
		2		√		√									√			√	√				√		
		3		√		√									√			√	√				√		
		4		√		√									√			√	√				√		
		Emerg.	√		√							√					√	√	√				√		
City of Troy	2023	1								√		√			√				√				√	√	
		2		√					√			√			√			√	√				√		
		3		√					√			√			√			√	√				√		
		4 – Emerg.	√		√				√			√		√		√	√	√	√				√		
City of Waco	2024	1						√				√			√		√		√				√	√	
		2						√	√			√		√	√		√	√	√				√		
		3						√	√			√		√	√		√	√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.						√	√			√		√		√	√	√	√				√		
Corix Utilities	2023	1		√		√		√	√										√				√	√	√
		2		√		√		√	√									√	√				√		
		3		√		√		√	√						√	√		√	√				√		
		4	√		√										√	√		√	√				√		
		5 – Emerg.													√	√	√	√	√				√		
East Bell WSC	2022	1		√					√			√			√				√					√	
		2		√					√									√	√						
		3 – Emerg.	√	√	√				√			√				√		√	√						
Files Valley WSC	2024	1																						√	
		2																							
		3 – Emerg.																							

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses										Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
Fort Belknap WSC	2019	1		√					√			√			√		√	√	√				√	√	
		2		√					√							√	√	√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√				√		√	√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
Gholson WSC	2019	1		√								√							√				√		√
		2		√								√		√	√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√								√		√	√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√								√		√	√		√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√							√				√	√	√	√		√	√	√		
Hill County WSC	2018	1					√								√		√		√				√		√
		2					√								√		√	√	√				√		
		3					√								√		√	√	√				√		
		4					√								√		√	√	√				√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√							√				√	√	√	√				√		
		6 - Wtr Alloc.					√					√		√		√	√		√			√	√		
Johnson County SUD	2022	1	√	√	√			√	√									√	√					√	
		2	√	√	√			√	√						√			√	√				√		
		3 – Emerg.	√	√	√			√	√						√			√	√				√		
Kempner WSC	2024	1		√				√	√						√	√	√		√					√	
		2		√				√	√						√	√	√		√				√		
		3		√				√	√					√	√	√	√		√				√		
		4		√				√	√					√	√	√	√		√			√	√		
		5 – Emerg.	√		√			√						√		√	√		√			√	√		
Lake Palo Pinto Area WSC	2023	0										√							√					√	
		1							√			√			√				√						
		2							√			√			√	√		√	√		√		√		
		3							√			√			√	√		√	√		√		√		
		4 – Emerg.			√				√			√	v			√	√		√						
Manville WSC	2016	1		√			√								√		√		√				√	√	√
		2		√			√		√						√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√	√		√		√			√				√	√	√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√							√	√				√		√			√	√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses										Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
North San Gabriel MUD No 1	2022	1		√				√	√						√			√	√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√						√			√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√						√	√		√	√						
		4-Emerg.	√	√	√								√	√		√	√	√	√	√					
North San Gabriel MUD No 2	2022	1		√				√	√						√			√	√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√						√			√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√						√	√		√	√				√		
		4- Emerg.	√	√	√			√	√				√	√		√	√	√	√				√		
Paloma Lake MUD No. 2	2019	1								√	√	√			√		√	√	√			√	√	√	
		2	√	√	√				√		√	√			√		√	√	√			√	√		
		3 - Emerg.	√	√	√				√		√	√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
Possum Kingdom WSC	2019	1		√				√	√	√	√	√			√				√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√		√	√		√	√		√	√	√			√	√		
		3 - Emerg.		√	√			√	√		√	√		√		√	√	√	√			√	√		
RMS WSC	2019	1		√								√			√		√		√				√		√
		2		√								√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√								√			√		√	√	√			√	√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√							√				√	√	√	√			√			
Salado WSC	2023	1						√	√						√		√		√					√	√
		2						√	√						√		√	√	√						
		3						√	√								√	√	√						
		4 – Emerg.						√	√							√	√	√	√				√		
Somervell County Water District	2019	1	√	√	√			√	√			√					√		√				√	√	
		2	√	√	√			√	√			√			√	√	√	√	√			√	√		
		3	√	√	√			√	√			√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
		4 - Emerg.			√							√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
Sonterra MUD	2023	Voluntary								√					√				√				√	√	√
		1		√											√			√	√				√		
		2		√				√	√			√			√			√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√			√			√	√		√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√							√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
Southwest Milam WSC	2019	1		√					√			√			√				√				√		√
		2		√					√									√	√				√		
		3	√	√	√				√		√	√				√	√	√	√			√	√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses											Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other[1]	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other[2]	SW	GW
Sportsman's World MUD	2024	1		√						√					√	√			√				√	√	
		2		√						√					√	√		√	√				√		
		3		√						√				√	√	√	√	√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.										√		√		√	√	√	√						
Stephens Regional SUD	2024	1		√				√	√			√					√	√	√				√	√	
		2		√				√	√			√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√	√			√	√			√				√	√	√	√			√	√		
		4 - Emerg.			√			√	√			√	√	√		√	√	√	√		√	√	√		
Tri-County SUD	2019	1		√															√				√		√
		2		√										√	√		√	√	√			√	√		
		3		√										√	√		√	√	√			√	√		
		4		√										√	√		√	√	√			√	√		
		5 - Emerg.	√		√							√				√	√	√	√		√	√			
Vista Oaks MUD	2019	Voluntary								√					√		√		√				√	√	
		1			√						√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		2			√						√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
Wellborn SUD	2022	1								√					√				√				√	√	√
		2		√				√	√						√			√	√				√		
		3		√				√	√						√			√	√				√		
		4		√				√	√							√	√	√	√				√		
		5 – Emerg.	√	√	√								√	√		√			√				√		
West Bell County WSC	2023	1						√	√								√		√					√	
		2		√	√			√	√							√	√		√				√		
		3						√	√							√	√		√				√		
		4 – Emerg.	√													√	√		√				√		
Wickson Creek SUD	2023	1		√					√						√		√	√	√				√		√
		2		√					√						√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√					√						√		√	√	√						
		4		√					√							√	√	√	√						
		5 – Emerg.	√	√	√				√							√	√		√						
Williamson County MUD No. 10	2024	Voluntary								√					√				√				√	√	
		1	√	√	√			√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		2	√	√	√			√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3 - Emerg.	√	√	√			√	√		√	√				√	√	√	√				√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Stage Number	Triggers										Responses										Water Supplies	
			Contamination	Demand/Capacity Based	Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Time	Wholesale Provider	Other(1)	Assessment and Identification	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notification of Public Agencies or Specific Users	Prohibited Use	Public Notification	Discontinue Water Diversions	Suspend Service	Water Allocation	Other(2)	SW	GW
Williamson County MUD No. 11	2024	Voluntary								√					√				√				√	√	
		1	√	√	√			√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		2	√	√	√			√	√		√	√			√		√	√	√				√		
		3 - Emerg.	√	√	√			√	√		√	√				√	√	√	√				√		
Williamson County MUD No. 22	2019	1		√			√			√	√				√				√				√		√
		2		√			√		√		√				√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√	√		√		√		√				√		√	√	√				√		
		4 - Emerg.	√		√						√					√	√	√	√				√		
Woodway	2024	1		√					√			√							√				√	√	√
		2		√					√						√		√	√	√				√		
		3		√					√						√		√	√	√				√		
		4		√					√						√	√	√	√	√				√		
		5 – Emerg.	√		√										√	√	√	√	√				√		

Notes:
(1) Additional triggers: any unforeseen conditions that may occur, including extended period of low rainfall/drought conditions; executive leadership declares critical shortage.
(2) Water use restrictions on: watering with handheld hose, use of greywater, hotel/motel/restaurant water use, pools, fountains, golf courses, athletic fields, parks, car washes.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 7.6 Summary of DCPs for WWPs in the Brazos G Area

Entity Name	DCP Date	Primary Water Supply Source	Stage Number	Triggers											Responses									Water Supplies	
				Contamination	Demand/WTP Capacity	Duration Period	Equipment out of Service or Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Raw Water Provider	Weather Conditions	Other[1]	Review System Ops/Make Repairs	Initiate Measures from Raw Water Provider	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notify Wholesale Customers &/or Emerg. Resp. Officials	Notify Board Members & Public	Discontinue Water Diversions	Water Allocation	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	SW	GW
Aquilla WSD	2019	Lake Aquilla	1		√	√				√	√	√	√		√	√	√		√	√				√	
			2		√	√				√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√					
			3	√	√	√	√			√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√		√			
			4 - Emerg.	√			√			√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√		√			
Bell County WCID No. 1	2024	Lake Belton & Lake Stillhouse	1		√	√			√	√	√	√	√		√	√			√	√		√	√	√	
			2		√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	√	√		√	√		
			3	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√		√	√		
Bistone MWSD[2]	2024	Lake Mexia; Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	1		√	√		√		√	√						√		√	√				√	√
			2		√	√		√		√	√						√	√	√	√					
			3 - Emerg.		√	√	√	√		√	√							√	√	√		√	√		
Bluebonnet WSC	2019	Lake Belton	1							√		√	√		√	√			√	√				√	
			2							√		√	√		√	√		√	√	√					
			3							√		√	√		√	√		√	√	√					
			4 - Emerg.							√		√	√		√	√		√	√	√		√	√		
Brazos River Authority	2019	Multiple reservoirs	1	√	√	√	√		√	√			√	√	√				√	√				√	
			2	√	√	√	√		√	√			√	√	√			√	√	√					
			3	√	√	√	√		√	√			√	√	√			√	√	√	√	√			
			4 – Pro-rata	√	√	√	√		√	√			√	√	√			√	√	√	√	√			
			Curtailment																						
Central Texas WSC	2018	Lake Stillhouse	1		√					√		√			√				√	√				√	√
			2		√					√		√			√	√		√	√	√		√			
			3		√					√		√			√	√		√	√	√		√	√		
			4 - Emerg.	√			√			√		√			√	√		√	√	√	√				
Eastland County WSC	2019	Lake Leon	1		√	√				√							√		√	√				√	
			2		√	√				√								√	√	√		√	√		
			3		√	√				√								√	√	√		√	√		
			4 - Emerg.			√	√			√	√			√	√			√	√	√		√	√		
North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority	2019	Millers Creek Reservoir	1							√	√				√				√	√				√	√
			2							√	√				√			√	√	√					
			3							√	√				√			√	√	√		√	√		
			4 - Emerg.	√			√								√			√	√	√	√	√	√		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity Name	DCP Date	Primary Water Supply Source	Stage Number	Triggers											Responses									Water Supplies	
				Contamination	Demand/WTP Capacity	Duration Period	Equipment out of Service or Failure	Groundwater Level	Production Rate	Reservoir Level	Supply Based	Raw Water Provider	Weather Conditions	Other(1)	Review System Ops/Make Repairs	Initiate Measures from Raw Water Provider	Irrigation Schedule	Mandatory Reduction	Notify Wholesale Customers &/or Emerg. Resp. Officials	Notify Board Members & Public	Discontinue Water Diversions	Water Allocation	Water Rate Change or Surcharge	SW	GW
Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1	2014	Lake Palo Pinto	1							√					√				√	√				√	
			2							√					√				√	√					
			3				√			√					√				√	√		√	√		
			4 - Emerg.	√			√				√			√	√			√	√	√		√	√		
Upper Leon River MWD	2024	Lake Proctor	1							√	√	√	√		√	√			√	√				√	
			2							√	√	√	√		√	√		√	√	√					
			3 - Emerg.	√			√			√	√	√	√		√	√		√	√	√		√	√		
West Central TX MWD	2024	Hubbard Creek Reservoir	1							√	√		√			√			√	√				√	
			2							√	√		√		√	√		√	√	√					
			3							√	√		√		√	√		√	√	√		√			
			4							√	√		√		√	√		√	√	√		√			
			5 - Emerg.				√							√	√	√		√	√	√					

Notes:
(1) Additional triggers: any unforeseen conditions that may occur, such as acts of God or man.
(2) Bistone MWSD is both a WUG and WWP, but the DCP is more similar to those provided by WWPs and is included here instead of the WUG table.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

7.3.2.4 Groundwater Conservation Districts

According to the TWC, Section 36.1071(a), Groundwater Conservation Districts (GCDs) are required to adopt management plans that address natural resource issues, drought conditions, conservation, recharge enhancement, rainwater harvesting, and precipitation enhancement/brush control, as well as include desired future conditions (DFCs). Since GCDs are water regulators and not water suppliers, their role is to provide scientific information to those entities with permits to help them make informed decisions during emergency conditions. As a result, drought response measures are typically addressed within a GCD's Management Plan instead of a separate DCP. Of the thirteen GCDs located in the Brazos G Area, the following Districts have developed a separate DCP in conjunction with their Management Plan: Brazos Valley GCD, Clearwater Underground Water Conservation District, and Middle Trinity GCD. A summary of their latest DCP triggers and responses are summarized below in Table 7.7.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 7.7 Summary of Groundwater Conservation District DCPs in the Brazos G Area

Groundwater Conservation District	Major Aquifer(s)	Stage Number	Drought Triggers	District's Responses
Brazos Valley GCD	Carrizo-Wilcox, Queen City, Sparta, Yegua-Jackson & Brazos River Alluvium	1-Mild	NOAA 30-day rain node deficit from avg rainfall; PDSI shows mild drought.	Conduct water conservation public education; keep up-to-date drought information (PDSI) and other helpful drought indicators on website.
		2-Moderate	NOAA 30-day rain node deficit from avg rainfall; PDSI shows moderate level of drought for 6 mo.	Conduct water conservation public education; keep up-to-date drought information (PDSI) and other helpful drought indicators on website; review and confirm permit holders are enforcing their DCPs.
		3-Severe	NOAA 30-day rain node deficit from avg rainfall; or PDSI shows severe level of drought; natural or man-made contamination of water supply source(s); or declaration by State or Federal Gov't of disaster due to drought condition in a county served by District; or unforeseen events cause health/safety risks to the public.	Conduct water conservation public education; keep up-to-date drought information (PDSI) and other helpful drought indicators on website; review and confirm permit holders are enforcing their DCPs; monitor well levels frequently basis after consulting District's hydrologist.
		4-Extreme	NOAA 30-day rain node deficit from avg rainfall; or PDSI shows extreme level of drought for 12 mo.; water level monitoring indicates significant decrease in water levels to affect GW production of permit holders; natural or man-made contamination of water supply source(s); or declaration by State or Federal Gov't of disaster due to drought condition in a county served by District; or unforeseen events cause health/safety risks to the public.	Conduct water conservation public education; keep up-to-date drought information (PDSI) and other helpful drought indicators on website; review and confirm permit holders are enforcing their DCPs; monitor well levels frequently basis after consulting District's hydrologist; designate DMZ under Rule 7.2 as appropriate and/or restrict GW production by permittees.
Clearwater Underground Water CD	Edwards BFZ	1-Aware	*PDI 70 to 79%; Spring Discharge 900 to 701 ac-ft/month* (PDI monitored daily on running-year basis & based on NEX-RAD rainfall data; PDI trigger cond. must be exceeded 28 consecutive days; Spring Discharge monitored with daily max discharge values averaged over 5 consecutive days on running 5-day basis)	Continue or increase voluntary reduction; check for plumbing leaks; no filling of ponds, lakes, tanks, reservoirs, swimming pools or other surface impoundments w/total capacity of more than 50,000 gallons except for PWSs (goal to achieve 10% reduction in water usage)
		2-Concern	*PDI 60 to 69%; Spring Discharge 700 to 401 ac-ft/month* (PDI monitored daily on running-year basis & based on NEX-RAD rainfall data; PDI trigger cond. must be exceeded 28 consecutive days; Spring Discharge monitored with daily max discharge values averaged over 5 consecutive days on running 5-day basis)	Continue or increase voluntary reduction; check for plumbing leaks; no filling of ponds, lakes, tanks, reservoirs, swimming pools or other surface impoundments w/total capacity of more than 50,000 gallons except for PWSs (goal to achieve 20% reduction in water usage); limit outdoor watering to once every 5-7 days bet. 7pm and 7am (ag/horticulture operations exempted but encouraged to reduce watering by 20%); wash vehicles at car wash only as needed; water livestock in leak-proof troughs if possible.
		3-Serious	*PDI 50 to 59%; Spring Discharge 400 to 201 ac-ft/month* (PDI monitored daily on running-year basis & based on NEX-RAD rainfall data; PDI trigger cond. must be exceeded 28 consecutive days; Spring Discharge monitored with daily max discharge values averaged over 5 consecutive days on running 5-day basis)	Continue or increase voluntary reduction; check for plumbing leaks; no filling of ponds, lakes, tanks, reservoirs, swimming pools or other surface impoundments w/total capacity of more than 50,000 gallons except for PWSs (goal to achieve 30% reduction in water usage); limit outdoor watering to once every 5-7 days bet. 7pm and 7am (ag/horticulture operations exempted but encouraged to reduce watering by 30%); wash vehicles at car wash only as needed; water livestock in leak-proof troughs if possible; fountains/swimming pools/décor. ponds covered where possible; water for dust control when req'd by law.
		4-Critical	*PDI < 50%; Spring Discharge 200 ac-ft/month or less* (PDI monitored daily on running-year basis & based on NEX-RAD rainfall data; PDI trigger cond. must be exceeded 28 consecutive days; Spring Discharge monitored with daily max discharge values averaged over 5 consecutive days on running 5-day basis)	Continue or increase voluntary reduction; check for plumbing leaks; no filling of ponds, lakes, tanks, reservoirs, swimming pools or other surface impoundments (goal to achieve 40% reduction in water usage); no outdoor watering (ag/horticulture operations exempted but encouraged to reduce watering by 40%); no vehicle washing; water livestock in leak-proof troughs if possible; water for dust control when req'd by law.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Groundwater Conservation District	Major Aquifer(s)	Stage Number	Drought Triggers	District's Responses
Clearwater Underground Water CD	Trinity	1-Aware	PDI 70 to 79%; (PDI monitored daily on running-year basis & based on NEX-RAD rainfall data; PDI trigger cond. must be exceeded 28 consecutive days)	Continue or increase voluntary reduction; check for plumbing leaks; no filling of ponds, lakes, tanks, reservoirs, swimming pools or other surface impoundments w/total capacity of more than 50,000 gallons except for PWSs (goal to achieve 10% reduction in water usage)
		2-Concern	PDI 60 to 69%; (PDI monitored daily on running-year basis & based on NEX-RAD rainfall data; PDI trigger cond. must be exceeded 28 consecutive days)	Continue or increase voluntary reduction; check for plumbing leaks; no filling of ponds, lakes, tanks, reservoirs, swimming pools or other surface impoundments w/total capacity of more than 50,000 gallons except for PWSs (goal to achieve 20% reduction in water usage); limit outdoor watering to once every 5-7 days bet. 7pm and 7am (ag/horticulture operations exempted but encouraged to reduce watering by 20%); wash vehicles at car wash only as needed; water livestock in leak-proof troughs if possible.
		3-Serious	PDI 50 to 59%; (PDI monitored daily on running-year basis & based on NEX-RAD rainfall data; PDI trigger cond. must be exceeded 28 consecutive days)	Continue or increase voluntary reduction; check for plumbing leaks; no filling of ponds, lakes, tanks, reservoirs, swimming pools or other surface impoundments w/total capacity of more than 50,000 gallons except for PWSs (goal to achieve 30% reduction in water usage); limit outdoor watering to once every 5-7 days bet. 7pm and 7am (ag/horticulture operations exempted but encouraged to reduce watering by 30%); wash vehicles at car wash only as needed; water livestock in leak-proof troughs if possible; fountains/swimming pools/décor. ponds covered where possible; water for dust control when req'd by law.
		4-Critical	PDI < 50%; (PDI monitored daily on running-year basis & based on NEX-RAD rainfall data; PDI trigger cond. must be exceeded 28 consecutive days)	Continue or increase voluntary reduction; check for plumbing leaks; no filling of ponds, lakes, tanks, reservoirs, swimming pools or other surface impoundments (goal to achieve 40% reduction in water usage); no outdoor watering (ag/horticulture operations exempted but encouraged to reduce watering by 40%); no vehicle washing; water livestock in leak-proof troughs if possible; water for dust control when req'd by law.
Middle Trinity GCD	Trinity	0	PDSI > 80%; PDI	N/A
		1	PDSI 70 to 80%; PDI	Reduction of pumping by 10% on voluntary basis; information posted on District's website
		2	PDSI 60 to 70%; PDI	Reduction of pumping by 20% on voluntary basis; information posted on District's website
		3	PDSI 50 to 60%; PDI	Reduction of pumping by 30% on voluntary basis; information posted on District's website
		4	PDSI < 50%; PDI	Reduction of pumping by 40% on voluntary basis; information posted on District's website

Notes:
PDI – Precipitation Deficit Index

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Also, GCDs are generally more concerned about long-term pumping (usage over decades) than short-term drought conditions. All of the GCDs use either the PDSI or PDI to monitor the severity of drought conditions. Based on PDSI or PDI readings, the GCDs then notify all of their permitted public water suppliers to implement their respective DCPs. Also, each of the GCDs focus on their respective DFCs based on specific aquifer characteristics within their management area (i.e., Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer versus the Trinity Aquifer).

7.4 RWPA Drought Response Triggers and Actions

As shown in Tables 7.5, 7.6, and 7.7 many WUGs, WWPs, and GCDs within the Brazos G Region have developed DCPs for their respective service areas. These DCPs include detailed drought triggers and corresponding management measures tailored to the specific water resources they manage. The Brazos G RWPG recommends leveraging these existing drought triggers and actions outlined in the DCPs to ensure a coordinated and effective response across the Region. By aligning the regional water planning efforts with the established triggers and actions, the RWPG aims to enhance the resilience of water supplies during drought conditions. This approach also promotes consistency and cooperation among the various entities managing and relying on water resources within the Brazos G Area.

7.5 Existing and Potential Emergency Interconnects

In the event of a severe and prolonged drought or interruption or contamination of an existing water supply, it is important for municipal WUGs to have a back-up plan and alternative source of supply available. In fact, TCEQ requires all PWSs to have a plan in place based on the guidelines outlined in 30 TAC, Chapter 288, Subchapter B. Interconnects between two municipal WUGs are an acceptable alternative for emergency water supply in lieu of trucking in treated drinking water to a community.

The TCEQ Texas Drinking Water Watch database (TCEQ database) was the primary source used to identify existing emergency interconnect information for the Brazos G Area. The availability of each PWS water source is categorized as Permanent, Seasonal, Interim or Emergency in the TCEQ database; however, details on existing interconnect supply capacity or location are not provided. As a result, numerous emergency users and providers were contacted by phone to obtain infrastructure details about each interconnect, such as meter size, pipeline diameter and capacity; information regarding future emergency interconnects was also collected. In many cases, an understanding or agreement is already in place between the interconnect provider and user about the transfer volume of water supply in the event of an emergency. According to TWC §16.053(r), confidential information regarding the location coordinates of each of the emergency interconnects was not gathered or included in the regional plan.

A summary of the number of existing and future emergency interconnects in the Brazos G Area, including who is connected to whom, principal county served, infrastructure details and the emergency provider's source of supply is presented in Table 7.8. During this planning cycle, 125 interconnects were identified compared to 115 interconnects in the 2021 Brazos G Plan. A few of the WUGs, including the Cities of Bryan, College Station and Round Rock, have more than one interconnect with particular WUGs. Forty-four of the potential emergency providers have a single source of water supply. If this source became contaminated or no longer available for the emergency user, then other alternatives or arrangements would be necessary. Twenty-one of the WUG providers have two supply sources, and four of the listed WUG providers have three or more sources of supply.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 7.8 Summary of Emergency Interconnects in the Brazos G Area

Emergency User [A]	Emergency Provider [B]	Provider's Sources [C]		
		Source #1	Source #2	Source # 3
ACTON MUD	CITY OF GRANBURY	LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	HOOD COUNTY (GW)	
AQUA WSC	CITY OF LOCKHEART	WILCOX AQUIFER (GW)	SAN MARCOS RIVER (SW)	
AXTELL WSC	EOL WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
BEACHVIEW ACRES WATER ASSOCIATION	LAKESHORE WATER SYSTEM	HILL COUNTY (GW)		
BELL MILAM FALLS WSC	EAST BELL WSC	CENTRAL TEXAS WSC (SW)	BELL COUNTY (GW)	
BELLMEAD	CITY OF WACO	BRAZOS RIVER (SW)	WACO LAKE (SW)	
BENTWATER ON LAKE GRANBURY	CITY OF GRANBURY	LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	HOOD COUNTY (GW)	
BETHANY SUD	BETHESDA WSC	FORT WORTH (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)	
BIROME WSC	CITY OF MOUNT CALM	HILL COUNTY (GW)		
BLOCK HOUSE MUD	CITY OF LEANDER	LCRA-LAKE TRAVIS (SW)		
BLUE WATER OAKS ESTATES	JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	BRA-LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	MANSFIELD (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)
BOLD SPRINGS WSC	CITY OF WEST	WACO (SW)	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)	
BRAZOS RIVER ACRES	RIVER COUNTRY ACRES	HOOD COUNTY (GW)		
BRUSHY CREEK MUD	CITY OF ROUND ROCK	BRA-LAKE GEORGETOWN (SW)	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	
CANYON CREEK ADDITION	ACTON MUD	BRA-LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	HOOD COUNTY (GW)	
CEDRON CREEK RANCH WATER SUPPLY	STEELE CREEK HARBOR	BOSQUE COUNTY (GW)		
CHALK BLUFF WSC	ROSS WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)	WACO (SW)	
CITY OF ALVARADO	JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	MANSFIELD (SW)	BRA-LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)
CITY OF BAIRD	CALLAHAN COUNTY WSC	CLYDE (SW)	BAIRD(SW)	
CITY OF BAIRD	CITY OF CLYDE	LAKE CLYDE (SW)	ABILENE (SW)	
CITY OF BELTON	CENTRAL TEXAS WSC	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW (SW)	BELL COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF BREMOND	TRI COUNTY SUD	FALLS COUNTY (GW)	ROBERTSON COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF BRYAN	CITY OF COLLEGE STATION	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
CITY OF BRYAN	WICKSON CREEK SUD	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
CITY OF COLLEGE STATION	CITY OF BRYAN	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
CITY OF COLLEGE STATION	TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
CITY OF COLLEGE STATION	WELLBORN SUD	NAVASOTA RIVER (SW)	BRAZOS (GW)	
CITY OF FLORENCE	CITY OF GEORGETOWN	BRA-LAKE GEORGETOWN (SW)	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF GEORGETOWN	CITY OF LEANDER	LCRA-LAKE TRAVIS (SW)		
CITY OF GEORGETOWN	CITY OF ROUND ROCK	BRA-LAKE GEORGETOWN (SW)	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF GEORGETOWN (FUTURE)	CITY OF ROUND ROCK	LCRA-LAKE TRAVIS (SW)	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF GEORGETOWN (FUTURE)	CITY OF ROUND ROCK	LCRA-LAKE TRAVIS (SW)	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF GODLEY	JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	BRA-LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	MANSFIELD (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)
CITY OF GRANBURY	BRAZOS REGIONAL PUA	BRA-LAKE GRANBURY (SW)		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Emergency User [A]	Emergency Provider [B]	Provider's Sources [C]		
		Source #1	Source #2	Source # 3
CITY OF HUBBARD	POST OAK SUD	DAWSON (SW)	CORSICANA (SW)	
CITY OF KILLEEN	CENTRAL TEXAS WSC	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW (SW)	BELL COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF LEANDER	CITY OF CEDAR PARK	LCRA-LAKE TRAVIS (SW)		
CITY OF LORENA	CITY OF HEWITT	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)	WACO (SW)	LORENA (SW/GW)
CITY OF MEXIA	BISTONE MWSD	LIMESTONE COUNTY (GW)	LAKE MEXIA (SW)	
CITY OF MINGUS	CITY OF GORDON	PALO PINTO COUNTY (GW)		
CITY OF MOUNT CALM	BIROME WSC	HILL COUNTY (GW)		
CITY OF OGLESBY	CORYELL CITY WSD	GATESVILLE (SW)		
CITY OF RIESEL	TRI COUNTY SUD	FALLS COUNTY (GW)	ROBERTSON COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF RIO VISTA	JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	BRA-LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	MANSFIELD (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)
CITY OF ROCKDALE	SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC	MILAM COUNTY (GW)		
CITY OF ROGERS	BELL MILAM FALLS WSC	CENTRAL TEXAS WSC (SW)	BELL COUNTY (GW)	
CITY OF ROUND ROCK	CITY OF AUSTIN	LCRA-LAKE TRAVIS (SW)	LCRA-LAKE AUSTIN (SW)	
CITY OF ROUND ROCK	CITY OF GEORGETOWN	BRA-LAKE GEORGETOWN (SW)		
CITY OF ROUND ROCK	BRUSHY CREEK MUD	BRA-LAKE GEORGETOWN (SW)		
CITY OF ROUND ROCK (FUTURE)	CITY OF GEORGETOWN	LCRA-LAKE TRAVIS (SW)		
CITY OF ROUND ROCK (FUTURE)	CITY OF GEORGETOWN	LCRA-LAKE TRAVIS (SW)		
CITY OF THROCKMORTON	FORT BELKNAP WSC	CITY OF GRAHAM (SW)		
CITY OF WACO	BLUEBONNET WSC	LAKE BELTON (SW)		
CITY OF WHITNEY	HILL COUNTY WSC	AQUILLA WSD (SW)		
COMANCHE COVE	CITY OF GRANBURY	LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	HOOD COUNTY (GW)	
COTTONWOOD WSC	CITY OF WEST	WACO (SW)	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)	
CROSS COUNTRY WSC	HIGHLAND PARK WSC	BOSQUE COUNTY (GW)		
CROSS COUNTRY WSC	PATRICK WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
CROWN RANCH SUBDIVISION	DOBBIN PLANTERSVILLE WSC 1	MONTGOMERY COUNTY (GW)		
DOBBIN PLANTERSVILLE WSC 2	DOBBIN PLANTERSVILLE WSC 1	MONTGOMERY COUNTY (GW)		
EAST BELL WSC	BELL MILAM FALLS WSC	CENTRAL TEXAS WSC (SW)	BELL MILAM FALLS WSC (GW)	
EAST BELL WSC	CITY OF TEMPLE	LEON RIVER (SW)		
EOL WSC	AXTELL WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
EOL WSC	PRAIRIE HILL WSC	LIMESTONE COUNTY (GW)		
EULA WSC	CITY OF CLYDE	LAKE CLYDE (SW)	ABILENE (SW)	
FALCON CREST ADDITION	NORTHCREST ADDITION	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)		
GLEN OAKS MOBILE HOME PARK	WICKSON CREEK SUD	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
GRANBURY ACRES	CITY OF GRANBURY	LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	HOOD COUNTY (GW)	
GUN & ROD ESTATES	CITY OF BRENHAM	LAKE SOMERVILLE (SW)		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Emergency User [A]	Emergency Provider [B]	Provider's Sources [C]		
		Source #1	Source #2	Source # 3
HAMILTON INN	CITY OF HAMILTON	UPPER LEON MWD (SW)		
HILLTOP WSC	BOLD SPRINGS WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
JARRELL SCHWERTNER WSC	SONTERRA MUD	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	BRA-LONE STAR RWA (SW)	
JARRELL-SCHWERTNER	SONTERRA MUD	JARRELL COUNTY (GW)		
JONAH WATER SUD	CITY OF GEORGETOWN	BRA-LAKE GEORGETOWN (SW)	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	
LAGUNA VISTA SUBDIVISION	LAGUNA TRES SUBDIVISION	HOOD COUNTY (GW)		
LAKESHORE WATER SYSTEM 2	LAKESHORE WATER SYSTEM	HILL COUNTY (GW)		
LATHAM SPRINGS BAPTIST ENCAMPMENT	GHOLSON WSC	HILL & MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
LEE COUNTY FWSD #1	LEE COUNTY WSC	LEE COUNTY (GW)		
LEON JUNCTION WSC	FLAT WSC	GATESVILLE (SW)		
LINCOLN WSC	LEE COUNTY WSC	LEE COUNTY (GW)		
LTG WSC	PURE WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
MALLARD POINTE	CITY OF GRANBURY	LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	HOOD COUNTY (GW)	
MESA GRANDE WSC	CITY OF GRANBURY	LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	HOOD COUNTY (GW)	
METROPLEX HOMESTEADS WATER SUPPLY	JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)	BRA-LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	MANSFIELD (SW)
MINERVA WSC	SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC	MILAM COUNTY (GW)		
MURRAY HILL WATER SYSTEM	HILL COUNTY WSC	AQUILLA WSD (SW)		
NOLAN COUNTY FWSD #1	CITY OF SWEETWATER	OAK CREEK LAKE, LAKES SWEETWATER & TRAMMELL (SW)	NOLAN COUNTY (GW)	
NORTH MILAM WSC	CITY OF CAMERON	LITTLE RIVER (SW)		
OAK HILL WATER SYSTEM	HILL COUNTY WSC	AQUILLA WSD (SW)		
OAKVIEW FARMS SUBDIVISION	BETHESDA WSC	FORT WORTH (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)	
PRAIRIE HILL WSC	EOL WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
PURE WSC	LTG WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
RIDGE CREST ADDITION & MISTY HOLLOW	BETHESDA WSC	FORT WORTH (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)	
RIVER COUNTRY ACRES	BRAZOS RIVER ACRES	HOOD COUNTY (GW)		
ROSS WSC	CHALK BLUFF WSC	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)		
SHADY HILLS ESTATES WATER SYSTEM	BETHESDA WSC	FORT WORTH (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)	
SHADY MEADOWS ESTATES	OAKVIEW FARMS AND BETHESDA WSC	TERRANT COUNTY (GW)		
SONTERRA MUD	JARRELL SCHWERTNER WSC	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	CENTRAL TEXAS WSC (SW)	SALADO WSC (GW)
SOUTH BOSQUE WSC	CITY OF WACO	LAKE WACO (SW)	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)	
SOUTH SAN GABRIEL RANCHES	HIGH GABRIEL WSC	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)		
SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC	CITY OF ROCKDALE	MILAM COUNTY (GW)		
STEPHENS REGIONAL SUD	CITY OF BRECKENRIDGE	WEST CENTRAL TEXAS MWD (SW)	LAKE DANIELS (SW)	LAKE HUBBARD (SW)
SUNDANCE ADDITION	JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	MANSFIELD (SW)	BRA-LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	MANSFIELD (SW)
SYLVESTER MCCAULLEY WSC	CITY OF HAMLIN	ABILENE (SW)		

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Emergency User [A]	Emergency Provider [B]	Provider's Sources [C]		
		Source #1	Source #2	Source # 3
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	CITY OF COLLEGE STATION	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	CITY OF COLLEGE STATION	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
TWIN CREEK SUBDIVISION	BETHESDA WSC	FORT WORTH (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)	
WELLBORN SUD	CITY OF BRYAN	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
WELLBORN SUD	CITY OF COLLEGE STATION	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
WELLBORN SUD	TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
WEST BELL COUNTY WSC	CITY OF KILLEEN	BELL COUNTY WCID 1 (SW)		
WEST BRAZOS WSC	CITY OF WACO	LAKE WACO (SW)	MCLENNAN COUNTY (GW)	
WESTERN HILLS	CITY OF GRANBURY	LAKE GRANBURY (SW)	HOOD COUNTY (GW)	
WESTSIDE RURAL WSC	BETHESDA WSC	FORT WORTH (SW)	JOHNSON COUNTY (GW)	
WICKSON CREEK SUD	CITY OF BRYAN	BRAZOS COUNTY (GW)		
WICKSON CREEK SUD	WELLBORN SUD	NAVASOTA RIVER (SW)	BRAZOS (GW)	
WILLIAMSON COUNTY WSID 3	CITY OF ROUND ROCK	BRA-LAKE GEORGETOWN (SW)	WILLIAMSON COUNTY (GW)	
WORTH RANCH	PALO PINTO WSC	MINERAL WELLS (SW)		

Notes:
(1) Emergency interconnect users/providers listed in TCEQ Drinking Water Watch Database; infrastructure details to be confirmed by email and/or via phone discussions. Text in red represents information from this cycle, which is to be confirmed. Sources of new providers are to be filled in.

7.6 Drought Management WMS

The regional water plan is developed to meet projected water demands during a drought of severity equivalent to the DOR. Brazos G sees the purpose of the planning as ensuring that sufficient supplies are available to meet future water demands. For this reason, drought management recommendations have not been made by Brazos G as a water management strategy for specific WUG needs. Reducing water demands during a drought as a defined water management strategy does not ensure that sufficient supplies will be available to meet the projected water demands; but simply eliminates the demands. While Brazos G encourages entities in the Region to promote demand management during a drought, it should not be identified as a "new source" of supply. Recommending demand reductions as a water management strategy is antithetical to the concept of planning to meet projected water demands. It does not make more efficient use of existing supplies as does conservation, but instead effectively turns the tap off when the water is needed most. It is planning to not meet future water demands.

While Drought Management WMS are not recommended as water management strategies by the Brazos G RWPG, DCPs are encouraged for all entities and the Region supports the implementation of the drought responses outlined in these DCPs when corresponding triggers occur. While the relief provided from these DCP responses can prolong supply and reduce impacts to communities, they are not considered to be predictable or controllable for all entities under all potential droughts. Where recommended by other RWPGs, the Brazos G RWPG supports such recommendations.

7.7 Emergency Responses to Local Drought Conditions or Loss of Water Supply

As a result of the severe drought experienced during 2015 and 2016, the State water planning process encourages entities to plan for this potential emergency condition based on the DOR. It is especially important for small entities that rely on a sole source of supply to have a back-up plan in case they experience a local drought, infrastructure/equipment failure or water supply contamination. Although many entities and WWPs have adopted DCPs, it is less common for the smaller municipalities or those included in County-Other to have these types of emergency plans in place.

All municipal WUGs in the Region were evaluated regarding their potential emergency response to local drought conditions or loss of existing water supplies. Based on TWDB's template for this task, the emergency response alternatives included both temporary and/or permanent solutions. For the purpose of the evaluation, it was assumed that the entities being evaluated had approximately 180 days or less of water supply remaining. Municipal WUGs using groundwater supplies also considered implementing desalination of brackish groundwater, depending on the aquifers located in the area, as an alternative source of supply. MAG availability was not included in the analysis/alternative of drilling additional wells since the emergency supply would be used on a temporary basis. Municipal WUGs using surface water supplies were analyzed for curtailment of junior water rights and for releases from upstream reservoirs; additional yield availability was not analyzed for reservoir releases.

A high-level review and analysis were performed for (1) small WUGs having 2030 Census populations of less than 7,500 and relying on a sole source of water supply; and (2) all County-Other WUGs in the Brazos G Area regardless of population or number of sources. Several of the small WUGs are split by county, but it is the total WUG population that includes them on the list for having a total population of less than 7,500. If a WUG relied on surface water from an intake structure or a specific reservoir, then it was considered to have a sole source of supply, regardless of the number of contracts in place. A WUG that had a contract for purchasing treated water from BRA was not considered to have a sole source of supply due to BRA's system operations. WUGs using both groundwater and surface water supplies were not included in the evaluation, with the exception of County-Other entities.

Many of the WWPs in the Brazos G Area are also looking for ways to diversify their water supply portfolio in case a severe drought or loss of water supply occurs; examples of water supply initiatives that have been identified or implemented are highlighted below.

Table 7.9 Alternative Water Supply Initiatives for WUG/WWPs in the Brazos G Area

WUG/WWP	Alternative Water Supply Initiative(s)
Bluebonnet WSC	Contracted with the Cities of Waco, Woodway and McGregor to construct a 16-inch diameter line/interconnect (serves both directions) as an alternative water supply source in case of an emergency.
Bistone MWD	Secured dual water supply sources, including Carrizo-Wilcox groundwater wells and water rights in Lake Mexia.
Bell County WCID No. 1	The new water treatment plant at Lake Stillhouse has been constructed in addition to its existing treatment plant, adding redundancy into their water supply.
Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1	Secured an alternative source from Turkey Peak Reservoir in case they experience high turbidity or contamination of their current water supplies (primarily blend and treat water from the Brazos River and Lake Palo Pinto); Turkey Peak Reservoir will be located on Palo Pinto Creek immediately downstream from Lake Palo Pinto.
City of Bryan	Constructed Gibbons Creek Reservoir as an alternative surface water supply, and is currently pursuing a Aquifer Storage and Recovery project to diversify their groundwater portfolio.
West Central Texas MWD	As of 2016, aecured an additional source of supply, Possum Kingdom Reservoir, in case the District experiences severe drought or emergency conditions impacting their primary water supply from Lake Hubbard.
City of Stamford	Identified additional groundwater supplies from property owners located north of the city, as well as additional surface water supplies from Cedar Ridge Reservoir.
Central Texas WSC	Will be able to supplement and firm up their water supply as a result of the Lake Granger Augmentation Project.
North Central Texas MWA	Drilled nine wells in the Seymour Aquifer during 2015 to provide back-up groundwater supplies for the Authority.

A nearby entity that could provide supply in the case of an isolated incident was identified for each WUG, and existing interconnects were noted based on information listed in the TCEQ database. For the small WUGs split by county, a nearby entity was identified for that particular county if possible. In addition, trucking in water was considered as a supply option under severe circumstances. A total of 201 WUG entries (including small WUGs split by county) were researched and analyzed using the TCEQ database, including 37 County-Other WUGs. Over twice as many WUG entries were evaluated during this planning cycle compared to the 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan; the results of this effort are summarized in Table 7.10.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 7.10 Potential Emergency Water Supplies for Small and County-Other WUGs Facing Loss of Supply

Entity				Potential Emergency Water Supply Sources							Implementation Requirements			
Water User Group	County	2030 Population	2030 Demand (AF/yr)	Release From Upstream Reservoir	Curtailment of Upstream/Downstream Water Rights	Local Groundwater Well	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	Truck in Water	Supply from Nearby Entity	Existing Emergency Interconnect	Potential Entity Providing Supply	Other Local Entities Required to Participate/Coordinate	Emergency Agreements/Arrangements Already in Place?	Type of Infrastructure Required
ANSON	JONES	2,291	345			X	X	X	X		STAMFORD			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
AXTELL WSC	MCLENNAN	1,775	303			X	X	X	X	EOL WSC	WACO	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
BARTLETT	BELL	1,639	328			X		X	X		HOLLAND			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
BARTLETT	WILLIAMSON	1,639	328			X	X	X	X		ROUND ROCK			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
BELL COUNTY WCID 1	BRAZOS	264	98					X						Transportation
BELL COUNTY WCID 3	BELL	9,460	1,659					X	X		NOLANVILLE			Pipeline, Transportation
BELL COUNTY-OTHER	BELL	4,610	760		X	X	X	X	X		KILLEEN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
BLOCK HOUSE MUD	WILLIAMSON	5,749	808			X		X	X	LEANDER	ROUND ROCK			
BOSQUE COUNTY-OTHER	BOSQUE	6,648	894			X		X	X		CLIFTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
BRAZOS COUNTY-OTHER	BRAZOS	2,497	350			X	X	X	X		COLLEGE STATION			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
BREMOND	ROBERTSON	781	156			X	X	X	X	TRI COUNTY SUD	HEARNE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
BURLESON COUNTY-OTHER	BURLESON	7,076	788			X	X	X	X		CALDWELL			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CADE LAKES WSC	BRAZOS	436	110					X						Transportation
CALDWELL	BURLESON	4,293	919			X		X	X		ROCKDALE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CALLAHAN COUNTY WSC	CALLAHAN	2,304	190			X		X	X		CLYDE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CALLAHAN COUNTY WSC	SHACKELFORD	2,304	190	X		X		X	X		MORAN			
CALLAHAN COUNTY-OTHER	CALLAHAN	2,126	159	X	X	X		X	X		CLYDE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CALVERT	ROBERTSON	1,042	269			X	X	X	X		HEARNE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CAMERON	MILAM	5,320	1,265			X		X	X		MILANO WSC			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CEGO-DURANGO WSC	FALLS	1,174	203			X		X	X		MARLIN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE DISTRICT	BELL	891	280					X	X		COPPERAS COVE			Pipeline, Transportation
CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE DISTRICT	CORYELL	891	280					X	X		COPPERAS COVE			Pipeline, Transportation
CENTRAL WASHINGTON COUNTY WSC	WASHINGTON	3,623	480			X	X	X	X		BRENHAM			
CHALK BLUFF WSC	MCLENNAN	3,608	576			X	X	X	X	ROSS WSC	WACO	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity				Potential Emergency Water Supply Sources							Implementation Requirements			
Water User Group	County	2030 Population	2030 Demand (AF/yr)	Release From Upstream Reservoir	Curtailment of Upstream/Downstream Water Rights	Local Groundwater Well	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	Truck in Water	Supply from Nearby Entity	Existing Emergency Interconnect	Potential Entity Providing Supply	Other Local Entities Required to Participate/Coordinate	Emergency Agreements/Arrangements Already in Place?	Type of Infrastructure Required
CHAPPELL HILL WSC	WASHINGTON	493	107			X	X	X	X		BRENHAM			
CHILDRESS CREEK WSC	BOSQUE	1,336	338			X		X	X		CLIFTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CISCO	EASTLAND	3,947	730	X		X		X	X		EASTLAND			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
COMANCHE	COMANCHE	4,307	522		X	X		X	X		DE LEON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
COMANCHE COUNTY-OTHER	COMANCHE	7,117	719	X	X	X		X	X		COMANCHE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CORYELL COUNTY-OTHER	CORYELL	3,543	401	X	X	X	X	X	X		COPPERAS COVE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CRAWFORD	MCLENNAN	870	202		X	X		X	X		MCGREGOR			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CROSS COUNTRY WSC	BRAZOS	3,310	643					X		X	CROSS COUNTRY WSC		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
CROSS PLAINS	CALLAHAN	920	211			X		X	X		CLYDE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
DE LEON	COMANCHE	2,226	235		X	X		X	X		COMANCHE COUNTY WSC			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
DEANVILLE WSC	BURLESON	1,926	367			X		X	X		CALDWELL			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
DOG RIDGE WSC	BELL	5,016	942			X		X	X		HARKER HEIGHTS			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES	BRAZOS	2,837	3,240					X						Transportation
DUBLIN	ERATH	2,877	323		X	X		X	X		STEPHENVILLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
EAST CRAWFORD WSC	MCLENNAN	985	331			X		X	X		WOODWAY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
EASTLAND	EASTLAND	3,515	610	X		X		X	X		CISCO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
EASTLAND COUNTY-OTHER	EASTLAND	2,976	255	X	X	X		X	X		EASTLAND			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ELM CREEK WSC	BELL	4,460	693			X		X	X		MOODY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ELM CREEK WSC	CORYELL	4,460	693			X		X	X		OGLESBY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ELM CREEK WSC	MCLENNAN	4,460	693			X		X	X		BRUCEVILLE-EDDY			
EOL WSC	MCLENNAN	1,873	228			X	X	X	X	AXTELL WSC & PRAIRIE HILL WSC	WACO	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ERATH COUNTY-OTHER	ERATH	18,207	2,475		X	X		X	X		STEPHENVILLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
FALLS COUNTY-OTHER	FALLS	6,889	842		X	X	X	X	X		MARLIN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
FERN BLUFF MUD	WILLIAMSON	5,426	1,152			X		X	X		BRUSHY CREEK MUD			
FILES VALLEY WSC	HILL	3,600	706			X		X	X		HILLSBORO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
FISHER COUNTY-OTHER	FISHER	907	100			X	X	X	X		ROTAN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity				Potential Emergency Water Supply Sources							Implementation Requirements			
Water User Group	County	2030 Population	2030 Demand (AF/yr)	Release From Upstream Reservoir	Curtailment of Upstream/Downstream Water Rights	Local Groundwater Well	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	Truck in Water	Supply from Nearby Entity	Existing Emergency Interconnect	Potential Entity Providing Supply	Other Local Entities Required to Participate/Coordinate	Emergency Agreements/Arrangements Already in Place?	Type of Infrastructure Required
FLAT WSC	CORYELL	682	194			X		X	X		GATESVILLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
FLORENCE	WILLIAMSON	1,416	208			X		X	X	GEORGETOWN	ROUND ROCK		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
FORT BELKNAP WSC	STEPHENS	3,853	515			X		X	X		BRECKENRIDGE			
FORT BELKNAP WSC	THROCKMORTON	3,853	515			X		X	X		THROCKMORTON			
FORT BELKNAP WSC	YOUNG	3,853	515			X		X	X		OLNEY	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
FORT GATES WSC	CORYELL	2,345	479			X		X	X		GATESVILLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
FORT GRIFFIN SUD	EASTLAND	1,141	213	X		X		X	X		CISCO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
FORT GRIFFIN SUD	SHACKELFORD	1,141	213	X		X		X	X		MORAN			
FORT GRIFFIN SUD	STEPHENS	1,141	213	X		X		X	X		BRECKENRIDGE			
FORT GRIFFIN SUD	THROCKMORTON	1,141	213	X		X		X	X		THROCKMORTON			
FRANKLIN	ROBERTSON	1,959	281			X	X	X	X		HEARNE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GHOLSON WSC	HILL	4,560	627			X	X	X	X		AQUILLA	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GHOLSON WSC	MCLENNAN	3,435	472			X	X	X	X		WACO	X	X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GIDDINGS	LEE	5,497	1,129			X	X	X	X		THRALL			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GLEN ROSE	SOMERVELL	2,776	603			X		X	X		TOLAR			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GODLEY	JOHNSON	1,365	170			X		X	X	JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	CLEBURNE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GORDON	ERATH	659	166		X	X		X	X		STEPHENVILLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GORDON	PALO PINTO	659	166	X		X		X	X		STRAWN			
GORMAN	EASTLAND	952	111			X		X	X		CARBON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GRAHAM	YOUNG	7,421	2,470			X		X	X					Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GRANDVIEW	JOHNSON	1,754	291			X		X	X		ALVARADO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GRANGER	WILLIAMSON	1,234	194			X	X	X	X		ROUND ROCK		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GRIMES COUNTY-OTHER	GRIMES	10,456	1,434			X	X	X	X		NAVASOTA			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
GROESBECK	LIMESTONE	3,225	585	X	X			X	X		MEXIA			Pipeline, Transportation
H & H WSC	MCLENNAN	1,475	199			X	X	X	X		TRI COUNTY SUD	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HAMBY WSC	BRAZOS	1,413	176					X						Transportation
HAMILTON	HAMILTON	2,700	527			X		X	X		MULTI COUNTY WSC			Well, Pipeline, Transportation

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity				Potential Emergency Water Supply Sources							Implementation Requirements			
Water User Group	County	2030 Population	2030 Demand (AF/yr)	Release From Upstream Reservoir	Curtailment of Upstream/Downstream Water Rights	Local Groundwater Well	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	Truck in Water	Supply from Nearby Entity	Existing Emergency Interconnect	Potential Entity Providing Supply	Other Local Entities Required to Participate/Coordinate	Emergency Agreements/Arrangements Already in Place?	Type of Infrastructure Required
HAMILTON COUNTY-OTHER	HAMILTON	3,461	415			X		X	X		HAMILTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HAMLIN	JONES	1,544	315			X	X	X	X		STAMFORD			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HASKELL	HASKELL	3,179	602			X	X	X	X		STAMFORD			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HASKELL COUNTY-OTHER	HASKELL	2,221	286		X	X	X	X	X		HASKELL			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HEARNE	ROBERTSON	5,253	867			X	X	X	X		FRANKLIN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HICO	HAMILTON	1,224	177			X		X	X		HAMILTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HIGHLAND PARK WSC	BOSQUE	517	150			X		X	X		CLIFTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HIGHLAND PARK WSC	MCLENNAN	517	150			X		X	X		WACO, GHOLSON WSC			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HILL COUNTY-OTHER	HILL	4,438	470	X	X	X	X	X	X		HILLSBORO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HOG CREEK WSC	BRAZOS	370	396					X						Transportation
HOLLAND	BELL	1,209	136			X		X	X		BARTLETT			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
HOOD COUNTY-OTHER	HOOD	41,090	4,127	X	X	X		X	X		GRANBURY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ITASCA	HILL	1,698	200			X		X	X		HILLSBORO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
JAYTON	KENT	492	97			X	X	X	X		ASPERMONT			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
JOHNSON COUNTY-OTHER	JOHNSON	12,805	1,310	X	X	X		X	X		BURLESON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
JONES COUNTY-OTHER	JONES	7,090	857	X	X	X	X	X	X		ABILENE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
KENT COUNTY-OTHER	KENT	245	29			X	X	X	X		JAYTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
KNOX CITY	KNOX	1,004	246			X		X	X		MUNDAY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
KNOX COUNTY-OTHER	KNOX	900	89		X	X	X	X	X		MUNDAY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
LACY LAKEVIEW	MCLENNAN	7,585	1,022			X		X	X		WACO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
LAKE PALO PINTO AREA WSC	PALO PINTO	1,061	128	X				X	X		SANTO SUD			
LAMPASAS COUNTY-OTHER	LAMPASAS	740	95			X	X	X	X		LAMPASAS			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
LAWN	COLORADO	242	47					X						Transportation
LEE COUNTY-OTHER	LEE	2,717	271			X	X	X	X		GIDDINGS			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
LEROY TOURS GERALD WSC	MCLENNAN	1,557	193					X	X					Pipeline, Transportation
LEVI WSC	MCLENNAN	2,193	574			X		X	X		LORENA			

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity				Potential Emergency Water Supply Sources							Implementation Requirements			
Water User Group	County	2030 Population	2030 Demand (AF/yr)	Release From Upstream Reservoir	Curtailment of Upstream/Downstream Water Rights	Local Groundwater Well	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	Truck in Water	Supply from Nearby Entity	Existing Emergency Interconnect	Potential Entity Providing Supply	Other Local Entities Required to Participate/Coordinate	Emergency Agreements/Arrangements Already in Place?	Type of Infrastructure Required
LEXINGTON	LEE	1,951	376			X		X	X		GIDDINGS			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
LIMESTONE COUNTY-OTHER	LIMESTONE	2,782	251	X	X	X	X	X	X		MEXIA			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
LIPAN	HOOD	937	146			X		X	X		GRANBURY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MART	LIMESTONE	1,798	460			X	X	X	X		MEXIA	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MART	MCLENNAN	1,798	460			X	X	X	X		WACO	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MCGREGOR	MCLENNAN	9,961	2,602			X		X	X		MOODY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MCLENNAN COUNTY WCID 2	MCLENNAN	1,185	222			X	X	X	X		WACO	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MCLENNAN COUNTY-OTHER	MCLENNAN	5,941	734	X	X	X		X	X		WACO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MERKEL	BRAZOS	2,617	329					X						
MEXIA	LIMESTONE	6,936	1,026			X		X	X	BISTONE MWD	SLC WSC			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MILAM COUNTY-OTHER	MILAM	7,187	853		X		X	X	X		CAMERON			Pipeline, Transportation
MILANO WSC	BURLESON	2,811	511			X		X	X		ROCKDALE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MILANO WSC	MILAM	2,811	511			X		X	X		CAMERON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MORGANS POINT RESORT	BELL	5,300	774		X	X		X	X		TEMPLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MULTI COUNTY WSC	CORYELL	3,306	328			X		X	X		GATESVILLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MULTI COUNTY WSC	HAMILTON	624	62			X		X	X		HAMILTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MUNDAY	KNOX	1,162	228			X		X	X		GOREE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MUSTANG VALLEY WSC	BOSQUE	1,862	439			X		X	X		MERIDIAN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
MUSTANG VALLEY WSC	CORYELL	1,862	439			X		X	X		GATESVILLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
NAVASOTA	GRIMES	7,917	1,581			X		X	X		COLLEGE STATION			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
NOACK WSC	BRAZOS	738	152					X						Transportation
NOLAN COUNTY-OTHER	NOLAN	1,218	135		X	X		X	X		SWEETWATER			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
NORTH BOSQUE WSC	MCLENNAN	2,075	638			X		X	X		WACO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
NORTH RURAL WSC	PALO PINTO	1,654	177	X	X			X	X		PALO PINTO WSC			
OGLESBY	CORYELL	515	40			X				CORYELL CITY WSD	GATESVILLE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
PALO PINTO COUNTY-OTHER	PALO PINTO	3,089	272	X	X			X	X		MINERAL WELLS			Pipeline, Transportation
PALO PINTO WSC	PALO PINTO	748	102	X	X			X	X		NORTH RURAL WSC			

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity				Potential Emergency Water Supply Sources							Implementation Requirements			
Water User Group	County	2030 Population	2030 Demand (AF/yr)	Release From Upstream Reservoir	Curtailment of Upstream/Downstream Water Rights	Local Groundwater Well	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	Truck in Water	Supply from Nearby Entity	Existing Emergency Interconnect	Potential Entity Providing Supply	Other Local Entities Required to Participate/Coordinate	Emergency Agreements/Arrangements Already in Place?	Type of Infrastructure Required
PALOMA LAKE MUD 1	WILLIAMSON	3,447	537			X		X	X		GEORGETOWN		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
PALOMA LAKE MUD 2	WILLIAMSON	2,506	390			X		X	X		GEORGETOWN		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
POSSUM KINGDOM WSC	PALO PINTO	1,413	599	X	X			X	X		GRAFORD			
POSSUM KINGDOM WSC	STEPHENS	1,413	599	X	X			X	X		BRECKENRIDGE			
POTOSI WSC	CALLAHAN	7,732	1,164			X		X	X		CLYDE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
POTOSI WSC	TAYLOR	7,732	1,164			X		X	X		ABILENE			
PRAIRIE HILL WSC	LIMESTONE	1,384	277			X	X	X	X	EOL WSC	MEXIA	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
PRAIRIE HILL WSC	MCLENNAN	1,384	277			X	X	X	X	EOL WSC	WACO	X		Well, Pipeline, Transportation
RIESEL	MCLENNAN	1,231	156			X	X	X	X	TRI COUNTY SUD	RMS WSC	X	X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
RIO VISTA	JOHNSON	1,069	185			X		X	X	JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	CLEBURNE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
RISING STAR	EASTLAND	698	130			X		X	X		GORMAN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ROBERTSON COUNTY WSC	ROBERTSON	3,370	522			X	X	X	X		HEARNE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ROBERTSON COUNTY-OTHER	ROBERTSON	1,926	210			X	X	X	X		HEARNE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ROCKDALE	MILAM	7,428	1,609			X		X	X	SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC	CAMERON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ROGERS	BELL	918	164			X		X	X	BELL MILAM FALLS WSC	BELTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
ROSCOE	NOLAN	1,092	222			X		X	X		SWEETWATER			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
S U N WSC	BRAZOS	2,348	244					X						Transportation
SANTO SUD	HOOD	2,005	270			X		X	X		GRANBURY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
SANTO SUD	PALO PINTO	2,005	270	X		X		X	X		GORDON			
SHACKELFORD COUNTY-OTHER	SHACKELFORD	228	22	X	X			X	X		ALBANY			Pipeline, Transportation
SLC WSC	LIMESTONE	1,000	101			X		X	X		MEXIA			Pipeline, Transportation
SMITH BEND WSC	BOSQUE	128	18			X		X	X		CLIFTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
SNOOK	BURLESON	1,170	410			X	X	X	X		CALDWELL			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
SOMERVELL COUNTY-OTHER	SOMERVELL	1,407	166	X	X			X	X		GLEN ROSE			Pipeline, Transportation
SOMERVILLE	BURLESON	1,316	268			X	X	X	X		CALDWELL			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
SPORTSMANS WORLD MUD	PALO PINTO	76	75	X	X			X	X		PALO PINTO WSC			
STAFF WSC	EASTLAND	1,251	195			X		X	X		GORMAN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity				Potential Emergency Water Supply Sources							Implementation Requirements			
Water User Group	County	2030 Population	2030 Demand (AF/yr)	Release From Upstream Reservoir	Curtailment of Upstream/Downstream Water Rights	Local Groundwater Well	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	Truck in Water	Supply from Nearby Entity	Existing Emergency Interconnect	Potential Entity Providing Supply	Other Local Entities Required to Participate/Coordinate	Emergency Agreements/Arrangements Already in Place?	Type of Infrastructure Required
STAFF WSC	STEPHENS	1,251	195			X		X	X		BRECKENRIDGE			
STEAMBOAT MOUNTAIN WSC	TAYLOR	7,215	960			X		X	X		ABILENE			
STEPHENS COUNTY-OTHER	STEPHENS	315	32			X		X	X		BRECKENRIDGE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
STEPHENS REGIONAL SUD	EASTLAND	2,831	550	X		X		X	X	BRECKENRIDGE	EASTLAND			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
STEPHENS REGIONAL SUD	PALO PINTO	2,831	550	X		X		X	X	BRECKENRIDGE	POSSUM KINGDOM WSC			
STEPHENS REGIONAL SUD	SHACKELFORD	2,831	550	X		X		X	X	BRECKENRIDGE	ALBANY			
STEPHENS REGIONAL SUD	STEPHENS	2,831	550	X		X		X	X	BRECKENRIDGE	ALBANY			
STEPHENS REGIONAL SUD	THROCKMORTON	2,831	550	X		X		X	X	BRECKENRIDGE	THROCKMORTON			
STONEWALL COUNTY-OTHER	STONEWALL	462	53			X	X	X	X		ASPERMONT			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
STRAWN	PALO PINTO	547	124	X	X			X	X		MINERAL WELLS			Pipeline, Transportation
STURDIVANT PROGRESS WSC	PALO PINTO	2,285	237	X	X			X	X		PALO PINTO WSC			
TAYLOR COUNTY-OTHER	TAYLOR	1,516	165		X			X	X		ABILENE			Pipeline, Transportation
TDCJ LUTHER UNITS	GRIMES	1,170	319			X	X	X	X		NAVASOTA			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
TDCJ W PACK UNIT	GRIMES	1,675	451			X	X	X	X		NAVASOTA			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
TEXAS STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	MCLENNAN	1,000	2,016			X		X	X		LACY LAKEVIEW			
THE BITTER CREEK WSC	BRAZOS	1,631	247					X						
THE GROVE WSC	BELL	1,317	199			X		X	X		MOODY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
THE GROVE WSC	CORYELL	1,317	199			X		X	X		OGLESBY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
THORNDALE	MILAM	1,775	265			X		X	X		ROCKDALE			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
THORNDALE	WILLIAMSON	1,775	265			X	X	X	X		ROUND ROCK		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
THROCKMORTON	THROCKMORTON	617	146		X			X	X	FORT BELKNAP WSC	GRAHAM			Pipeline, Transportation
THROCKMORTON COUNTY-OTHER	THROCKMORTON	154	14		X			X	X		THROCKMORTON			Pipeline, Transportation
TOLAR	HOOD	1,153	186			X		X	X		GRANBURY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
TWIN CREEK WSC	ROBERTSON	922	225			X	X	X	X		FRANKLIN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
TYE	TAYLOR	1,016	157			X		X	X		ABILENE			
VALLEY MILLS	BOSQUE	1,267	247			X		X	X		CLIFTON			Well, Pipeline, Transportation

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Entity				Potential Emergency Water Supply Sources							Implementation Requirements			
Water User Group	County	2030 Population	2030 Demand (AF/yr)	Release From Upstream Reservoir	Curtailment of Upstream/Downstream Water Rights	Local Groundwater Well	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	Truck in Water	Supply from Nearby Entity	Existing Emergency Interconnect	Potential Entity Providing Supply	Other Local Entities Required to Participate/Coordinate	Emergency Agreements/Arrangements Already in Place?	Type of Infrastructure Required
VALLEY MILLS	MCLENNAN	1,267	247			X		X	X		WACO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
VIEW CAPS WSC	TAYLOR	1,963	319			X		X	X		ABILENE			
VISTA OAKS MUD	WILLIAMSON	2,765	431			X		X	X					Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WALSH RANCH MUD	WILLIAMSON	824	128			X		X	X		BRUSHY CREEK MUD			
WASHINGTON COUNTY-OTHER	WASHINGTON	10,918	1,362			X	X	X	X		BRENHAM			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WEST BELL COUNTY WSC	BELL	4,335	783			X		X	X		KILLEEN			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WEST BRAZOS WSC	BRAZOS	2,290	396					X		X	WEST BRAZOS WSC		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WESTBOUND WSC	BRAZOS	2,405	183					X						Transportation
WHITNEY	HILL	2,424	454			X		X	X	HILL COUNTY WSC	AQUILLA			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WILLIAMSON COUNTY MUD 10	WILLIAMSON	3,780	589			X		X	X		GEORGETOWN		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WILLIAMSON COUNTY MUD 11	WILLIAMSON	5,921	922			X		X	X		GEORGETOWN		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WILLIAMSON COUNTY-OTHER	WILLIAMSON	53,875	8,194	X	X	X	X	X	X		ROUND ROCK			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WILLIAMSON TRAVIS COUNTIES MUD 1	WILLIAMSON	3,832	584			X		X	X		GEORGETOWN		X	Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WILLIAMSON COUNTY WSID 3	WILLIAMSON, TRAVIS	4,992	1,002			X		X	X					Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WINDSOR WATER	MCLENNAN	647	104			X		X	X		WOODWAY			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WOODROW OSCEOLA WSC	HILL	2,842	546			X		X	X		HILLSBORO			Well, Pipeline, Transportation
WOODROW OSCEOLA WSC	BRAZOS	2,842	546					X						Transportation
YOUNG COUNTY-OTHER	YOUNG	3,410	401		X	X		X	X		GRAHAM			Well, Pipeline, Transportation

Notes:
(1) The supply sources are informed by the 2030 supply information from DB 27, accessed on 8/29/2024 and 01/17/2025.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

7.8 Other Drought-Related Considerations and Recommendations

The Brazos G RWPG acknowledges that DCPs are a useful drought management tool for entities with both surface and groundwater sources and recommends that all entitles consider adopting a DCP in preparation for drought conditions. The RWPG also recommends that in accordance with TCEQ guidelines, entities update their DCPs every five years as triggers can change as wholesale and retail water providers reassess their contracts and supplies.

7.8.1 Drought Response Recommendations for Surface Water

Surface water accounts for approximately 69 percent of projected 2080 municipal supplies in Brazos G. Surface water is sold by more than 73 WUG/WWPs and comes from over 37 lakes and numerous river intakes. With such a variety of supply sources it is difficult to create a set of triggers and responses that fit the needs of each WUG in the regional planning area. Brazos G recognizes that supplies are understood best by the operators and suggests that WUGs without DCPs look to the DCPs of their water providers as examples, if available.

For entities without DCPs which supply themselves with local surface water, the Brazos G RWPG suggests reviewing the drought responses and recommendations used by similar entities in the Region. An example of triggers and responses from the DCP for the City of Waco is presented below (Table 7.11). Waco was selected as a representative example because they provide water to several entities throughout the Brazos G Area and rely on a single source of surface water, i.e., Lake Waco. The DCP includes four water stages ranging from "Water Alert" to "Water Crisis". The triggers depend on parameters such as treatment plant use, storage levels, reservoir elevations, and system failures. The responses include categories ranging from home irrigation limits to commercial and industrial use reductions.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 7.11 Waco Surface Water Drought Contingency Response

Drought Stage	Trigger	Actions	Goals
Stage 1 – MILD Water Shortage	▪ Lake Waco reservoir level decreases to 457 msl (about 80% of capacity); or ▪ Weather forecasts and streamflow conditions warrant restrictions, based on opinion of the city manager; or ▪ Other unforeseen events, such as a water treatment plant, pipe or pump failure or source of supply contamination that necessitates the public participation in a reduction of water usage.	▪ Mandatory restrictions: » The city will reduce use of water for municipal purposes by Submittal of a water plan that includes following the mandated day and times allowed for watering and meeting the water reduction goal. » Monitor “excessive watering” and issue notifications to customers. » Criminal penalties apply during Stage 1 Restrictions. » All landscape and other outdoor water usage at each service address shall be limited to two days a week based on the last digit in the physical street address; however, landscape and outdoor water usage is prohibited from 10:00 AM to 7:00 PM. » Variances will be reduced to 45 days for newly installed plants. All other variance requirements in the Conservation Plan remain in effect. » Golf course landscape watering and Athletic Field watering must adhere to the water plan that was submitted or adhere to the twice a week water schedule.	▪ Reduction of previous 3-year average daily use by 1%
Stage 2 – MODERATE Water Shortage	▪ Lake Waco reservoir level decreases to 452 msl (about 60% capacity) ▪ Inability to recover approximately 90 percent of water stored in all storage facilities within a 24-hour period ▪ Weather forecasts and streamflow conditions warrant restrictions, based on opinion of the city manager ▪ Other unforeseen events, such as a water treatment plant, pipe or pump failure, or source of supply contamination that necessitates the public’s participation in a reduction of water usage.	▪ Mandatory restrictions: » The city will reduce use of water for municipal purposes by: 1. Submittal of a water plan that includes following the mandated day and times allowed for watering and meeting the water reduction goal 2. Reduced hours for such things as spray parks. » The city will monitor “excessive watering” and issue notification to customers. “Excessive watering” occurs where run-off extends for a distance greater than (10) feet from the customer’s property or where there is washing or hosing down of buildings, sidewalks, driveways, patios, porches, parking surfaces or other paved surfaces. » Criminal penalties apply during Stage 2 restrictions. » All landscape and other outdoor water usage at each service address shall be limited to two days a week based on the last digit in the physical street address; however, landscape and outdoor water usage is prohibited from 10:00 AM to 7:00PM. » Watering of newly installed landscaping variances is reduced to 30 days from the date of planting. After the first month, the landscape water day’s schedule and hourly restrictions must be followed. All other variance requirements in the Conservation Plan remain in effect. » Golf course landscape watering and Athletic Field watering must adhere to the water plan that was submitted or adhere to the twice a week watering schedule. » Any other measure that the City Manager determines is necessary and in the best interest of the public to maintain an adequate water supply. » Conservation Rates take effect.	▪ Reduction of previous 3-year average daily use by 2% November – March and 8% April - October

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Drought Stage	Trigger	Actions	Goals
Stage 3 – SEVERE Water Shortage	▪ Lake Waco reservoir level decreases to 449 msl (about 50% capacity); or ▪ There is an inability to recover approximately ninety (90) percent of water stored in all storage facilities within a twenty-four (24) hour period. ▪ Weather forecasts and streamflow conditions, in the opinion of the city manager, warrant restrictions on the use of water; or ▪ Total amount of water available, as determined by the utilities director, to the city from its developed water sources is less than a 24-month supply; or ▪ Other unforeseen events, such as a water treatment plant, pipe or pump failure, or source of supply contamination that necessitate the public's participation in a reduction of water usage	▪ Mandatory restrictions: » The city will reduce use of water for municipal purposes by: 1. Submittal of a water plan that includes following the mandated day and times allowed for watering and meeting the water reduction goal 2. Reduced hours for such things as spray parks. » The city will monitor "excessive watering" and issue notification to customers. "Excessive watering" occurs where run-off extends for a distance greater than (10) feet from the customer's property or where there is washing or hosing down of buildings, sidewalks, driveways, patios, porches, parking surfaces or other paved surfaces. » Criminal penalties apply during Stage 3 restrictions. » All landscape and other outdoor water usage at each physical street address shall continue according to the landscape water days schedule (1 day a week); however, landscape and outdoor water usage is prohibited from 10:00 AM to 7:00PM. » Watering by handheld hose-end nozzle or sprayer that requires continuous human action (such as squeezing of a lever) is permitted on the water day and times reflected above. Buried drip irrigation is still permitted as long as it is buried at least 6 inches deep. » No variables for newly installed plantings will be given. » Existing swimming pools, hot tubes, spas, ornamental ponds and fountains may be replenished with a handheld hose to maintain operation only » Permitting of new swimming pools, hot tubs, spas, ornamental ponds or fountain construction is prohibited, except that those under construction at the time Stage 3 restrictions are initiated may complete construction and may be filled one time only. Filling occurs when an amount of water equal to at least seventy-five (75) percent of the water capacity is placed in structure or facility. » Excessive water fun-off from any landscaped area onto streets, alleys, or parking lots is prohibited. Run-off is excessive when it extends for a distance greater than ten (10) feet from the customer's property. » Washing or hosing down buildings, sidewalks, driveways, patios, porches, parking areas, or other paved surfaces is prohibited. » Commercial car washes will not be allowed to operate during Drought Stage 3. » Use of water from fire hydrants is prohibited except for firefighting and health and safety related activities. » Any other measure that the City Manager determines is necessary and in the best interest of the public to maintain an adequate water supply. ▪ Conservation Rates take effect.	▪ Reduction of previous 3-year average daily use by 2% November – March and 15% from April- October
Stage 4 – EMERGENCY Water Shortage	▪ Lake Waco reservoir level decreases to 445 msl (about 40% capacity), or ▪ City manager determines that catastrophically decreasing reservoir levels and/or delivery capabilities with an inability to recover to provide necessary services for public health, safety, and welfare exist; or ▪ Weather forecasts and streamflow conditions, in the opinion of the manager, warrant restrictions on the use of water; or ▪ Total amount of water available, as determined by the water utilities director, to the city from its developed water sources is less than a 12-month supply; or ▪ Other unforeseen events, such as a water treatment plant, pipe or pump failure or source of supply contamination that necessitate the public's participation in a reduction of water usage.	▪ Mandatory restrictions: » Any and all outdoor/landscape water usage is prohibited until the emergency is alleviated. This applies to all metered water users using the city's public water supply and includes all residential (single or multi-family), commercial (car wash, nurseries, business), recreational (public/private golf courses, parks, athletic fields), religious, health care, school, and municipal entities, This applies to watering with a handheld hose and drip irrigation. » Water used for municipal purposes will be limited to only those activities necessary to maintain the public health, safety and welfare, as determined by the City. » Use of water from fire hydrants is prohibited except for firefighting and other health and safety related activities » Any other measure that the City Manager determines is necessary and in the best interest of the public to maintain an adequate water supply. » Conservation Rates take effect.	▪ Reduction of previous 3-year average daily use by 5% November – March and 20% April – October. ▪ Note the city manager or his/her designee can set a goal for greater water use reduction as circumstances warrant.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

7.8.2 Drought Response Recommendations for Groundwater

Groundwater accounts for approximately 28 percent of projected 2080 municipal supplies. Entities in Brazos G use both brackish and non-brackish wells from over 22 aquifers or formations. With such a variety of supply sources it is difficult to create a set of triggers and responses that fit the needs of each WUG in the regional planning area. Brazos G recognizes that supplies are understood best by the operators and suggests that WUGs without DCPs look to the DCP's of their water providers and groundwater conservation districts as examples, if available.

For entities without DCPs supplying themselves with local groundwater, Brazos G suggests reviewing the drought responses and recommendations used by similar nearby entities. An example of triggers and responses from the DCP for the City of Thrall is presented below (Table 7.12). Thrall was selected as a representative example because they are a small WUG using local groundwater like many of the groundwater reliant WUGs who have not yet developed a DCP. The DCP includes five water stages ranging from "Mild" to "Emergency". The triggers depend on parameters such as season, ground storage levels, contamination, and system failures. The responses include categories ranging from residential irrigation limits to commercial and industrial use reductions. Note that Thrall is in the process of updating this DCP.

Table 7.12 Thrall Groundwater Drought Contingency Response

Drought Stage	Trigger	Actions
Stage I – MILD	Yearly: May 1st – September 30th.	▪ City reduces water main flushing ▪ Voluntary limit on irrigation to 2 days a week at designated times ▪ City of Thrall should adhere to Stage 2 restrictions below ▪ Customers are requested to minimize or discontinue non-essential water use
Stage II – MODERATE	Ground Storage does not gain over 20ft.	▪ Mandatory limit on irrigation to 2 days a week at designated times or by hand-held hose or 5-gallon bucket ▪ Vehicle washing allowed only with hand-held bucket or hose ▪ Filling of pools or Jacuzzis limited to watering days/times ▪ Non-circulating ponds or fountains are prohibited unless supporting aquatic life. ▪ Use of water from fire hydrants shall be limited to firefighting activities or other activities necessary to maintain public health, safety and welfare. ▪ All restaurants are prohibited from serving water unless requested ▪ Non-essential uses are prohibited
Stage III – SEVERE	Ground Storage does not gain over 15 ft.	▪ All actions listed in Stage II ▪ Irrigation limited to hand-held hose or less than 5 gallons of faucet water is used during designated watering days and times. ▪ The use of water for construction from designated hydrants under special permit is discontinued.

Drought Stage	Trigger	Actions
Stage IV – CRITICAL	Ground Storage does not gain over 10 ft	▪ All actions listed in Stages II and III ▪ Only washing of mobile equipment in the critical interest of public health or safety is allowed. Commercial car washes can be used during designated hours. ▪ Filling of swimming pools or fountains is prohibited ▪ No applications for new, additional or expanded water service infrastructure shall be approved
Stage V – EMERGENCY	▪ Infrastructure breaks ▪ Contamination ▪ System outage	▪ All actions described in previous stages ▪ Irrigation of landscaped areas is absolutely prohibited ▪ Use of water to wash any vehicle is absolutely prohibited

7.9 Development of Region-Specific Model DCPs

TCEQ has prepared model DCPs for wholesale and retail water suppliers and irrigation districts to provide guidance and suggestions to entities with regard to the preparation of DCPs. Not all items in the model will apply to every system's situation, but the overall model can be used as a starting point for most entities. The Brazos G RWPG suggests that the TCEQ Model DCPs should be used in conjunction with drought contingency measures such as those listed above for Waco and Thrall for entities wishing to develop a new DCP. The DCPs for Waco and Thrall can be found in Appendix J.

The TCEQ model DCPs can be found on TCEQ's website at the following link:

https://www.tceq.texas.gov/permitting/water_rights/wr_technical-resources/contingency.html

7.10 Drought Preparedness Council Report

The Drought Preparedness Council (DPC) provided a letter to the Brazos G RWPG on February 8, 2024, providing three recommendations below.

1. "The regional water plans and State Water Plan shall serve as water supply plans under DOR conditions. The DPC encourages RWPGs to consider planning for drought conditions worse than the DOR, including scenarios that reflect greater rainfall deficits and/or higher surface temperatures."
    a. Brazos G Response: The Brazos G RWPG has utilized the Chapter 7 guidelines provided by TWDB staff and has addressed the requirements related to DWDOR, as discussed in Section 7.2. This has included identifying where such studies have been conducted for consideration of needs for redundancies to address uncertainty in regional water planning.
2. "The Drought Preparedness Council encourages RWPGs to incorporate projected future reservoir evaporation rates in their assessments of future surface water availability."
    a. Brazos G Response: While it is possible to quantitatively assess a range of input variables including hydrology worse than the DOR, the existing regional water planning framework does not support evaluating a range of possible futures (e.g., future evaporation rates) for the 2026 regional water plans. However, the 2026 Brazos G RWP accounts for several conservative assumptions to plan for and mitigate against potential DWDOR, as discussed in Section 7.2.

3. "The Drought Preparedness Council encourages RWPGs to identify in their plans utilities within their boundaries that reported having less than 180 days of available water supply to the TCEQ during the current or preceding planning cycle. For systems that appeared on the 180-day list, RWPGs should perform the evaluation required by TAC Section 357.42(g), if it has not already been completed for that system."
    a. Brazos G Response: The Brazos G RWPG has addressed the requirements consistent TAC §357.42(g), as shown in Section 7.7.

7.11 Other Drought Recommendations

7.11.1 Recommendations to the Drought Preparedness Council

The Brazos G RWPG offers no recommendations to the Drought Preparedness Council nor any recommendations regarding the State Drought Preparedness Plan.

7.11.2 Monitoring and Assessment

The Brazos G RWPG recommends that all entities monitor the drought situation around the State and locally in order to prepare for and facilitate decisions. Several State and local agencies are monitoring and reporting on conditions with up-to-date information. More information can be found at these local, State and Federal resources:

- BRA Drought Information: https://www.brazos.org/About-Us/Water-Supply/Drought
- PDSI: http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/temp-and-precip/drought/historical-palmers/
- TWDB Drought Information: http://waterdatafortexas.org/drought/
- TCEQ Drought Information: https://www.tceq.texas.gov/response/drought
- Drought Annex: State of Texas Emergency Management Plan (2014, updated 2016): https://waterdatafortexas.org/drought/twdb-reports/state_of_texas_drought_annex_2016.pdf
- National Drought Mitigation Center: https://drought.unl.edu/
- National Integrated Drought Information System: https://www.drought.gov/drought/states/texas

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

CHAPTER 8 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNIQUE STREAM SEGMENTS, UNIQUE RESERVOIR SITES, AND OTHER LEGISLATIVE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Recommendations Concerning River and Stream Segments Having Unique Ecological Value

The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department provides a wealth of information on stream segments throughout the State and by region.[1] The Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) supports the proactive dissemination of such information to all water providers and users within the area in support of the continued improvement of the management of the region's water resources.

RWPGs are given the option of designating stream segments having "unique ecological value" within their planning areas. Five criteria are used to identify such segments:

1. Biological Function:
    a. Quantity (acreage or a real extent of habitat).
    b. Quality (biodiversity, age, uniqueness).
2. Hydrologic Function:
    a. Water quality.
    b. Flood attenuation and flow stabilization.
    c. Groundwater recharge and discharge.
3. Occurrence of Riparian Conservation Areas.
4. Occurrence of high water quality, exceptional aquatic life or high aesthetic value.
5. Occurrence of threatened or endangered species and/or unique communities.

The Brazos G RWPG (Brazos G) has chosen not to designate any stream segments as having unique ecological value.

[1] https://tpwd.texas.gov/landwater/water/conservation/water_resources/water_quantity/sigsegs/

8.2 Recommendations Concerning Sites Uniquely Suited for Reservoir Construction

Brazos G has previously identified the following sites as uniquely suited for reservoir construction. Each site was associated with a request by a potential local project sponsor to include the project as a recommended or alternative water management strategy in the 2016 Plan:

- Cedar Ridge Reservoir (City of Abilene).
- Turkey Peak Reservoir (Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District No. 1).
- Millers Creek Off-Channel Reservoir (OCR) (North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority) (now known as Lake Creek Reservoir).
- Brushy Creek Reservoir (City of Marlin).
- Coryell County OCR (Coryell County).

Texas Water Code (TWC), 16.051(g-1) states "The designation of a unique reservoir site under this subsection terminates on September 1, 2015, unless there is an affirmative vote by a proposed project sponsor to make expenditures necessary in order to construct or file applications for permits required in connection with the construction of the reservoir under federal or state law."

Brazos G recommends re-designation of the Millers Creek OCR (known as Lake Creek Reservoir) and the Coryell County OCR, for which the unique designation appears to have terminated. Vol. II. Sections 4.3 and 4.5 provides details supporting the designation of these sites of unique value for construction of reservoirs. These sites are identified in this section of the Plan as sites for site-specific reservoir development as a recommended water management strategy. The sections cited provide the location, hydrologic, geologic, topographic, water availability, water quality, environmental, cultural, and current development characteristics, making each site uniquely suited for reservoir development to provide water supply for the current planning period.

Brazos G recommends no change in designation for the previously designated sites for Cedar Ridge Reservoir, Turkey Peak Reservoir and Brushy Creek Reservoir, as those designations have not terminated because sufficient action has been taken prior to September 1, 2015, regarding their development to meet the requirements of TWC 16.051(g-1).

Brazos G does not recommend designation of any additional sites as uniquely suited for reservoir construction.

8.3 Brazos G – A Valuable Texas Resource

Brazos G is one the most diverse regional water planning areas in Texas, covering 37 counties along the Brazos River Basin. The geographic area extends from Kent, Stonewall, and Knox Counties in the northwest to Washington and Lee Counties in the southeast.

Since its inception, Brazos G has been an important platform in regional water planning. Our central mission is to develop a regional water plan. Brazos G does not enact any water planning policy or strategy. Rather, it captures input and develops a regional water plan that meets the statutory requirements. The planning process is the true added value.

Brazos G brings together perspectives from agriculture, industries, municipalities, counties, small business, water utilities, the public, electric utilities, groundwater management representatives, environmental interests, and river authorities in an approach that helps enhance the overall water planning process.

Brazos G uses various resources such as our consultant, Carollo Engineers, Inc., and its subconsultants, to collect reliable Region-wide data to include in our regional water plan. We engage with other stakeholders in addressing water planning issues. We reach out to constituents in the 37 counties as we develop the regional water plan. Input from these various sources makes the regional water planning process a bottom-up approach. Brazos G also arranges public meetings, including meetings in its Upper Basin, Middle Basin, and Lower Basin to collect even more public input. This process encourages transparency and inclusivity.

Brazos G serves an important role as an entry point for public engagement in the water planning process. This role also makes it a good resource for the Texas Legislature as it grapples with the realities of an ongoing drought, a rapidly growing population, and strong economic development.

8.4 Legislative and Policy Recommendations

Brazos G established a Water Policy Workgroup to discuss various issues concerning State water policy and to formulate proposed positions for the planning group to consider for recommendation to the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) and the Texas Legislature. As the population and economic demands grow, water supplies become more stressed. These developments coupled with recent drought conditions make it increasingly important for water planning groups to consider diverse water management strategies.

Regional water planning rules require use of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) water availability models (WAMs) in determining surface water supply availability. The period of record for most existing TCEQ WAMs ends with the year 1997. In portions of the Brazos River Basin, drought conditions since 1997 are worse than conditions experienced prior to 1997. Therefore, firm water availability from existing surface water supply sources and from new surface water supply strategies may be overstated. As a result, water shortages may exist that are not apparent in the regional and State water plans. Brazos G recognizes modeled available groundwater (MAG) as the amount of water that the TWDB Executive Administrator determines may be produced on an average annual basis to maintain or achieve the desired future conditions (DFCs) adopted by the groundwater conservation districts (GCDs) within a groundwater management area (GMA). "Desired future condition" means a quantitative description of the desired condition of the groundwater resources in a management area at one or more specified future times.

GMAs are tasked with the joint planning of groundwater resources as prescribed in TWC Chapter 36.108. DFCs proposed provide a balance between the highest practicable level of groundwater production and the conservation, preservation, protection, recharging, and prevention of waste of groundwater and control of subsidence in the management area. DFCs are policy decisions, not physical facts. Regional water plans are required to use the MAGs in place at the time of adoption of TWDB's State Water Plan in the next regional water planning cycle or, at the option of the RWPG, established subsequent to the adoption of the most recent plan. TWDB revised its planning rules to include a MAG Peak Factor that ensures regional water plans have the ability to fully reflect how, under current statute, GCDs anticipate managing groundwater production under drought conditions. However, additional work and efforts to implement regional water plan projects into the groundwater availability model pumping dataset would

further assist and benefit uniform, comprehensive joint planning by both GMAs and RWPGs, further defining the potential impacts and outlook for the future.

Brazos G considers it prudent to explore alternatives to the historic drought of record for water planning purposes. As more diverse water management planning strategies are developed alternative water planning measurements may include firm yield, safe yield and/or operational yield as appropriate. In addition, the water planning process requires coordination with agencies such as the TCEQ and the TWDB. These agencies need sufficient funding and staffing in order to assist water planning groups in fulfilling their water planning mission. Brazos G applauds the Texas Legislature's decision to fund regional flood planning efforts, infrastructure, development of existing and new water resources, and hydrology updates and urges the Texas Legislature to provide additional funding for regular maintenance updates and continued project advancements.

Brazos G will promote water development policies that support efforts to protect both groundwater and surface water sources by encouraging sound practices that will not adversely affect water supply or quality. We support other agencies and organizations in their efforts to encourage responsible land management and water stewardship. Maintaining our watershed health, economic sustainability, and community viability are all critical elements in our water planning efforts. Protecting source water and sensible stewardship of the areas adjacent to and around river basins, sensitive sub-basins, aquifers, and recharge zones is essential for maintaining these resources for present and future needs.

During development of the 2026 Plan, the Water Policy Workgroup revisited several legislative and water policy recommendations incorporated into the 2021 Plan and developed additional recommendations. All recommendations identified by the Workgroup were presented for consideration by the full Brazos G RWPG. After deliberation, Brazos G offers the following specific recommendations concerning State water policy to the TWDB and the Texas Legislature.

8.4.1 Issue No. 1: Streamlining the Processes for Project Implementation

"Brazos G recommends that the Texas Legislature direct all State and local agencies involved in planning, reviewing, and/or permitting water projects to develop defined outcomes and measures of the process for evaluating, approving, permitting, coordinating, and funding in order to allow timely project implementation. Processing timelines are critical factors in the development of new resources. The timely development of new sources, consistent with adopted plan strategies, is a major element of meeting the State's water demands. The amount of time required to gain approval for surface water projects—and, more recently, groundwater projects—is just one example of the need for more structured and cost-effective processes."

8.4.2 Issue No. 2: Plan Implementation

"Brazos G recognizes the need for expeditious implementation of the State Water Plan facilitated by the use of the State Water Implementation Fund for Texas."

8.4.3 Issue No. 3: Coordination between RWPGs and GCDs

"Brazos G is committed to working cooperatively with GCDs as the State's "preferred method of groundwater management" and GMAs when developing the Regional Plan. The GCDs are requested to review population and water demand projections for their respective Districts and comment accordingly.

GMAs are tasked with the joint planning of groundwater resources as prescribed in TWC Chapter 36.108 by adopting DFCs. "Desired future condition" means a quantitative description of the desired condition of the groundwater resources in a management area at one or more specified future times. DFCs proposed provide a balance between the highest practicable level of groundwater production and the conservation, preservation, protection, recharging, and prevention of waste of groundwater and control of subsidence in the management area. DFCs are policy decisions, not physical facts.

Coordination and cooperation among GCDs, GMAs, the RWPG, and other stakeholders are paramount to successful and accurate planning.

Regional water plans are required to consider the MAGs in place at the time of adoption of TWDB's State Water Plan in the next regional water planning cycle or, at the option of the RWPG, established subsequent to the adoption of the most recent plan. GCDs may issue permits in excess of the MAG. Any such exceedance should not be deemed to violate any regional water plan guideline.

TWDB revised its planning rules to include a MAG Peak Factor to assist regional water plans in having the ability to reflect how GCDs anticipate managing groundwater production under drought conditions, but this effort is lacking.

Planning of and management to DFCs as a view of the health of aquifers without unreasonably depleting aquifers is consistent with Brazos G's historical policy not to support water management strategies that would substantially deplete aquifers.

Brazos G encourages and recommends the TWDB amend its rules concerning use of MAG as the limiting factor in accounting of water availability for groundwater projects to be included in the Regional Plan. Unlike management of surface water, MAG is only one of several factors, along with property rights, required to be considered by GCDs in permitting. In order for the planning group to accurately plan and predict needs, a more flexible approach in the use of MAG is necessary.

8.4.4 Issue No. 4: System Operation of Water Facilities

"Brazos G recognizes the inherent benefit of system operations of existing water supply sources and recommends that State water planning as well as permitting continue to promote such water management strategies. System operation involves coordinated operation of two or more water supply sources (including surface water reservoirs, run-of-river diversions and aquifers) such that the system yield is greater than the sum of the individual sources.

System operation provides several significant benefits to the State, including more effective utilization of existing infrastructure; efficient use of water supplies to meet water demand; delay or avoidance of expensive new water supply infrastructure; and reduced negative environmental impacts potentially resulting from major new projects."

Brazos G fully supports the Asset Management Program for Small Systems to assist small water and wastewater systems by creating comprehensive asset management plans for managing the systems in a financially and technically sustainable manner.

Brazos G also fully supports the Water Utilities Technical Assistance Program with a primary goal to provide eligible water and wastewater utilities with financial, managerial and technical capabilities necessary to apply for financial assistance from the TWDB. This support should remain a priority for several reasons, but the primary reason is that many systems have shown the need for this assistance due

to limited resources, lack of knowledge and high turnover of staff. The technical assistance based on the needs of the participant systems should include:

- Asset management evaluation.
- Preparation of a rate study.
- Review of existing organizational operations procedures.
- Review of existing financial statement/budgeting procedures.
- Development of water conservation plans.
- Completion of project information forms/financial assistance applications.

Brazos G recommends continued support for water loss technical assistance and data validation services. This provision will help to yield more accurate data collection and dissemination; promote affordable water service for utility customers; guide water utilities on how to best address and fund water loss mitigation; and ensure that State financial resources are expended effectively.

8.4.5 Issue No. 5: Interbasin Transfers of Surface Water

"Brazos G recognizes that Interbasin Transfers (IBTs) have been a critical component of water management in the Brazos G Area and are a necessary component of overall State water management strategies. The automatic assignment of junior rights to an interbasin water transfer is a deterrent and suppresses the development of interbasin water supply projects. We recommend the re-evaluation of the junior water rights provision that is automatically assigned to interbasin transfers. We also recommend that statutory rules, policies and administrative code be reviewed, and the permitting and review process be streamlined to eliminate any unnecessary obstacles to IBTs."

8.4.6 Issue No. 6: Groundwater Governance

"While Brazos G recognizes that the Rule of Capture remains valid law in Texas, we also recognize that advances in science, changes in water marketing, Texas Supreme Court and case law rulings, and increasing pressures on groundwater add complexity to this issue. Planning and management of groundwater is tasked to balance the conservation and development of groundwater to meet the needs of the State.

Certain aquifers within the Brazos G RWPG are prolific and robust, while, in other parts of the Region, groundwater supply is being tapped to its limits. In some instances, landowners will be required to lower pumps or drill deeper wells due to depletion of either artesian pressure or, in limited cases, water table decline caused by over-pumping. Local management through checks and balances can effectively and fairly regulate usage and protect individual property rights, so long as the variation in GCDs does not prevent the consideration of regional solutions to regional problems. In many cases, GCDs may be appropriate mechanisms to provide local management of groundwater, to fairly preserve historic use, ensure long-term availability of water supply, and protect private property rights – both the rights of those pumping groundwater, and their neighbors. In areas without a GCD and their modification of the Rule of Capture, it is vital to engage individual local entities utilizing the resource in the current and future planning of the resource through the RWPG and GMA.

As such, Brazos G supports the continued management of fresh, brackish, and saline groundwater by GCDs and the joint planning effort of the GMAs. TWDB and GCDs should continue to improve and

advance the best available science for use in the development and conservation of all groundwater resources."

8.4.7 Issue No. 7: Conjunctive Use of Groundwater and Surface Water

"Brazos G recognizes conjunctive use as an important management strategy to maximize use of available resources to meet water demands of the State Water Plan. Conjunctive use is the systematic utilization of groundwater and surface water to optimize the combined yield from both sources. Conjunctive use seeks to maximize the advantages and minimize the disadvantages of each source when both are utilized together. As conjunctive use projects are identified, they should be recommended water management strategies for the regional water plan because Brazos G encourages development of conjunctive use projects. Construction of surface water reservoirs, which provide new sources of water, along with judicial use of groundwater resources, which can be of finite quantity, will provide an integrated solution for the water needs of the future. Brazos G encourages consideration of applicable water quality and environmental issues related to conjunctive use. Brazos G recommends further developing frameworks to evaluate conjunctive use projects."

8.4.8 Issue No. 8: Aquifer Storage and Recovery

"Aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) projects have the potential to store large amounts of water, eliminate evaporative losses of stored water, reduce impacts to groundwater and surface water resources in times of peak demand, and minimize the impact on surface owners when compared to large reservoir projects. However, it is important to note the significant time component of ASR projects regarding injection and withdrawal. ASR historically is associated with water injection in the winter months, or times of high supply and low demand, and recovered in the following summer months, times of low supply and high demand. The longer the injected water is left in place, the greater potential for the injected water to migrate and disintegrate with the native water source.

While ASR projects could be beneficial, there are a number of questions regarding ownership of the injected water, percentage of injected water that is recoverable over time, impact to existing groundwater users, and the quality to which injected water must be treated. An improved legal/public policy framework is needed to address these issues and enhance adoption. Further, we recommend that these water management strategies include sufficient hydrologic study to protect receiving aquifers.

8.4.8.1 Aquifer Recharge Projects

An aquifer recharge project (ARP) (also known as managed aquifer recharge) means a project involving the intentional recharge of an aquifer by means of an injection well or other means of infiltration, including actions designed to reduce declines in the water level of the aquifer, supplement the quality of groundwater available, improve water quality in an aquifer, improve spring flows and other interactions between groundwater and surface water and/or mitigate subsidence. ARPs have the potential to provide another avenue for water resource stewardship to benefit local and regional water supplies for many of the same reasons discussed in the ASR paragraphs above. Storage quantity and water quality reporting for these projects will be vital for use in regional water planning activities to fully account for supplies available during times of drought.

Brazos G recommends that appropriate State agencies and State legislative bodies review TWC 27.201 (1) and consider renaming Aquifer Recharge Project to Managed Aquifer Recharge. This will create

consistency with other states as well as eliminate cumbersome wording and misunderstanding of this strategy within the regional planning framework.

Furthermore, Brazos G encourages the use and development of ARP (aka MAR) to enhance and protect water resources available in our Region.

8.4.9 Issue No. 9: Municipal Per Capita Water Use

"Brazos G recommends the regional water planning process be changed to separate non-residential and residential water use and look at both independently. The current practice of using a water user group's (WUG's) overall gallons per capita per day (gpcd) does not take into account the variation of land use or density of WUG service areas. Adopting better definitions and metrics for water planning beyond the limitations of gpcd would improve the water supply planning process as well as allow for more useful comparisons between WUGs. Also, there needs to be consistency in all water use calculations, and better guidance as to whether regional planning groups are to use raw water delivered or treated water provided in calculating water use for resource planning."

8.4.10 Issue No. 10: Reservoir Water Management

"Brazos G recognizes that the primary purpose of conservation storage capacity in Texas reservoirs authorized for water supply is, in fact, water supply. Although recreational and aesthetic benefits of these reservoirs may provide economic impacts locally, these are secondary incidental benefits. Therefore, we recommend that appropriate State agencies and State legislative bodies uphold the critically important primary purpose of Texas water supply reservoirs to ensure long-standing agreements and contracts are honored and deliveries are not jeopardized by secondary interests. Further, consideration of providing educational programs regarding reservoir purpose and management and other appropriate assistance for businesses and others impacted is recommended.

Additionally, Brazos G recommends that appropriate State agencies and State legislative bodies protect water supply reservoirs from future policies or rules that could cause a conversion from prioritizing water supply purposes to flood control purposes (i.e., mandates of pre-releases, seasonal drawdown protocols, re-allocation of conservation storage, etc.)."

8.4.11 Issue No. 11: Watershed Planning/Source Water Protection

"Brazos G will promote water development policies that support efforts to protect both groundwater and surface water sources by encouraging sound practices that will not adversely affect water supply or quality. We support agencies and organizations in their efforts to encourage responsible land management Maintaining our watershed health, economic sustainability and community viability are all critical elements in our water planning efforts. Sensible stewardship of the areas adjacent to and around river basins, sensitive sub-basins, aquifers and re-charge zones is essential for maintaining these resources. Through source water protection, Texas can promote equitable costs for present and future water sources. Furthermore, Brazos G encourages all governmental agencies, when making regulatory/ permitting decisions or influencing decisions regarding land and resource use, to give preference to alternatives to protect or enhance the quality of water so that such water resources may be utilized for beneficial use."

8.4.12 Issue No. 12: Water Pricing and Conservation

"Acknowledging that water providers must protect a limited resource, pricing signals for both retail and wholesale water should incentivize conservation, as should GCD rules (e.g., by not penalizing permit holders for 'underutilization'). Brazos G encourages water providers to seriously consider implementing appropriate rate structures that would be consistent with best management practices for the water industry. State agencies responsible for regulating these rate structures should provide water providers with the ability to not only cover the cost of service but allow water rate structures to act as a tool in recovering the known future costs of developing or acquiring the next available resource. Similarly, groundwater conservation districts should consider imposing transport fees only on water actually transported, not merely permitted for transport, out of a district."

8.4.13 Issue No. 13: Reuse of Wastewater Effluent

"Brazos G promotes the full development of municipal wastewater effluent as a resilient water resource that can be responsibly used to help meet the water needs of the State of Texas, consistent with the protection of downstream, senior water rights. We further support state agencies and organizations in their efforts to develop technologies and permit the storage and reuse of wastewater effluent as a resilient water source and the protection of downstream surface water rights dependent upon such historically discharged wastewater effluent."

8.4.14 Issue No. 14: Education

"Brazos G believes strongly that water education is important and supports water conservation and public awareness programs at the State and local level. Research indicates that there is a strong relationship between knowledge of water sources and a willingness to conserve. Conservation can be a cost-effective means of securing future water supply."

8.4.15 Issue No. 15: Effects of the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act on Water Supply Systems

Brazos G encourages continued support to small and disadvantaged water systems with assistance for planning, acquisition, design, and construction of water infrastructure to meet Federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) standards. Many small and disadvantaged water systems lack the staff, knowledge, skills, and resources needed to comply with current and future SDWA regulations. These gaps can result in violations, enforcement actions, and administrative orders against those systems. To add further complication, many of the water systems in these communities do not have enough customers with the ability to provide a sustainable rate base to reliably fund the system's continued needs and new treatment requirements that did not exist when the system was originally established. Additionally, many do not have full-time operators with the training needed to operate their treatment systems effectively. Many systems also rely on volunteer board members from the community that have a limited understanding of the responsibilities and requirements or have the dedicated time needed to sustainably run the water system and meet health-based standards and regulatory requirements. Brazos G supports education, proactive assistance, and, where necessary, regionalization to aid these water supply systems.

8.4.16 Issue No. 16: Planning Process Improvements

"In order to realize the value of the planning process, Brazos G recommends the Texas Legislature provide funding and direct the TWDB to adopt policies in the following areas:

- Strategic Initiatives. TWDB should provide funds for studies deemed important by the RWPGs as strategic initiatives that should be pursued. These would be similar to the Phase 1 studies performed during the third cycle of the regional water planning process prior to development of the 2011 regional water plans.
- Planning Support for Small Systems. Small systems are often at higher risk of losing water supply during drought, and the TWDB should provide support and funding for closer coordination with small systems.
- Brazos G recommends continued support for water loss technical assistance and data validation services. This provision will help to yield more accurate data collection and dissemination; promote affordable water service for utility customers; guide water utilities on how to best address and fund water loss mitigation; and, ensure that State financial resources are expended effectively.
- Mid-cycle Legislative Requirements. The Texas Legislature should not change the requirements of the regional water plans after the current planning cycle has commenced without also providing additional funding for increased requirements."

CHAPTER 9 IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPARISON TO THE PREVIOUS REGIONAL WATER PLAN

9.1 Introduction

Chapter 9 addresses the statutory requirements outlined in Senate Bill 660 (82nd Legislative Session) and the planning rules under 31 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §357.45(a), which mandates the evaluation of the implementation status of water management strategies (WMS) and projects recommended in the 2021 Brazos G Water Plan. This assessment is based on data provided by Regional Water Planning Groups (RWPGs) through DB27, and supplementary information collected via Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)-provided forms. Key metrics, including project initiation dates, implementation progress, and expenditure to date, are analyzed to identify challenges and impediments to development. Additionally, this chapter offers a comparative analysis of the 2021 and 2026 Plans, emphasizing improvements in the planning process and examining efforts to enhance regional collaboration among water user groups (WUGs) to achieve shared benefits and economies of scale.

9.2 Implementation of Previous Regional Water Plan

To evaluate the level of implementation and identify impediments to the development of WMS recommended in the 2021 Plan, critical factors affecting progress in meeting projected water-supply needs, the Brazos G Planning Group conducted a comprehensive survey and engagement effort. This included emailed surveys, phone calls, virtual and in-person meetings with WUGs throughout the Region, and sub-regional meetings to exchange information. In addition to the survey, several supplementary methods were employed to identify projects that may have been implemented. These methods included:

- Assessing the scope of work for potentially infeasible WMS.
- Identifying changes since the adoption of the previous plan.
- Reviewing funding records from the TWDB.
- Analyzing conservation implementation reports submitted to the TWDB.

The findings from these efforts are detailed in Appendix M, providing a structured overview of implementation progress and associated challenges.

9.3 Progress of Regionalization

The regional water planning process is a pivotal mechanism for promoting collaboration and regionalization. It establishes a cohesive framework for planning, incorporating shared population and water demand projections, as well as a standardized approach to assessing supply availability. The public meetings convened regularly by Brazos G facilitate the exchange of information across a vast and diverse planning area, effectively bridging the "silos" that often isolate different entities in their water planning efforts. Brazos G represents five groundwater management areas (GMAs), which collectively span the entire planning Region. Each member brings a distinct perspective, contributing their expertise and insights into the sustainable management of groundwater resources. Brazos G regards groundwater

management as a regional issue that necessitates active and engaged participation from local stakeholders.

9.3.1 Overview of Regional Projects

The 2026 Brazos G Plan outlines several "regional" projects, such as the Bosque County Regional Project, Rolling Plains Groundwater Conservation District (GCD) Managed Aquifer Recharge Project, and a range of strategies to address the growing water demands in Williamson, Bell, and Coryell Counties. Efforts such as the Lake Whitney Water Supply Project, Somervell County Water Supply Project, and the West Texas Water Partnership are recommended, while other evolving efforts such as regionalization activities in Bell County and McLennon Counties through the newly formed Central Texas Water Alliance WMS have been identified by the Brazos G RWPG. Many of the recommended WMS and projects in the Plan are designed to serve multiple entities-directly or indirectly-, providing comprehensive, regional solutions to the pressing issue of water scarcity in the Brazos River Basin. Brazos G also works in close collaboration with neighboring regional water planning areas, sharing resources and strategies with Regions O, B, C, F, L, K, and H.

Brazos G serves as an essential forum for ongoing participation and dialogue on water supply challenges across the 37-county Region. It has fostered a mindset that views water supply issues through a regional lens, encouraging the development of integrated solutions to address the needs of all stakeholders.

9.3.2 RWPA's Progress in Achieving Economies of Scale

In accordance with statutory requirements established by HB 807 (86th Legislative Session) and the associated planning rules (31 TAC §357.45(b)), regional water plans are required to assess efforts to promote cooperation among WUGs to achieve economies of scale and encourage WMS that benefit the Region as a whole. This regionalization assessment must include:

- The number of recommended WMS in the previous and current RWPs that serve more than one WUG.
- The number of recommended WMS in the previous RWP that serve multiple WUGs and have been implemented since that plan.
- A description of efforts by the RWPG to promote WMS and WMSPs that serve multiple WUGs and provide regional benefits.

According to data from the TWDB, 37 WMS served multiple WUGs in the 2021 Plan, while the 2026 Plan includes 33 WMS. To this date there are 33 (ongoing and/or completed) strategies that have been implemented based on the information obtained by the Brazos G RWPG. The Brazos G RWPG actively recognizes and encourages coordination among WUGs to develop shared WMS where appropriate. Such opportunities, like those being explored in Bell County, are highly valued by the planning group, as it supports key objectives, including:

- Ensuring water solutions are practical, culturally relevant, and socially appropriate.
- Tailoring strategies to address the unique resources and challenges of each community.
- Fostering community participation to instill a sense of ownership and accountability for water resources.
- Promoting knowledge transfer to empower local communities as stewards of their water resources.

The Brazos G RWPG remains committed to exploring opportunities for collaborative WMS in this and future regional water plans, ensuring the continued advancement of regional cooperation and shared benefits.

9.4 Comparison To Previous Plan

This section offers a comparative analysis of projected water demands, supplies, needs, and WMS between the 2021 and 2026 Plans. Each regional water planning cycle updates population and water demand projections to incorporate the most recent census data or enhanced estimates from the Texas State Demographer. This round of planning has included information from the 2020 US Census.

Changes in per capita water use reflect shifting municipal water use patterns, driven by water conservation initiatives, drought response measures, and development trends. County-aggregated water demands for sectors such as irrigation and steam-electric power are similarly revised, based on updated estimates from the TWDB.

Groundwater supply projections can fluctuate due to adjustments in modeled available groundwater (MAG) determinations, which are adopted through the GMA process. Surface water supply projections also evolve as the Brazos Basin water availability model (WAM) has been updated by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), new return flow projections have been developed, reservoir sedimentation forecasts are revised, and the TWDB alters water availability determination requirements. These updates collectively impact the availability of water supplies for both current uses and future WMS, leading to the observed differences between the 2021 and 2026 Plans.

9.4.1 Changes to WUGs

The 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plans exhibit notable differences. These variations stem from changes in WUGs, alongside shifts in population growth, water demand, and source availability. As a result, the assessment of water needs across the Brazos G Region differs significantly between the two plans.

Table 9.1 outlines the new WUGs added to the 2026 Plan in comparison to the 2021 Plan. Notably, no additional wholesale water providers (WWPs) have been included in the 2026 Plan. And two previously existing WUGs, Bethany Hearne WSC and Mitchell County Utility, have been removed from the 2026 Plan, as these entities have been merged into other WUGs.

Table 9.1 New WUGs in the 2026 Plan

Entity	County
Bell County WCID 1	Bell
Cade Lakes WSC	Burleson
City of Benjamin	Knox
Hog Creek WSC	Bosque, McLennan
Noack WSC	Williamson
S U N WSC	Fisher, Jones, Taylor
Westbound WSC	Callahan, Eastland

9.4.2 Drought of Record

The drought of record varies across different geographic locations in the Brazos G Area. As described in Chapter 7 of Volume I, there have been two primary droughts of record in the Brazos G Area:

- The drought of the 1950s in Mid and Lower Brazos G Areas.
- The 2015 drought in the Upper Brazos G Area.

In both plans, surface water supplies were determined using the TCEQ approved WAMs. For the 2021 Plan, WAMs used for all major river basins in the Brazos G Area incorporated historical hydrologic conditions that occurred between 1940 and 1996. Since the publishing of the 2021 Brazos G RWP, the TCEQ's official Brazos River Basin WAM (Brazos WAM) has been updated with an extended hydrology through the year 2018. This WAM forms the basis of the modeling performed for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G RWP. The official WAM has been modified to include reservoir sedimentation for reservoirs with storage capacity of 5,000 acre-feet (ac-ft) or more and volumetric surveys with reported sedimentation rates. This updated Brazos WAM is referred to as the Brazos G WAM.

Chapter 7 of Volume I provides a comprehensive analysis of droughts of record in the region, supported by evaluations of the Palmer Drought Severity Index and streamflow data. These analyses, conducted for both the 2021 and 2026 Plans, yielded consistent results that reinforce the identification of the droughts of record presented in this section.

9.4.3 Water Demand Projections

Overall, water demand projections for the planning area are greater in the 2026 Plan than in the 2021 Plan, as illustrated in Figure 9.1, with the exception of the 2030 decade. Municipal water demand projections are higher in the 2026 Plan for each decade, increasing to 1,002,767 acre-feet per year (ac-ft/yr by 2080. Non-municipal demands in the 2026 Plan, however, are significantly less than projections in the 2021 Plan for each decade, reaching 568,686 ac-ft/yr by the 2080 decade. Because of this, the total 2026 demands are lower in the 2030 decade, but then surpass the total demand projections from the 2021 Plan by 2040 due to the large population growth and accordant increases in municipal demand projections, reaching a total of 1,002,767 ac-ft/yr by 2080.



Figure 9.1 Water Demand Projections in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans

9.4.4 Water Supply Assumptions

For the 2021 Plan, the MAG for each aquifer system in the Brazos G Area was used. For aquifers without MAG amounts, the Brazos G RWPG adopted availability estimates from the 2016 Plan. The same method was generally applied to the 2026 Plan. The Brazos G Region is underlain by seventeen aquifers, including six major and 11 minor aquifers in Texas, with their locations shown in Chapter 1 of this report.

In broad terms, the MAG represents the annual volume of groundwater that can be developed without exceeding the criteria outlined in the aquifer desired future conditions (DFCs), as determined by modeling. When assessing proposed pumping for regulatory approval, the MAG serves as a guideline, often alongside other criteria. However, for planning purposes, the MAGs are treated as firm limits, with annual groundwater production not allowed to exceed these values. When available, the amount of groundwater for development is based on the TWDB's determination of MAG, which reflects the DFCs set by the GCDs within a GMA. The locations of the GMAs are depicted in Figure 9.3.

For aquifers without an adopted MAG, the TWDB provided "non-MAG" estimates for groundwater availability. Many of these non-MAG estimates are based on groundwater modeling conducted during the development of the MAGs for other aquifers. Some of the non-MAG availabilities were carried over from the last planning cycle.

The Brazos G technical consultant reviewed the groundwater availability estimates and recommended some adjustments based on a variety of sources, including information from historical TWDB groundwater reports, the TWDB groundwater database, estimates of historic pumping, and information from Brazos G members and stakeholders. A more detailed analysis of these estimates for specific aquifers is provided in Chapter 3. In many cases, the recommendations were to restore the non-MAG availabilities from the 2021

RWP cycle. Figure 9.2 below compares the total groundwater availability in the Brazos G Region between the 2021 and 2026 Plans.



Figure 9.2 Groundwater Availability in Brazos G Region



Figure 9.3 GMAs in the Brazos G Region

For surface water availability, both the 2021 and 2026 Plans utilized the TCEQ Brazos WAM as the base model, which was then adapted with additional assumptions specific to the regional context, and referred to as the Brazos G WAM. This model incorporates assumptions defined by the TCEQ when evaluating water right reliabilities, though these assumptions may not always align with the needs of regional water planning. For instance, the TCEQ WAM uses permitted storage capacities for all reservoirs, whereas water supply planning requires consideration of current and future sedimentation conditions. A comprehensive list of the assumptions used in the WAM can be found in Chapter 3 of this report.

Both plans also made similar adjustments to the model in determining water availability for existing water rights. This determination is based on a complex set of factors, including location, hydrologic conditions, diversion volume, reservoir storage, and priority date. The 2026 Brazos G WAM includes 77 primary control points that provide naturalized flow data, along with 67 evaporation data sets used to estimate evaporation for the 650 reservoirs represented in the model. The model used for the 2026 Plan is based on an updated TCEQ WAM featuring an extended underlying naturalized hydrologic period of record from 1940 to 2018. Water availability computations are carried out at over 3,800 control points across the river basin, analyzing more than 1,700 water right records. The Brazos G WAM incorporates water right data from the TCEQ for all water rights in the Brazos Basin as of October 2023.

Assumptions for determining groundwater and surface water availability in both Plans are compared below in Table 9.3.

Table 9.2 Assumptions for Determining Water Available to Current Supplies and WMS

2021 Brazos G Plan	2026 Brazos G Plan
Groundwater availability based on MAG where determined, and 2016 estimates and/or modeling to support development of MAG for other aquifers. MAG Peak Factor applied to the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Brazos County.	Groundwater availability based on MAG where determined, and 2021 estimates and/or modeling to support development of MAG for other aquifers. MAG Peak Factor applied to the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Brazos County.
Existing surface water supply based on estimated 2020 and 2070 wastewater effluent discharges adjusted for reuse assumptions.	Existing surface water supply based on estimated 2030 and 2080 wastewater effluent discharges adjusted for reuse assumptions.
Existing surface water supply to irrigation rights based on minimum annual supply from minimum monthly diversions.	Existing surface water supply to irrigation rights based on minimum annual diversion from the WAM.
Surface WMS exclude wastewater effluent discharges (TCEQ Run 3 assumptions), except where effluent is part of the supply for the strategy.	Surface WMS include wastewater effluent discharges (TCEQ Run 3 assumptions).
Surface WMS subject to TCEQ Environmental Flow Standards.	Surface WMS subject to TCEQ Environmental Flow Standards.
BRA System Operations Permit included in the TCEQ Brazos WAM.	BRA System Operations Permit included in the TCEQ Brazos WAM.

Notes:
BRA – Brazos River Authority

9.4.5 Existing Water Supplies

Water supplies available to WUGs and WWPs in the Brazos G Area have changed slightly since the last planning cycle. Municipal supplies have increased substantially, while supplies to non-municipal WUGs have slightly decreased. WUG supplies are based on the current infrastructure ability of each to obtain water supplies. These abilities primarily include existing infrastructure, water-rights limitations, and GCD permit limitations. Groundwater supplies, surface water supplies, and total supplies[1] are compared in Figure 9.4, Figure 9.5, and Figure 9.6, respectively, for municipal and non-municipal WUGs.



Figure 9.4 Groundwater Supplies Available to WUGs in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans

[1] Reuse supplies comprised less than 4 percent of the total available existing supplies in Brazos G Area. The reuse totals are included in Figure 9.6.



Figure 9.5 Surface Water Supplies Available to WUGs in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans



Figure 9.6 Total Water Supplies Available to WUGs in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans

9.4.6 Needs

When projected water demands surpass the available supply for a WUG, the resulting gap is classified as a "Water Need." This section provides an overview of the water needs (shortages) for WUGs in the Brazos G Area. A detailed table in the Executive Summary Appendix outlines the water needs for each WUG by county, labeled as "Region G WUG Needs/Surplus."

As shown in Figure 9.7, municipal water shortages tend to rise over the planning period, while municipal surpluses generally decrease, a trend observed in both the 2021 and 2026 Plans. However, the decline in surpluses is relatively minor. A notable difference is the significant increase in municipal shortages in the 2026 Plan compared to the 2021 Plan. The 2026 Plan shows municipal shortages at the outset of the planning period, and these shortages grow at a faster rate than those in the 2021 Plan.



Figure 9.7 Municipal Surpluses and Needs (Shortages) in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans

A comparison of total needs and surpluses between the two Plans, as seen in Figure 9.8, reveals that while the total surpluses in the 2021 Plan are consistently lower than those in the 2026 Plan, the water needs in the 2021 Plan are higher in 2030. By 2040, the difference between the two Plans narrows, and from 2050 onwards, the water needs in the 2026 Plan exceed those in the 2021 Plan.



Figure 9.8 Total Surpluses and Needs (Shortages) in the 2021 and 2026 Brazos G Plans

9.4.7 WMS and Projects

As anticipated, a significant number of the WMS and projects proposed in the 2021 Plan are once again recommended in the 2026 Plan. While the projected needs in the 2026 Plan are generally higher across each decade compared to the 2021 Plan, the corresponding surpluses are also higher in the 2026 Plan. However, the 2021 Plan shows lower surpluses, resulting in a comparable supply shortage for WUGs of similar magnitude in both Plans. This section highlights the key differences in the WMS and projects between the 2021 and 2026 Plans.

Significant effort was given to identifying infeasible strategies in the 2021 Brazos G Plan, and incorporating the considerations relating to infeasibility into the process for evaluating potentially feasible WMS for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Plan. This effort resulted in adjustments to project onsets, revisions to strategies, and an increased attention to the identification of unmet needs (both municipal and non-municipal).

In the 2021 Plan, conservation measures are recommended for all municipal WUGs with per capita water usage exceeding 140 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), regardless of their projected needs or surpluses. Furthermore, more ambitious conservation targets are set for certain municipal entities in Williamson County, with the goal of reducing per capita water use to 120 gpcd by 2070. The 2026 Plan adopts the same methodology and assumptions for municipal water conservation as those applied in the 2021 Plan. However, there is a notable shift in the proportion of recommended water management strategy volumes attributed to conservation strategies between the two Plans. In the 2021 Plan, conservation strategies accounted for approximately 29 percent (2.2 million ac-ft/yr) of the total recommended water management strategy volumes for 2070. In contrast, the 2026 Plan reduce this share to roughly 22 percent of the total recommended volumes due to the increasing conservation effort in the Brazos G Area.

In the 2021 Plan, municipal conservation strategies recommended for 2070 totaled approximately 977,000 ac-ft/yr, with 320,000 ac-ft/yr allocated to water loss reduction efforts. These conservation strategies addressed approximately 26 percent of the identified municipal water needs in 2020 and 25 percent of the projected needs for 2070.

For the 2026 Plan, approximately 142,000 ac-ft in municipal conservation strategies are recommended for 2070, with 8,100 ac-ft dedicated to water loss reduction. These conservation strategies address about 29 percent of the identified municipal water needs in 2030 and 35 percent of the needs projected for 2080. These changes reflect an evolving focus on conservation as a key strategy to meet future water demands in the Region. Reuse is also a key water management strategy in both the 2021 and 2026 Plans.

Supplies from Other Regions

The 2021 Plan anticipates the supply of approximately 78,000 ac-ft/yr of water from outside the Brazos G Area during the 2070 decade, while the 2026 Plan projects nearly 60,000 ac-ft/yr of out-of-Region supplies by 2080.

Several entities in the Brazos G Region rely upon source water from outside the Region, including the Edwards Trinity Plateau Aquifer, Lake Benbrook, Brownwood Reservoir, Navarro Mills Reservoir, the Colorado River MWD System, Lake Livingston (Trinity River Authority), Lake Corsicana, Halbert Lake, OH Ivie Lake, the Cross Timbers Aquifer, Richland Chambers and Cedar Creek Reservoirs (TRWD), and the Highland Lakes System (LCRA).

New Reservoirs

The amended 2021 Plan recommended the construction of the Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir, Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir, Cedar Ridge Reservoir, Turkey Peak Reservoir, Brushy Creek Reservoir, Throckmorton Reservoir, and Lake Creek Reservoir. The 2026 Plan includes each of the aforementioned reservoirs.

BRA System Operations

The BRA System Operations Permit (Sys Ops Permit) was identified as a recommended water management strategy in the 2021 Plan. Since the adoption of the 2016 Plan, TCEQ has issued the System Operations Permit to the BRA. This permit, under Permit No. 12-5851, authorizes the BRA to appropriate additional water made available through the operation of the BRA's existing water rights and reservoirs. This supply is now represented as an existing supply for the purposes of the 2026 Plan.

The System Operations Permit allows the BRA to divert available run-of-river streamflow from the middle and lower Brazos Basin (downstream of Possum Kingdom Reservoir) in quantities greater than those permitted under existing water rights certificates. This additional water can be used in coordination with water stored in BRA reservoirs to meet future customer needs. For the 2026 Plan, the BRA's System Operations Permit accounts for 11 percent of the total authorized diversion volume.

The BRA holds multiple contracts to supply water to cities, districts, irrigators, and industrial users throughout the Brazos River Basin. Many of these contracts are served by the BRA's reservoirs or through lakeside diversions. However, since the additional supply from the System Operations Permit depends on unregulated flows below existing BRA reservoirs, it is available only for diversion along the main stem of the Brazos River.

Out of the 557,721 ac-ft/yr of firm yield from standalone reservoir supplies, the reliable supply from system operations for 2030 is estimated at 131,384 ac-ft/yr. This supply is assumed to be available for meeting demands along the main stem of the Brazos River, as there is no infrastructure in place to transport this additional supply to demands located in the Little River or Aquilla sub-systems.

Additional Groundwater Development

The 2026 Plan recommends approximately 289,000 ac-ft/yr of additional groundwater development by 2070, compared to 72,000 ac-ft/yr in the 2021 Plan. This increase reflects the increasing pressure from growing water demands on the Region's groundwater sources in the Brazos G Area.

Aquifer Storage and Recovery

The 2021 Plan includes five recommended aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) projects for College Station, Bryan, Waco (McLennan County ASR), the BRA (Lake Granger ASR), and Georgetown (Lake Georgetown ASR). All of these projects are also recommended in the 2026 Plan, with the addition of another ASR project for the City of Bryan and modification to the Acton MUD ASR strategy.

Unmet Needs

The Brazos G RWPG conducts a thorough evaluation of proposed WMS to ensure they are both technically feasible and economically viable. Strategies deemed infeasible due to practical, technical, or financial constraints are not recommended to address existing water supply needs. As a result, these needs are classified as unmet within the regional water plan. In the 2021 Plan, needs left unmet total a maximum of 148,167 ac-ft/yr in 2030 for irrigation, mining and steam-electric uses.

The 2026 Brazos G Plan identifies a significantly smaller amount of unmet needs compared to the 2021 Plan, including approximately 30,000 ac-ft/yr of municipal unmet needs, compared to approximately 65,000 ac-ft/yr in 2030 in the previous plan. This improvement highlighted Brazos G RWPG's commitment to provide reliable supply to the Brazos G water users.

Alternative WMS and Projects

Both the 2021 and 2026 Plans include alternative WMS for specific WUGs and WWPs. These alternatives are intended to serve as substitutes if the recommended strategies become infeasible. Examples of such alternatives include the development of Carrizo groundwater for the City of Bryan in Robertson County and the West Texas Water Partnership.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

CHAPTER 10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND ADOPTION OF PLAN

10.1 Public Participation

The Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group (BGRWPG) provided considerable opportunity for the public to participate in the planning process. Notices and meeting agendas were posted prior to each meeting in accordance with State law, and these and other meeting materials were posted on the BGRWPG website (www.brazosgwater.org) as they became available prior to each meeting. The public was invited to speak during public comment periods during each planning group and committee meeting. In addition, stakeholders were often invited to participate in planning group and committee meetings (as formal items of the meeting agenda) to present information to the planning group that was pertinent to issues the planning group was considering.

The BGRWPG formally adopted its process for identifying, evaluating and selecting water management strategies on February 13, 2024, and included opportunities for public input during the development of the scope of work to develop the 2026 Plan.

The BGRWPG held three sub-regional meetings in January 2025 to solicit comments on the draft water user group (WUG), wholesale water provider (WWP), and major water provider (MWP) plans prior to development of the Initially Prepared Plan (IPP). These meetings were held in College Station on January 14, 2025 (Lower Subregion), in Waco on January 15, 2025 (Middle Subregion), and in Abilene on January 16, 2025 (Upper Subregion).

The BGRWPG held a public hearing on May 6, 2025, to receive comments from the public on the IPP.

The BGRWPG complied with all Texas Open Meetings Act and Public Information Act requirements during the development of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan.

10.1.1 Rural Outreach Efforts

The majority of the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area encompasses a multitude of rural communities across Texas. Engagement with these communities has always been a critical component of regional water planning for the BGRWPG and has been a point of emphasis this planning cycle. Rural outreach has helped to improve data accuracy, promote sustainable practices, build stronger relationships which have increased participation, provide opportunities for learning, developing a better understanding of the unique needs and priorities of the communities, and help to spread knowledge, connecting people with resources.

This Plan is largely supported by information provided by WUGs based on survey results and numerous outreach efforts from the RWPG members and technical consultant. For example, an initial survey was distributed to all WUGs to update and refine information needed to report on population and water demand projection revisions (Chapter 2), existing supplies and physical and legal capacity (Chapter 3). The survey also served as a starting point for the identification of infeasible water management strategies (WMSs) (Chapter 5), from which more direct engagement resulted in an improved picture of the present

implementation status of numerous WMS and WMS Projects (Chapter 9), as well as drought information, activities and responses (Chapter 7). Each of these are examples of where rural outreach and engagement were performed for the development of this Plan.

As part of the survey process, surveys were distributed to all the identified WUGs within the Region. Information was further shared with WWPs, MWPs, and Groundwater Conservation Districts (GCDs) in order to reach a broader audience for engagement. In addition, telephone follow-up calls and virtual meetings were conducted to facilitate responses from WUGs had been appropriately characterized. The results of these surveys are presented in multiple tables throughout the Plan.

The BGRWPG conducted outreach specifically to rural entities in the planning area to collect and evaluate information to support the development of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan. This included a record of which rural entities were contacted by the BGRWPG's technical consultant, and which entities were not responsive to RWPG contact efforts. Particular focus was given to those rural public water systems that had self-reported water restrictions to Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) due to water supply issues during this planning cycle, reported to TCEQ that they had less than 180 days of water supply remaining during this planning cycle, have not previously engaged in the regional planning process, and have already been identified as facing significant near-term shortages under drought conditions in previous regional water planning. Information on these elements was provided by the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) to facilitate the engagement with these rural entities, and was used by the BGRWPG's technical consultant for targeted outreach activities.

10.2 BGRWPG Website (www.brazosgwater.org)

The BGRWPG has directed the Brazos River Authority (BRA) to maintain a website where meeting notices, agendas, and presentation materials may be viewed by the public. In addition to meeting materials, the 2001, 2006, 2011 2016, and 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plans are posted for public viewing and download, as well as documents from the planning process for the 2026 Plan. The website offers other features including member contact information, planning area maps, planning data, and audio transcripts of meetings.

10.3 Coordination with WUGs, WWPs, and MWPs

The BGRWPG coordinated with multiple WUGs, WWPs, MWPs, GCDs, groundwater management areas, county judges, and councils of governments in the Brazos G Area regarding population and water demand projections developed by the TWDB, groundwater and surface water availability estimates, proposed water management strategies, and recommendations for sites uniquely suited for reservoir construction.

A survey was disseminated in May 2023 to WUGs, WWPs, MWPs, GCDs, and county judges to obtain input regarding draft population, water demand projections, current sources of supply, implementation of recommended water management strategies and water management strategy projects, and infeasible strategies.

Increased engagement with WUGs, WWPs, and MWPs was a key emphasis of the BGRWPG during the development of the 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan. At the BGRWPG's instruction, the technical consultant team made significant outreach efforts through phone calls, virtual and in-person meetings to

share and gather information to improve the regional plan's alignment with local water supply efforts, and to reduce/eliminate to the extent practicable infeasible water management strategies.

Draft plans for each WUG, WWP, and MWP were presented to WUGs, WWPs, and MWPs at the three subregional meetings held in January 2025. In addition, digital copies of the 2026 Brazos G IPP were provided to county libraries and county clerks in all Brazos G counties and posted on the Brazos G website for public review and comment.

10.4 Coordination with Other Planning Regions

Coordination with other planning regions was accomplished primarily through the technical consultants, who coordinated data and shared information that was later reported to the planning groups. Coordination was accomplished with the technical consultants from Regions B, C, F, H, K, L and O. Other coordination was accomplished through the participation of planning group members as liaisons with other planning groups.

10.5 BGRWPG Meetings

The BGRWPG held a significant number of public meetings during the 2026 planning cycle, between September 29, 2021, and October 20, 2025, including regular meetings of the full planning group; three sub-regional meetings; periodic meetings of the Executive, Scope of Work, and Finance Committees; and periodic meetings of the Groundwater and Water Policy Workgroups.

10.6 Public Hearing and BGRWPG Responses to Public and Agency Comments on the Initially Prepared Plan

The BGRWPG held a public hearing on May 6, 2025, to receive comments from the public on the IPP. The public hearing was an in-person meeting and was compliant with the Public Hearing Act. A total of approximately 40 individuals, including Brazos G RWPG members, administrative staff, and consultants, attended the hearing. One individual provided oral and written comments, and three provided written comments.

Written comments were open to be received from the public for 60 calendar days following the public hearing. Agency comments were open to be received for 90 calendar days following the public hearing. Following the public hearing on May 6, 2025, written public comments were received by the planning group through June 23, 2025. Agency comments were received through July 7, 2025. Written comments were received from the TWDB, BRA, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, City of Bryan, City of Georgetown, Jarrell-Schwertner WSC, City of Round Rock, Bell County WCID No. 1. No comments were received from Federal agencies.

The following section summarizes the public and agency comments received and the responses of the BGRWPG. TWDB comments are addressed in Section 10.7. Individual comments and their corresponding responses from the BGRWPG are organized by tables. The following section does not include the entirety of each written comment but instead summarizes the key points for brevity. Copies of the written comments in their entirety as received are included in Appendix H.

10.6.1 Comments Received from WUGs, WWPs and MWPs

The following Table 10.1 summarizes the comments received from WUGs, WWPs and MWPs and the corresponding responses from BGRWPG.

Table 10.1 Comments Received from WUGs, WWPs and MWPs

Comment No	Formal Comment	Comment Response
WWP - 1	WWP Comment: BRA has reframed the naming convention of the Belhouse Project to be more in line with how the project will be operated (i.e., Belhouse Drought Preparedness Project). We are suggesting that the 2026 Brazos G RWP include the updated naming convention of the project (Volume II, Section 8.4, pg. 8.4-1 – 8.4-6) I've included a link to a website hosted on brazos.org that has some of the latest information about the Belhouse Drought Preparedness Project. https://brazos.org/project-updates/belhouse	Renamed WMSID 7074 from "Belton Stillhouse Pipeline-BRA" to "Belhouse Drought Preparedness Project"
WWP - 2	WWP Comment: Lake Granger Augmentation – Phase 2 (Conjunctive Use) – This water management strategy includes expansion of the East Williamson County Water Treatment Plant to incorporate future groundwater. The current description of this water management strategy within the Brazos G IPP outlines a Carrizo-Wilcox well field in Milam County (additional ~46,000 acft/yr). Let's move this strategy to an alternative strategy instead of a recommended strategy.	Changed the WMS "Lake Granger Augmentation-Ph2" both (Groundwater) and (Surface water) to an Alternative WMS.
WUG - 1	City of Bryan - Remove the Miramont Reuse project from the plan. Also requested including WMS to redrill wells. WUG indicated not sure if that would fit under Section 5.1 with the groundwater supplies in Brazos County or if that section is for a totally new wellfield. Based on the new projects coming online in the Simsboro, WUG indicated they will most likely need to redrill a number of their wells and lower the pumps.	Removed Vol II Section 3.5 - City of Bryan Miramont Reuse
WUG - 2	City of Georgetown - Concerns over recommended strategies being limited by MAG, requests removal of Lone Star Regional Water Authority from Gatehouse / Lee County groundwater WMS.	1. Rename Gatehouse WMS to "Lee/Bastrop County Groundwater WMS". 2. Incorporate recharge costs into WMS costing.
WUG - 3	Jarrell-Schwertner WSC - WUG identified revisions to existing supply amounts, projected population/demand growth, and allocations of supply.	Supplies to be reallocated based on WUG input, and text revised to reflect uncertainty in projections of municipal demand growth with availability of more recent localalized studies.

Comment No	Formal Comment	Comment Response
WUG - 4	City of Round Rock - Discussed how the state calculates the available water for Edwards-BFZ Aquifer wells.WUG indicates current rated infrastructure / pumping / capacity of 276ac-ft is low. Under "Municipal Demand Allocations DB27", for the Highland Lakes, the BCRUA WTP is currently rated for 32.5MGD, and Round Rock has 8.67MGD of capacity. The plant is one month away from being substantially complete with the BCRUA Phase 1D expansion which will take the capacity 42MGD, and Round Rock will have 11.2MGD of capacity. WUG requests value to be increased. In Volume 2, the BCRUA System (8.8-1), the existing capacity is 32.5MGD and by the time the report is issued, will be 42MGD. The raw water barge which is discussed in the writeup also has been expanded to 39-42MGD depending on the lake level. These will need to be updated from the 17MGD listed in the IPP. In Volume 2, the IPP has conservation and additional BCRUA development at the only WMS for Round Rock. WUG requests Lake Granger Augmentation WMS be included for City of Round Rock. The Lake Granger Augmentation is looking at Trinity Aquifer, Carizo-Wilcox Aquifer and ASR. WUG is currently conducting a Water Supply Study evaluating all of those options. WUG wishes to ensure that if one of these projects is proposed as a standalone, that the Lake Granger Augmentation project being included in the 2026 Plan allows for WUG to obtain SWIFT funding.	1. Confirm allocation of groundwater supply is MAG limited. 2. Increase Round Rock capacity to 11.2 MGD for BCRUA municipal demand allocation. 3. Update volume 2 BCRUA information (8.8-1) to reflect increased capacity (dependent upon lake level). 4. Add City of Round Rock as sponsor for Lake Granger Augmentation WMS. Revise text for strategy to note that if an alternative source of groundwater supply is identified and permitted by the WUG, then a strategy for Lake Granger Augmentation with that alternative source should be considered consistent for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Plan.
WUG - 5	Bell County WCID #1 - Update information on Regional Groundwater Supply project.	Text to be added reflecting 89th Texas Legislature's passage of SB 1194 creating the Central Texas Water Alliance (CTWA), with sponsors including Bell County, the Bell County WCID No. 1, Clearwater Underground Water Conservation District, and McLennan County, and the efforts of the CTWA to develop a regional groundwater supply project. Language added to reflect that for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Plan, a project by the one or more of the sponsors identified as part of the CTWA or the CTWA itself should be considered consistent with the recommended strategies for the sponsors identified within the 2026 Plan.

10.6.2 Comments Received from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

The following Table 10.2 summarizes the comments received from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the corresponding responses from BGRWPG.

Table 10.2 Comments Received from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

Comment No	TPWD Formal Comment	Comment Response
TPWD - 1	DFCs set by a GCD provide quantifiable management goals for the GCD and become permitting targets for the GCDs, allowing local and regional control.	The text has been updated in 2026 Region G Plan to add more clarification.
TPWD - 2	Recommends greater specificity in environmental impacts, more detail on methodology and site-specific considerations.	In general, site-specific considerations will be addressed during the permitting stages for the projects. As it is now, the IPP has relevant information to each site and further details would be addressed as needed for the projects on an individual basis. No action or additional text recommended.
TPWD - 3	Reuse – Important to note that return flows provide a consistent instream flow, sustaining aquatic habitats during drought	Text added to the "Comments" row in Table 3.2-2: Even when a portion is reused, return flows in urbanized areas provide a consistent instream flow which helps sustain aquatic habitats and biotic communities, especially during drier years and drought.
TPWD - 4	Inclusion of TPWD's zebra mussel monitoring maps and control guidelines –alongside contingency planning for aquatic invasive species – would enhance the Plan's resilience and implementation readiness.	The TPWD zebra mussel monitoring maps and control guidelines have been added to the 2026 Region G Plan to strengthen contingency planning for aquatic invasive species.
TPWD - 5	Requests (similar to2016 & 2020 IPP comments) the Plan address zebra mussels and aquatic invasive species and their potential impacts on WMS Add Lampasas, Leon, and Little River for presence of Zebra mussels TPWD website added Lake Nasworthy in March 2025 Add information about zebra mussel control and reduction of spread to Lake Granger and Lake Georgetown ASR project descriptions	The 2026 Region G Plan has been updated to address zebra mussels and other aquatic invasive species, including potential impacts on WMS. Lampasas, Leon, and Little River have been added for zebra mussel presence, Lake Nasworthy (March 2025) has been included per TPWD data, and control/spread-reduction information has been added to the Lake Granger and Lake Georgetown ASR project descriptions.

10.6.3 Comments Received from Public

Table 10.3 summarizes the comments received from Public and the corresponding responses from BGRWPG.

Table 10.3 Comments Received from Public

Comment No	Formal Comment	Comment Response
Public - 1	City of Rockdale - Requested increase to population projections.	Added the following text in Vol 1 Section 5.25.4.1 "The City of Rockdale is forecasting significant near term growth as a result of development in the surrounding area with new manufacturing, Sandow Lakes Ranch, and newly permitted subdivisions within the city itself. Uncertainty in the near term population growth provides support for water management strategies that meet potential demands beyond the demand projected and adopted for this regional plan." and a figure of the City's population projection.
Public - 2	Bistone MWSD - 1. Vol. 1 - Pg 5.23-1 - Section 5.23.1.1: Please delete the incorrect statement ", and through purchases of treated surface water under contract with the City of Mexia. Available supply through treated water purchases from the City of Mexia is projected at 28 acft/yr." Bistone does not purchase water from the City of Mexia but is the exclusive wholesale provider to the City of Mexia via groundwater and surface water. Lake Mexia is 100% owned, maintained, and operated by Bistone MWSD and not the City of Mexia. It is not possible for Bistone MWSD to be supplied through surface water that the City of Mexia does not have to provide.	Statement removed and sale/transfer from Mexia to Bistone MWSD has been removed from DB27.
Public - 3	Bistone MWSD - 2. Vol. 1 - Pg. 5.23-2 - Section 5.23.1.2: The water usage demand projections are stated as 419 gpcd. This is high due to the population undercount and the way the wholesale customers are counted in this value such as the Mexia State School (large pop. represented by small number of meters). Bistone MWSD experienced water loss of less than 5%. Bistone MWSD sells approximately 85% of the water to the City of Mexia. The City has worked aggressively with DWSRF funding projects to reduce their water loss. The plan states "...RWPG recommends conservation to reduce usage to a goal of 140 gpcd" for Bistone MWSD. This is not possible as it is not old plumbing fixtures nor excessive water loss; rather, it is undercounted population and incorrect accounting for retail vs. wholesale water.	Vol I 5.23.1.2 Removed Conservation water management strategy. Added "The district has indicated that the projected gpcd is artificially high due to the methods of calculation, wholesale customers, and population undercount."

Comment No	Formal Comment	Comment Response
Public - 4	Bistone MWSD - 3. Vol 1 - Pg 5.23-2 - Section 5.23.1.2 - Table 5.32-2: WUG has a current TWDB SWIFT well field project to address shortage. This funding is $16M and provides ultimate wells for a total of 2.5 MGD (2,800 ac-ft/yr). This provides increased contract wholesale water to City of Mexia and will lessen the long term impact of sedimentation of Lake Mexia with surface water supply not available by 2070.	If the project is not yet operational we cannot reflect it as existing supplies. The Alternative WMS Carrizo Aquifer Development - Bistone MWSD could be modified to reflect the TWDB SWIFT funded project. It will remain as an alternative strategy due to MAG limitation.
Public - 5	Bistone MWSD - 4. Vol 1 - Pg. 5.23-5 - Section 5.23.4.1: Please correct "decreasing to 1,615 acft/yr in 2080." The new well field will make up for the projected decrease. Please delete the incorrect statement, ", The City also provides sales of treated water to the Bistone Municipal Water Supply District." The last sentence states City sales water to the "City of Shiloh". This is actually Shiloh WSC. Bistone MWSD and City of Mexia has agreed to swap the water supply from City of Mexia pass through to direct purchase from Bistone MWSD by 2027.	Removed statement regarding sale of water to Bistone MWSD and corrected City of Shiloh to Shiloh WSC.
Public - 6	Bistone MWSD - 5. Vol. 1 - Pg 5.23-5 - Section 5.23.4.2: The IPP states "The City's contractual supply is sufficient to meet demands in all decades." This is only true for the City of Mexia if Bistone MWSD completes the new well field project currently underway due to eventual loss of yield from Lake Mexia and surface water provided by Bistone. This is stated later in this IPP section under 2.a.i. which is correct.	Acknowledged, the statement is dependent upon Bistone MWSD completing projects necessary to create or maintain a source water supply.
Public - 7	Bistone MWSD - 6. Vol. 1 - Pg 5.23-8 - Section 5.23.9: For White Rock Water SUD, IPP states "City's contractual supply is sufficient to meet demands in all decades." City of Mexia and Bistone MWSD have wholesale connection points to White Rock's various subsystems. 100% of water is provided by Bistone MWSD and is either direct wholesale purchase or pass through the Mexia system. Sufficiency is only accurate if Bistone MWSD completes new well field project currently underway.	Acknowledged, the statement is dependent upon Bistone MWSD completing projects necessary to create or maintain a source water supply.
Public - 8	Bistone MWSD - 7. Vol. 1 - Pg 5.23-9 - Section 5.23.10.1: IPP states "through purchases of groundwater from the City of Mexia by 84 West WSC and the City of Shiloh. The 84 West WSC is now part of the City of Mexia; it is no longer a separate WSC. City of Shiloh is actually Shiloh WSC.	Revised sentence regarding purchase of groundwater.

Comment No	Formal Comment	Comment Response
Public - 9	Bistone MWSD - 8. Vol. 1 - Pg 6.27 - Table 6.5 - The needs left unmet listed for Bistone, and by association all the downstream wholesale customers, are only this small with Bistone's new well field project currently underway. Otherwise, the unmet needs will be much higher in WUG's opinion. The data in the IPP relies on large declining population to limit the amount of the unmet needs. Bistone sees this unmet needs derived only by new well field to offset loss of Lake Mexia yield.	The unmet needs identified within the 2026 Brazos G Plan are based on the required assumptions and methodologies employed for the purposes of regional water planning, providing a consistent depiction of projected demands and needs for the water use categories across the state. Uncertainties in the projected demands are acknowledged by the BGRWPG and within the Plan. No revisions to unmet needs section.
Public - 10	Bistone MWSD - 9. Vol. 2 - Pg 2-11, 2-26, 2-37: The water usage for demand projections is stated as 419 gpcd. This is high due to the population undercount and the way the wholesale customers are counted in this value. The advanced conservation gpcd goals are achievable with proper accounting for population, water meters, and how the wholesale customers are treated in the calculation. It is not plumbing or water loss that drives this factor.	Vol 2 Chapter 2.1 Removed Conservation water management strategy volume and costs from tables in Vol 2 Chapter 2.1.
Public - 11	Bistone MWSD - 10. Vol. 2 - Pg 11-85, Section 11.3.21: The new well field currently being funded by TWDB SWIFT is $16M total project cost and not $2,403,000.	The cost of the new well field has been updated to $16M for the final, adopted regional water plan.
Public - 12	Bistone MWSD - 11. Appendices pgs 124 & 125, Table 133: Disagree with Limestone declining population. Provides water meter data points for customers showing growth. Identifies two TWDB funded projects currently in early phases (1) $16M new well field (2-3 wells with ultimate 10 wells and added capacity of 2,800 acft/yr); and (2) $29.63M replacement of water transmission mains and elevated or pressure tanks.	Replacement of transmission mains is outside scope of regional plans. Modifications to current well field description and costs added for final plan.
Public - 13	Bistone MWSD - 12. Appendices pg 171, Table 136 and pg O-2 Table O.1: Disagrees with declining demand projections. 2021 projections were closer in line to anticipated growth. Growth is driver for 2 large TWDB projects for Bistone MWSD.	Text has been added to writeup for Bistone MWSD acknowledging uncertainties in growth projections and support for recommended strategies that exceed the projections adopted for the 2026 Plan.
Public - 14	Bistone MWSD - 13. Transmittal letter: Fully supports RWPG's recommendation to separate non-residential and residential water use and look at both independently.	Acknowledged. No revision necessary.

Comment No	Formal Comment	Comment Response
Public - 15	Granbury - Vol. 2, Section 15.5.1.11, chart: Should be increased to reflect what is in attachment. This new cost sheet will change the wording in other areas of the plan so they will need to be updated as well. Anticipate cost will increase another $5M by the time of construction. Population for Hood County today is approx. 72,000 people and that is double projected population.	Text added to Section 11.5.1.11, The UCM provides a standardized approach for relative comparisons between projects throughout the state. Text revised to acknowledge that the City has identified uncertainties in the cost estimate, and if additional information is developed identifying more detailed estimates of cost than the planning level costing performed herein for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Plan, then such costing information should be considered consistent with the 2026 Brazos G Plan.
Public - 16	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 1. Did not see any information about proposed ASR program by the City of Temple in central Bell County location. ASR in west Bell County is included.	Information for City of Temple ASR has been added as Volume II Section 7.7 for the final adopted plan.
Public - 17	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 2. Central Texas Water Alliance not noted in document. This is a program to bring water from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer to the Bell County and surrounding area for future water resources. It is in the planning stage at present and will most likely be a very expensive project. Local representatives can add additional information on this project.	Information for Central Texas Water Alliance was not available to the BGRWPG in time for the development and March 3, 2025, submittal of IPP. An Alternative strategy representing the Central Texas Water Alliance project has been added for the final adopted plan in Volume I Section 5.38.5.2 and Volume II Section 8.9.
Public - 18	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 3. Suggests use of unused water rights for local ASR program in the same year and the previous year when water is available for future use in the local area.	The TCEQ is assigned the regulatory duty to enforce water rights. No revision necessary.
Public - 19	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 4. Suggests providing estimated cost data for water to be used from various sources in ASR programs in a separate category for future planning of ASR programs by the members.	The BGRWPG will consider alternative means of organization and categorization within the next cycle of regional planning. No revision necessary.
Public - 20	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 5. Recommends for the quality of monitoring of waste water discharge and sludge for its various uses. This has become a recent issue with the PFAS chemical concerns in Region G and also for the possibility of the use of this water in ASR programs. In the past there has often been unknown problems that are not appreciated until later (e.g., asbestos, DDT, etc).	Such consideration may be given in future planning rounds depending on the extent of scope, budget, and availability of data. No revision necessary.
Public - 21	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 6. Suggests future restriction on the use of public water supplies as the water resources become more limited as type of outside watering, etc.	The BGRWPG does not have regulatory authority, but can consider such policy recommendations in future rounds of planning. No revision necessary.

Comment No	Formal Comment	Comment Response
Public - 22	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 7. The aquifer water status of the Trinity Aquifer and Carrizo-Wilcox aquifer is very difficult to understand especially by the general public. Notes Texas has formulas to regulate available groundwater supply but levels continue to decrease. Drawdown data should be clearly demonstrated in a manner that is easily understood by the general public and an estimated date of when the aquifer will no longer be a source of water should be estimated for public knowledge. The role of ASR should also be part of the explanation in estimating the duration of aquifer use. Pre-pumping and present aquifer level should be used to demonstrate this situation with other illustration that experts believe could demonstrate in situation. Better information is needed for public.	Descriptions of groundwater and ASR as water sources, and subsequent supply characterizations considering the legal and physical infrastructure ability to access these sources, are provided within the 2026 Brazos G Plan. Further, education of the public continues to be a goal of the BGRWPG. The BGRWPG's technical consultant and TWDB staff provide presentations at most regular meetings of the BGRWPG intended to educate attendees on the subjects addressed in the Plan. The BGRWPG will continue to strive to better educate all on the planning process and use of water throughout the region. No revision necessary.
Public - 23	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 8. Desalination can be considered if have the source, level of salt, and cost of desalination would justify the need. Provides example of lower Edwards Aquifer being used in San Antonio for water source in SAWS program.	Desalination was considered as a potentially feasible water management strategy, although in most cases was deemed infeasible due to high costs. This strategy will continue to be considered in future rounds of planning as such sources may become more cost effective. No revision to text necessary.
Public - 24	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 9. Transfer of water of east Texas to western area of the state is being discussed and Region G should put out a plan for the Region G area using a lake to lake transfer program. Lots of options available and would be fun to start drawing up some maps of transfer. Taking water from Lake Texoma and transferring it 20 or so miles to the Trinity River should also be considered. Could be used in an ASR program for the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer near Bryan in Region G.	Potentially feasible strategies were identified and evaluated through a process adopted by the BGRWPG. Interregional and interbasin strategies are particularly sensitive subjects warranting careful consideration. The BGRWPG will continue to strive to identify potentially feasible strategies in a collaborative manner with potential water providers to develop a regional plan that feasibly meets the needs of water users in the region. Such options may be considered in future rounds of planning. No revision to text necessary.
Public - 25	Mr. John Asbury, Temple TX, 10. Consider utilization of flood amounts spilling to estuary unused as source for ASR programs. Room in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and moderate amount of space in Trinity Aquifer. Unsure of Gulf Coast Aquifer space. Recommends TCEQ needs a special water permit to be used for water during time of the excess water situation and could be issue to various groups with available facilities.	TAC Chapter 298 identifies freshwater inflow standards required for the Brazos River Basin and estuary. The BGRWPG has evaluated surface water availabilities utilizing a Water Availability Model while taking into account those flows required to be maintained downstream for the estuary. Any flows exceeding the estuarine standards (magnitude and frequency) have been considered potentially available for water management strategies in the region. No revision to text necessary.

10.7 TWDB Comments on the Initially Prepared Plan and BGRWPG Responses

This section addresses comments received from the TWDB on the 2026 Brazos G IPP, submitted to TWDB on March 3, 2025. As mentioned previously, after submittal of the 2026 Brazos G IPP the TWDB provided a letter identifying itemized comments for the BGRWPG's consideration. These comments, and the BGRWPG's responses to each of those comments, are presented below.

10.7.1 Level 1 TWDB Comments

Level 1 comments are comments, questions, and data revisions that must be satisfactorily addressed to meet statutory, agency rule, and/or contract requirements. The following Table 10.4 summarizes the Level 1 comments received from TWDB and the corresponding responses from BGRWPG.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Table 10.4 Level 1 Comments Received from TWDB

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
1	Volume I, Chapter 1. The plan appears to be missing a description of reuse supplies in Chapter 1. Please include this information in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) § 357.30(3)]	Volume I, Chapter 1. A new subsection in Chapter I has been added (Section 1.5.3) describing the reuse supplies in the BGRWPA for the final, adopted regional water plan.
2	Volume I, Chapter 1. The plan does not appear to include a description of the drought of record(s) in the region within Chapter 1. Please include this information in the final, adopted regional water plan [31 TAC § 357.30(9)]	Volume 1, Chapter 1. New text has been added to Chapter 1, Section 1.10 describing the DOR in the Region. In addition, the section also provides a reference to Chapter 7 where more detailed information related to the DOR is located. These changes have been made for the final, adopted regional water plan.
3	Volume I, Chapter 3, and Volume 3, Appendix B. The plan does not appear to include a table documenting the methods used for estimating groundwater availability for aquifers without modeled available groundwater (MAG) volumes. Please include this information for non-MAG groundwater availability in table format including the aquifer, county, and methodology description in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.3.4.2]	Volume I, Chapter 3, and Volume 3, Appendix B. Chapter 3 and Appendix B.1 includes a new table documenting the methods used for estimating groundwater availability for aquifers without MAG volumes.
4	Volume I, Chapter 3. The plan does not present existing supplies by water user group (WUG). Per the contract scope of work (SOW) Task 3(A)(13), (B)(15), (C)(13) the plan must at minimum include a summary of existing supplies at the WUG level. These may be included via a region developed table or inclusion of a final copy of the applicable DB27 report in pdf form. Please include existing supplies by WUG in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.32(f); Contract SOW Task 3]	Volume I, Chapter 3. Section 3.8 (originally Section 3.7) includes new text referencing a newly added Chapter 1 Appendix A, which contains a final copy of DB27 SARA Report 93, summarizing the existing supplies for all WUGs.
5	Volume III, Appendix O. The City of Gordon appears to be missing from Table O.2. Please report existing supplies for all MWP by decade and category of use in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.32(f)]	Volume III, Appendix O. Existing supplies for the City of Gordon have been reported in Vol. I, Chapter 3, Vol. II and Appendix O in the final, adopted regional water plan.
6	Volume I, Chapter 3. The plan does not appear to include a summary of existing reuse water availability in the region. Please include existing reuse availability— classified as either direct or indirect—within a separate subsection of Volume I, Chapter 3 in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.32(f)]	Volume I, Chapter 3. A new subsection (Section 3.5) has been added to Chapter 3, summarizing existing reuse water availability in the region for both direct potable reuse and indirect potable reuse.
7	Volume I, Chapter 3. The plan does not appear to provide a methodology for estimating the amount of existing reuse water available. Please provide details on how the region estimated availability of existing reuse—including how projected population and water demands were considered in that determination—in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.3.3]	Volume I, Chapter 3. Chapter 3 Section 3.5 includes new text which provides details on how the region estimated availability of existing reuse, including how projected population and water demands were considered in the determination, for the final, adopted regional water plan.
8	Volume I, Section 3.2.7. The plan does not appear to include a separate table for local surface water supply. In the final, adopted regional water plan, please include a single table that lists each local surface water supply with a) an explanation for the basis of the supply itself, and b) the basis for the volume of supply. For unpermitted supplies, list the source as the sum of unpermitted surface water by county-basin split. Any unpermitted local surface water supplies must be listed individually as well with explanation and may be aggregated at the county-basin level when appropriate. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.3.6]	Volume I, Section 3.2.7. A new table has been added listing each local surface water supply with a) an explanation for the basis of the supply itself, and b) the basis for the volume of supply. In addition, new text has been included in the section to address the RWPG's acknowledgement that the local supplies are firm during a DOR.
9	Volume I, Chapter 4, Tables 4.1, Tables 4-2-4.6, and the state water planning database (DB27). The municipal WUG needs data presented in Table 4.1 appears to present information on projected water needs that is inconsistent with data reported in DB27. Please review all data in the table and revise as necessary to present data consistent with DB27. Additionally, data for municipal and non-municipal WUGs must be presented for each planning decade in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.33(c)]	Volume I, Chapter 4, Tables 4.1 through 4.6 and the state water planning database (DB27). The municipal WUG needs data in Table 4.1 has been updated to present information on projected water needs that is consistent with the data reported in DB27. In addition, Tables 4.2 through 4.6 have been updated to present all non-municipal WUG water needs that are consistent with the data reported in DB27 for all planning decades.
10	Volume II, Chapter 1. The plan does not appear to include documentation that all required water management strategies (WMS) were considered. Please confirm that all strategies required to be considered by the planning group in accordance with Texas Water Code § 16.053(e)(5) and 31 TAC § 357.34 were indeed considered. [TWC § 16.053(e)(5) + 31 TAC § 357.34(c)(1-6)]	Volume II, Chapter 1. New text has been added to Chapter 1, Section 1.2 clarifying that all required water management strategies were considered by the planning group in accordance with the TWC and TAC, references have been sited in the final, adopted regional water plan.
11	Volume II, Chapter 1. The plan does not appear to include a list or statement identifying potentially feasible water management strategies with potential, non-trivial flood mitigation benefits, or the lack thereof. Please include a list of strategies, if any, that could potentially provide flood mitigation benefits or indicate that no strategies were identified that could potentially provide such benefit in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Scope of Work, Task 5A; Exhibit C, Section 2.5.1]	Volume II, Chapter 1. Section 1.10 has been added to Volume II, Chapter 1 regarding the identification of potentially feasible strategies with potential non-trivial flood mitigation benefits and any Flood Mitigation Strategies with potential to provide new water supply benefits.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
12	Volume II, Section 8.4.2. The evaluation for the Lake Belton to Lake Stillhouse Hollow Pipeline WMS states that "The supply for this project is authorized under the existing BRA water right for Lake Belton and Lake Stillhouse Hollow and represents existing supplies. For purposes of planning guidelines and the development of unit cost, this strategy is considered to yield 5,000 ac-ft/yr of existing supplies. However, the actual yield of the project is zero considering it is transporting existing supplies." The types of facilities and associated capital or other costs that may be included in a regional water plan must be directly associated with development of additional water supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies. Please provide additional clarification documenting, specifically, how this strategy would increase the volume of supply in the final, adopted regional water plan and/or modify or remove the strategy, as appropriate. [31 TAC § 357.34(d)]	Volume II Section 8.4.2 has been revised to state the the WMS has been modeled in the WAM and could provide 2,000 afy of supply through system operations of Belton, Stillhouse and Georgetown via the proposed pipeline and an existing pipeline. WMSProjectID 1981 Revise to reflect 2,000 ac-ft per decade with unit cost of $4,298 (2030-2040) and $726 (2050-2080).
13	Volume II, Chapter 1. It is unclear from the plan what quantitative measure was used for assessing reliability of water supplies for water management strategy evaluations. Page 1-4 of Volume II states that "The criteria for reliability is that it meet municipal, industrial, and agricultural needs 100 percent of the time". However, the impact tables within the strategy evaluations appear to correlate reliability to a qualitative reporting of low to high. Please clearly provide the quantitative basis for reliability used in the evaluations of water management strategies in the final, adopted regional water plan—ensuring that any recommended strategies provide a firm water supply throughout drought of record conditions. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(3)(A)]	Volume II, Chapter 1. Chapter 1 has been revised to clearly define the quantitative basis for evaluating water supply reliability used in the evaluations of water management strategies in the final, adopted regional water plan.
14	Volume II. The plan does not appear to show estimated water losses in the evaluations of water management strategies. Please include calculated water loss estimates in each strategy or a range of estimated water losses by strategy type in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(3)(A), Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.9]	Volume II. The following clarificatin text has been added to Section 1.1, Volume II, to explain why water loss was not considered in WMSs. "The water supply from the water management strategies has not been included to account for water loss. The demands developed in Chapter 2, Volume I, of this plan already incorporate appropriate levels of water loss based on current system performance. Therefore, the identified supplies and projects are designed to meet these demands without additional consideration for water loss. The Brazos G RWPG expects that future projects will be developed and maintained responsibly, leading to a reduction in water losses below current levels. This reduction is specifically addressed within the water loss reduction component of the municipal conservation strategy."
15	Volume II, Section 1.6 and Volume III, Appendix P. It is unclear from the plan what quantitative measure was used for assessing the impact on agricultural resources for water management strategy evaluations. For example, Appendix P includes a numeric ranking of 1-3 for agricultural resources, however agricultural resources are not included in the impact matrix provided as Table 1-4 or in Appendix P. Please clearly provide the quantitative basis for the impact on agricultural resources used in the evaluations of water management strategies in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(3)(C)]	Volume II, Section 1.6 and Volume III, Appendix P. Table 1-4 of Volume II, Chapter 1 and Appendix P have been updated to include the acreage threshold for agricultural resources, along with several other parameter revisions for the final, adopted regional water plan.
16	Volume I, Chapter 5, and DB27. The following WUGs, including the WUG split in Region G, appear to be receiving strategy supply from a recommended strategy that would require an interbasin transfer (IBT) of surface water and to which Texas Water Code § 11.085(k)(1) appears to apply: Bethesda WSC, Burleson, Crowley, Fort Worth, Johnson County SUD, Mansfield, Mountain Peak SUD, and Venus. In the final, adopted regional water plan, at minimum, please acknowledge whether these WUGs are proposed to be receiving supply subject to an IBT and include a summary of water needs in the basin of origin and in the receiving basin. DB27 water needs data by basin is available by utilizing TWDB Secure Agency Reporting Application (SARA) Report ID 96. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(6)]	Volume I, Chapter 5, and DB27. The following WUGs receiving strategy supplies identified as potentially requiring IBT of surface water are actually recipients of identified recommended strategies coming from another RWPG: Bethesda WSC (Johnson County - Section 5.17.3.1), Burleson (Johnson County - Section 5.17.4.2), Johnson County SUD (Johnson County - Section 5.17.10.2) and City of Venus (Johnson County - Section 5.17.16.2). Text has been added to each of these water supply plans reflecting that IBT was considered. The following remaining entities receive water supplies from Region C where more details pertaining to the recommended strategies can be found. They are mentioned in the Region G Plan primarily because a portion of the City limits is within Johnson County: City of Crowley, City of Fort Worth, City of Mansfield and Mountain Peak SUD WMS details located in the Region C Plan.
17	Volume II, Section 8.2. It is unclear from the costing summary presented for the Managed Aquifer Recharge Project at Haskell and Knox Counties project, what project components are included in the capital cost estimated for the project. Please provide an additional breakdown with greater detail of major project components and capital costs in the evaluation and Table 8.2-2, in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(f)]	Volume II, Section 8.2. Updates have been made to Table 8.2-2: Cost Estimate Summary for the MAR Project (Haskell and Knox Counties) to include project components such as well field, pump station, and conveyance infrastructure. In addition, the UCM output report has been updated to reflect these new project components.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
18	Volume I, Section 5.40 and Volume III, Appendix M. The plan does not include a copy of the required TWDB template table providing the implementation status of large recommended strategies and projects in the region, in accordance with 31 TAC § 357.34(g). Section 5.40 refers to Appendix M for this information, however Appendix M presents the implementation survey results of the 2021 Brazos G plan. While an electronic copy of the required table was provided for TWDB's review of draft plan materials, the majority of the timeline and key milestones information was not completed. The following items must be addressed regarding this task in the final, adopted regional water plan [31 TAC § 357.34(g); Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B; Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.7]: a.) Please include a copy of the implementation status table for large, recommended projects in the 2026 Brazos G plan—utilizing the TWDB provided template (available in Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.7). b.) Please ensure that the implementation status table is completed to the best of the region's ability. Note this task is a key component of implementing the requirements of House Bill 1565, 88th Texas Legislature. If the region is not able to obtain all of the required information, please provide the specific reason(s) for any remaining, missing information. c.) Please ensure that the implementation status is included for all recommended strategies and projects meeting the criteria in accordance with 31 TAC § 357.34(g) and further detailed in Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.7. Based on the draft table provided to TWDB for review, the following projects meet the criteria and were not included: Georgetown Reclamation (WMSProjectId 5447) and Lake Granger ASR (WMSProjectId 1854). d.) Please ensure that online decades presented in the implementation status table for all projects are consistent with the online decades in DB27. For example, in the draft table submitted to TWDB for review, Groesbeck Off Channel Reservoir was shown with an online decade in 2030, however the online decade reported in DB27 is 2040. e.) Please include a graphic showing the timeline and any key milestones for each applicable project. f.) Please ensure that any appendices are correctly labeled for the separate tasks related to SOW Task 5B (implementation status of certain projects in the 2026 regional water plan) and Task 9 (implementation survey of the 2021 regional water plan).	Volume II, Section 5; Appendix M. A new section 5.41 has been added to Volume I, Chapter 5, summarizing the 13 WMSs recommended in the 2026 Brazos G RWP that meet the large recommended strategies and projects in the region, in accordance with 31 TAC § 357.34(g). The implementation status for each large WMSP is depicted in both a timeline chart and a summary table, with the corresponding project maps available in Volume II. Appendix M has been updated to include the implementation status for 2026 Brazos G Plan to the best of the Region's knowledge.
19	Volume II, Section 4.4. The evaluation for the City of Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir states that implementation of the off-channel reservoir will require permits from various state and federal agencies. Based on permitting timelines, please confirm that it is actually feasible for the reservoir to be online and providing a supply by the year 2040. [31 TAC § 357.34(g); Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B; Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.7]	Volume II, Section 4.4. Yes, it is feasible for the reservoir to be online and providing supply by the year 2040.
20	Volume II, Section 8.1 and DB27. The Bosque County-Regional Water Supply Project is currently entered into DB27 as an "Other Surface Water" strategy type, however the evaluation of this strategy includes expansion of an off-channel reservoir and, accordingly, needs to be classified as a "New Reservoir" for water supply planning purposes. Please coordinate with TWDB's Water Supply and Strategy Analysis team to update this strategy type in DB27. This revision will trigger the requirement for Region G to provide the implementation status for this project in accordance with 31 TAC § 357.34(g). Additionally, based on the content of the strategy evaluation, it is not clear whether obtaining or amending a water right permit is necessary to implement this strategy. Please ensure the evaluation in the final, adopted regional water plan is clear if a new or amended water right is required and whether the implementation timeline would be impacted. [31 TAC § 357.34(g); 31 TAC § 357.50(g)(2)(B)]	Volume II, Section 8.1 and DB27. TWDB has reviewed additional information and agrees with the Region G Consultant's request to keep the Bosque County–Regional Water Supply Project classified in DB27 as an "Other Surface Water" WMS type rather than a "New Reservoir." This project involves expansion of the existing Clifton off-channel reservoir (constructed in 1998, initial capacity 500 acft) to a total storage of approximately 2,000 acft, well below the 5,000 acft "major reservoir" threshold. Existing City of Clifton water rights on the North Bosque River are expected to support the expanded use. Accordingly, the implementation status requirement under 31 TAC § 357.34(g) will not apply. Timeline: July 23, 2025 – Region G submitted technical and regulatory basis for classification; August 4, 2025 – TWDB concurred and confirmed no implementation status reporting required.
21	Volume II, Chapter 7 and DB27. It is unclear in the plan whether strategy water supply volumes represented for several aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) projects have been reduced to appropriately reflect the expected percent of actual water supply recovery from the aquifer, noted in the plan as 75 percent. Please clearly state whether the net water supply yield accounts for the expected recovery rate of 75 percent for the following strategies: City of Bryan ASR of Still Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR) (Section 7.2), College Station ASR (WMSId 3239), Acton MUD ASR (Section 7.5), Lake Grander ASR (WMSId 3206), and Bell County WCID1 Fort Cavazos ASR (WMSId 6256). If the strategy supply volumes do not reflect the lesser, expected percent of recovery, please modify the supply volumes as appropriate in the final, adopted regional water plan and in DB27. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.4]	Volume II, Chapter 7 and DB27. The ASR strategy evaluations have been updated to list project specific ASR recovery rates. Water supply volumes accounting for the estimated recoverable rate for the final, adopted regional water plan have been revised for the following: - City of Bryan ASR of Still Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR) (Section 7.2) Added to DB27 as alternative strategy with project yield of 4,856 ac-ft/yr starting in 2040 with unit cost of $2,873 (2040-2050) and $1,347 (2060-2080) and project capital cost of $105,485,000. Project components are Water treatment plant, Advanced water treatment plant, transmission pipeline, wellfield, and pump station. - Acton MUD ASR (Section 7.5) removed from Volume II Section 7, startegy was removed from DB27. - Lake Granger ASR (WMSId 3206) Revised Project yield to 3245, 4665, 9330, 9330, 9330, 9330 for 2030-2080 respectively with unit costs $4146, $3870, $1633, $1271, $756 and $756 for 2030-2080 respectively. - College Station ASR - text modification has been made to Volume II, Chapter 7. - Bell County WCID1 Fort Cavazos ASR - text modification has been made to Volume II, Chapter 7.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
22	Volume II, Section 7.1 and DB27. It is unclear in the plan whether the strategy water supply volume for the Bryan ASR (Carrizo-Wilcox) (WMSId 3201) strategy was reduced to reflect the percent of actual water supply expected to be recovered from the aquifer, and it is also unclear if the expected percent of supply recovery is intended to be 75 percent or 90 percent per year. For example, Section 7.1.2 states “unrecoverable (loss) factor of 10 percent” however Section 7.1.4 states “Expected recovery from this project is estimated to be at least 75 percent.” Please clarify the expected percent of recovery and clearly state whether the net water supply yield accounts for the expected percent of recovery. If the strategy supply volumes do not reflect the lesser, expected percent of recovery, please modify the supply volumes as appropriate in the final, adopted regional water plan and in DB27 to reflect the lower volumes recovered. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.4]	Volume II Section 7.1 and DB27 has been revised to consistently reflect an ASR recovery percentage of 90%.
23	Volume II, Chapter 2. The plan does not appear to include an explanation for why conservation was not recommended for livestock WUGs with identified needs. Please include this information in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(j)(2)(B)]	Volume II, Chapter 2. A new section within Volume II, Chapter 2 has been added describing why conservation savings are not applied to livestock WUGs with needs for the final, adopted regional water plan.
24	Volume II, Section 2.1 and DB27. Based on data entered into DB27, the demand reduction volumes appear to be equivalent to over 40 percent of total demands for 39 municipal water user groups in at least one planning decade. As these volumes appear relatively high, please add a discussion to support this magnitude of the demand reduction volume for these water user groups in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(j)(2)(B)]	Volume II, Section 2.1 and DB27. Discussion has been added in Volume II, Section 2.1 explaining that the recommended water conservation strategy in the Brazos G Area reflects the Brazos G RWPG’s planning guidance and is considered appropriate for the WUGs in the region. The strategy includes an assumed one percent annual reduction in per capita municipal demand until target GPCD values are reached, typically 140 GPCD for most WUGs. For WUGs identified as having high levels of water loss, water loss mitigation is the first strategy considered to meet these goals. If projected savings from water loss reduction alone result in a GPCD lower than the target, the post-mitigation GPCD becomes the revised conservation goal for that WUG. In some cases, the cumulative effect of applying annual reductions over the full planning horizon results in projected demand reductions that exceed 40 percent in at least one planning decade. Additionally, one WUG has a projected GPCD below 60, primarily due to significant historical water loss volumes being addressed through water loss mitigation. The Brazos G RWPG believes these projected savings are tangible and represent realistic improvements achievable through the implementation of proven conservation best management practices.
25	Volume II, Section 2.1 and DB27. For the following municipal WUGs, the whole WUG's Gallons Per Capita Per Day (GPCD) adjusted for conservation is less than 60 GPCD in at least one planning decade: Cade Lakes WSC and Eula WSC. Please confirm the reasonableness of these anticipated low GPCDs in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(j)(2)(B)]	Volume II, Section 2.1 and DB27. Discussion has been added in Volume II, Section 2.1 (same as Comment #24). The recommended water conservation strategy in the Brazos G Area reflects the Brazos G RWPG’s planning guidance and is considered appropriate for the WUGs in the region. The strategy includes an assumed one percent annual reduction in per capita municipal demand until target GPCD values are reached, typically 140 GPCD for most WUGs. For WUGs identified as having high levels of water loss, water loss mitigation is the first strategy considered to meet these goals. If projected savings from water loss reduction alone result in a GPCD lower than the target, the post-mitigation GPCD becomes the revised conservation goal for that WUG. In some cases, the cumulative effect of applying annual reductions over the full planning horizon results in projected demand reductions that exceed 40 percent in at least one planning decade. Additionally, one WUG has a projected GPCD below 60, primarily due to significant historical water loss volumes being addressed through water loss mitigation. The Brazos G RWPG believes these projected savings are tangible and represent realistic improvements achievable through the implementation of proven conservation best management practices.
26	Volume I, Chapter 5, and DB27. TWDB SARA Report ID 120 'Recommended WMS with New/Amended IBT Permit & Conservation' appears to include two WUGs in which Region G is the primary region, Burleson and Johnson County SUD, that receive strategy supply from a proposed IBT strategy, but that do not have any recommended conservation strategy. Please include a water conservation strategy for each WUG that is to obtain water from a proposed IBT to which TWC § 11.085 applies, in the final, adopted regional water plan. These conservation strategies should reflect what would be required to result in the highest practicable level of water conservation and efficiency achievable. [31 TAC § 357.34(j)(2)(C)]	Volume I, Chapter 5, and DB27. New text has been added to Volume I, Chapter 5, Section 5.17.4 and 5.17.10. Added Advanced Conservation - Demand Reduction WMS for Johnson County SUD with supply reductions of 631, 2077, 2310, 2517, 2750, and 3012 for the 2030-2080 planning decades respectively, unit cost of $684 per ac-ft each decade. Added Advanced Conservation - Demand Reduction WMS for Burleson with supply reductions of 566, 1036, 1180, 1308, 1453, and 1615 for the 2030-2080 planning decades respectively, unit cost of $684 per ac-ft each decade.
27	Volume II, Section 2.1. While separate evaluation information is presented for water use reduction and water loss mitigation strategies, the savings and costs are presented as a whole in Table 2.4 and 2.7. For regional water planning purposes, water loss mitigation conservation strategies are required to be recommended separately from water use reduction conservation strategies. Please present the savings and cost separately for recommended municipal water use reduction and water loss mitigation strategies in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Scope of Work, Task 5C; Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.5]	Volume II, Section 2.1. Savings and costs have been added separately for each WUG for both water use reduction and water loss mitigation strategies, towards the end of Volume II, Chapter 2 for the final, adopted regional water plan. Footnote added to Volume II, Chapter 2, Attachment 1 tables A1 and A2 indicating that savings presented as a zero yield are not included as recommended conservation WMS.
28	Volume II, Section 3.2. Several entities (Mart, North Bosque WSC, Robinson, Manufacturing- McLennan County) in Table 3.2-1 of Volume II have higher 2080 Estimated Reuse volumes than apparent 2080 Maximum Available WWTP Effluent volumes. Please review and reconcile or correct in the final adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.3]	Volume II, Section 3.2. Table 3.2-1 has been updated to reflect the corrected volumes of potential wastewater reuse for the following entities: City of College Station, Mart, North Bosque WSC, Robinson and Manufacturing. These changes have been made for the final, adopted regional water plan.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
29	Volume II. The plan does not appear to present water management strategy project costing tool output reports for the following recommended WMSProjectIds: 4388; 4395; 5447; 5232; 5466; 5160; 5158; and 5159. Please include a detailed costing table for these recommended projects in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.13]	Volume II. Detailed costing tables have been added to the following recommended projects: Costing for WMS Project ID 4388 Cameron Little River intake added to Volume II 11.3. For WMS Project ID 4395, added table summarizing recommended WMS to Volume I Chapter 5.38. Added costing sheet and high level project information to Volume II Chapter 11.3.22. For WMS Project ID 5232, added WMS evaluation to Volume II Chapter 3. For WMS Project ID 5160, Added costing sheet and high level project information to Volume II Chapter 11.3.22. For WMS project IDs 5158 and 5159, Added costing sheets to Volume II Chapter 11.5.1 For WMSProjectID 5466, added new section to Vol II Chapter 3, section 3.13 (numbering subject to revision). For WMSProjectID 5447, cost table is located in Vol II Chapter 3.11 (numbering subject to revision).
30	Volume II. The plan does not appear to present water management strategy project costing tool output reports for the following alternative WMSProjectIds: 4260 and 4261. Please include a detailed costing table for these alternative projects in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.13]	Volume II. For the final, adopted regional water plan, water management strategy project costing tool output reports have been added for the following alternative WMSProjectIds: 4260 and 4261 within Chapter 11.3.21.
31	Volume II, Chapter 4. The plan does not appear to separately present the estimated mitigation land area and associated estimate of acquisition cost in the evaluations for new reservoir strategies. Please provide an estimated separate acreage and cost related to land acquisition (or range) for both the reservoir footprint and mitigation within the appropriate section of the plan or costing sheet—for each reservoir evaluation—in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.12]	Volume II, Chapter 4. The final Plan now includes estimated mitigation land areas and associated acquisition costs for new reservoir strategies. When such information is available from project sponsors, it is incorporated directly into the Plan. In cases where sponsor-provided data is not available, the planning group applies a conservative approach by assuming the mitigation land area is approximately equal to the reservoir footprint. Similarly, mitigation land acquisition costs are assumed to be comparable to those of the reservoir land. The Plan also noted that this approach may overestimate actual needs. In practice, required mitigation acreage could be lower if project sponsors are able to acquire lower-quality land or enhance existing land to meet ecological equivalency standards or higher if other ecological or regulatory factors require additional land acquisition. Similar statement has been added to Section 1.6, Volume II.
32	Volume II, Chapter 2 and DB27. Unit costs have been entered into DB27 as $0 for the recommended industrial water conservation for the mining and manufacturing WUGs. Please include non-zero unit costs for these strategies in DB27 and include assumptions used in the costing methodology utilized in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.12]	Volume II, Chapter 2 and DB27. Non zero unit costs have been entered into DB27 and included in Volume II, Chapter 2 for both mining and manufacturing WUGs. In addition, the assumptions used in the costing methodology have been included in the final, adopted regional water plan.
33	Volume II. The plan includes water treatment plant (WTP) expansion and other strategy types that include a WTP expansion as a stated project component. Any portion of strategies or costs that are associated with replacing portions of existing supply, including WTP capacity, are prohibited from being included in the regional water plans. The types of facilities and associated capital or other costs that may be included in a regional water plan must be directly associated with development of additional supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies. Please confirm that only the portion of WTP facilities (and costs) required to increase treated water supply volume (not to replace lost capacity) are included in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]	Volume II. Project components have been confirmed and revised if necessary for the final plan. Clarificatin text has been added to Section 1.5, Volumne II to state that the BGRWPG has ensured that only the portions of water treatment plant (WTP) facilities and associated costs that are directly related to increasing treated water supply volume are included in the regional water plan. Projects that involve WTP expansion or include WTP components have been reviewed to confirm that no costs related to replacement of existing capacity are included. All WTP-related strategies reflect new supply development from additional water sources, more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing supplies, consistent with applicable planning requirements.
34	Volume II, Section 11.5.1.4. The evaluation for the Central Texas WSC Water System Expansion recommended strategy lists “transmission pipeline replacement” as project components. Any portion of strategies or costs that replace portions of existing water supply are prohibited from being included in the regional water plans. The types of facilities and associated capital or other costs that may be included in a regional water plan must be directly associated with development of additional water supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies. Please provide additional clarification documenting specifically how, and by what share of the volume, this component would increase the volume of supply in the final, adopted regional water plan and/or modify or remove the strategy, as appropriate, to exclude replacement of existing infrastructure capacity [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]	Volume II, Section 11.5.1.4. The evaluation for the Central Texas WSC Water System Expansion strategy description has been revised to read upgrade existing transmission pipeline to increase conveyance capacity. WMS supply with all associated projects in place results in the total WMS supply volume. Intent of the WMS is to upgrade the existing pipelines from 14" diameter pipe to 20 and 18" diameter pipes. The upgrade is done by replacing the existing pipe with larger pipe with more conveyance capacity. Text has been added to Volume II, Section 11.5.1.4 indicating that, "The cost and supply associated with the WMS is only associated with the increased capacity provided by the new infrastructure elements of the WMS."
35	Volume II, Section 5.1. The evaluation for the City of Bryan’s Groundwater Strategies “includes upgrade to existing water treatment plant” as a project component. Any portion of strategies or costs that replace portions of existing water supply are prohibited from being included in the regional water plans. The types of facilities and associated capital or other costs that may be included in a regional water plan must be directly associated with development of additional water supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies. Please provide additional clarification documenting specifically how this component would increase the volume of supply in the final, adopted regional water plan, and by what share of the volume, and/or modify or remove the strategy, as appropriate, to exclude replacement of existing infrastructure capacity. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]	Volume II, Section 5.1. New text has been added in Section 5.1.4 clarifying that the cost estimates are for only new infrastructure elements required for the strategy.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
36	Volume II, Section 8.3. The evaluation for the East Williamson County Water Supply Project states that the project will be for infrastructure to utilize “current supplies and new supplies” to be delivered through “existing and proposed transmission systems.” Any portion of strategies or costs that replace portions of existing water supply are prohibited from being included in the regional water plans. The types of facilities and associated capital or other costs that may be included in a regional water plan must be directly associated with development of additional water supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies. Please provide additional clarification documenting specifically which component would increasing the volume of supply in the final, adopted regional water plan and/or modify or remove the strategy, as appropriate, to exclude replacement of existing infrastructure capacity. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]	Volume II, Section 8.3. For the final adopted plan, text is added to Volume II, Section 8.3.1 and 8.3.4 to indicate, "The cost and supply associated with the WMS is only associated with the increased capacity provided by the new infrastructure elements of the WMS."
37	Volume II, Section 8.6, and DB27. The evaluation for the Somervell County Water Supply Project (WMSId 5299) states that the project’s infrastructure will include development of a “retail distribution system.” Per Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15, new facilities associated with internal distribution networks (e.g., retail distribution within a WUG’s system) may not be included in the plan. Additionally, this strategy does not appear to be directly associated with development of additional water supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies based on how the strategy is entered into DB27. In DB27, the strategy WMS is currently structured as a supply reduction by WUG WMS in DB27. Somervell County Water District’s recommended WMS currently appears to be reducing their supply, transferring a portion to two other WUGs, and then returning a significant portion back to themselves. Please remove the water management strategy project from the final, adopted regional water plan and DB27. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]	Volume II, Section 8.6, and DB27. The evaluation for the Somervell County Water Supply Project has been revised to reflect that the total capital cost of this strategy covers only system expansion. This project involves construction of infrastructure to expand the existing system with an additional 1.25 MGD plant to utilize the existing water supply from Wheeler Branch Reservoir. DB27 has been updated to list this strategy type as "Existing Availability", not supply reduction. The revised water management strategy will continue to be a recommended strategy in the final, adopted regional water plan.
38	Volume II, Section 11.5.1.8. The evaluation for the City of Mineral Well’s Water Treatment Plant lists improvements to “renew and replace infrastructure” as part of the project. Any portion of strategies or costs that replace portions of existing water supply are prohibited from being included in the regional water plans. The types of facilities and associated capital or other costs that may be included in a regional water plan must be directly associated with development of additional water supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies. Please provide additional clarification specifically documenting and quantifying specifically how this strategy would increase the volume of supply in the final, adopted regional water plan or remove the strategy, as appropriate, to exclude replacement of existing infrastructure capacity. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]	Volume II, Section 11.5.1.8. All appropriate edits have been made to Section 11.5.1.8 to ensure that only components of the project directly related to increasing water supply are included in the regional water plan. References to infrastructure elements at the water treatment plant that serve as replacements rather than expansions have been removed or revised. The strategy now reflects only those improvements that contribute to increased supply volume, consistent with the requirements of Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15.
39	Volume II, Section 11.3.19. The evaluation for the Lampasas Expand System Capacity strategy states it will include “transmission pipeline improvements, pump station improvements, and tank rehabilitation”. Any portion of strategies or costs that replace portions of existing water supply are prohibited from being included in the regional water plans. The types of facilities and associated capital or other costs that may be included in a regional water plan must be directly associated with development of additional water supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies. Please provide additional clarification documenting specifically how and by what share of the supply this strategy is actually increasing the volume of supply provided in the final, adopted regional water plan and/or modify or remove the strategy, as appropriate, to exclude replacement of existing infrastructure capacity. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]	Volume II, Section 11.3.19. All appropriate edits have been made to Section 11.3.19 to ensure that only components of the project directly related to increasing water supply are included in the regional water plan. References to infrastructure elements that serve as replacements rather than expansions have been removed or revised. The strategy now reflects only those improvements that contribute to increased supply volume, consistent with the requirements of Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
40	Volume II and DB27. Several additional water treatment plant strategies do not appear to be directly associated with development of additional water supplies from new water sources or additional supplies from more efficient use of existing supplies, or volumetric increases to existing water supplies based on information in the plan and how they have been structured in DB27. Please review the information for the following strategies, provide additional clarification documenting specifically how these strategies are increasing the volume of supply in the final, adopted regional water plan and/or modify or remove the strategies, as appropriate, and work with TWDB's Water Supply and Strategy Analysis team to address the following issues [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]: a.) The WTP Upgrade for Arsenic Removal (County-Other, McLennan) (WMSId 3985) is currently structured as a supply reduction by WUG WMS in DB27. It appears that County-Other, McLennan WUG is both reducing and receiving the same amount of supply through this WMS in DB27. b.) The WTP Upgrade for Arsenic Removal (Falls and Limestone County) (WMSId 5302) WMS is currently structured as a supply reduction by WUG WMS in DB27. County-Other, McLennan WUG appears to be both reducing and receiving the same amount of supply through this WMS in DB27. c.) The Temple WTP Expansion' water management strategy (WMSId 7075) is currently set up as a supply reduction by WUG WMS that shows Temple as reducing their existing supplies and then receiving the same supply again which indicates replacement of existing supply and infrastructure which is not allowed. It appears that if the water treatment plant expansion is needed to access increased water supplies, then the existing supplies should be constrained, but not reduced, therefore this WMS needs to be restructured to correctly show this constraint or be removed.	Volume I and DB27. The intended reference appears to be Vol. I (not Vol. II). The water treatment plant strategies mentioned have been modified in the following way to ensure that for the final, adopted regional water plan, it is clear that these strategies increase strategy supply volumes: Volume I Chapter 5.24.34 (McLennan County-Other) strategy description revised to state that the strategy restores supply lost due to arsenic concentrations. Volume I Chapter 5.23.6 (Prairie Hill WSC) strategy description revised to state that the strategy restores supply lost due to arsenic concentrations. Volume I Chapter 5.10.5 (Falls County-Other) strategy description revised to state that the strategy restores supply lost due to arsenic concentrations. DB27 has been updated to correct the three items mentioned.
41	Volume II, Section 5.3.4; Table 5.3-1. The evaluation for the Lee County well field strategy for the City of Georgetown states on page 5.3-8 that "The Lee County well field at buildout includes 3 Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer wells, which have already been installed." Please clarify the specific components that were included in the cost for the "Well Fields (Wells, Pumps, and Piping) - $32,277,000" line item in Table 5.3-1 and ensure that costs were not included, for example to replace any existing infrastructure, in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.15]	Volume II, Section 5.3.4; Table 5.3-1. Additional text has been added to Section 5.3.4 clarifying that the buildout includes 3 Carizzo-Wilcox Aquifer wells, which have already been installed, plus an additional 3 wells that remain to be built. The accompanying pricing sheet and Table 5.3-1 reflect information on the 3 future wells, not the replacement of any existing infrastructure, in the final, adopted regional water plan.
42	Volume II, Section 8.2. It is unclear from the evaluation of the Managed Aquifer Recharge Project at Haskell and Knox Counties strategy how the water supply yield was determined and whether the strategy would provide a firm supply during severe drought conditions. Please provide additional details on the methodology for estimating the strategy yield and confirm that strategy supplies presented in the final, adopted regional water plan for this strategy are available as firm supplies under drought of record conditions. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(3)(A), Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2; Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B]	Volume II, Section 8.2. The memo from Rolling Plains GCD titled "Managed Aquifer Recharge Facility Production Capacities" dated December 18, 2025 was included at the end of Section 8.2 as an attachment. This memo provides the additional details on the methodology for estimating the strategy yield. The RWPG confirms that the strategy supplies are available as firm supplies during DOR.
43	Volume II, and DB27. The plan does not appear to include evaluations for the following projects and their associated water management strategies that have been entered as recommended projects in DB27: WMSProjectIds 4867; 5589; 5590; and 5591. Please provide evaluations for these projects including a description, discussion of associated facilities, and technical evaluation addressing all considerations and factors under § 357.34(e) for each project, in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(1); Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2; Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B]	Volume II, and DB27. WMSProjectID 5589, 5590, 5591 have had strategy summary information regarding supplies and costs added to Vol I 5.20. A new section 5.4 in Volume II Chapter 5 has been added for the City of Temple Groundwater strategies. WMSProjectId 4867 has been removed from DB27 and the final, adopted regional water plan.
44	Volume II. Chapter 3. The plan states on page 3.1-2 that the wastewater reuse project for Liberty Hill was evaluated as a specific management strategy, however the plan appears to be missing an evaluation for the recommended strategy and associated project Reuse Direct Potable Reuse (DPR) - Liberty Hill (WMSProjectId 5466). Please include this evaluation, including all evaluation requirements in 31 TAC § 357.34(e) in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(1); Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2; Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B]	Volume II, Chapter 3. New text has been added to Volume II, Section 3.12 which includes a description and evaluation of the Liberty Hill DPR WMS for the final, adopted regional water plan.
45	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, Chapter 7, and DB27. The Temple ASR of surface water and DPR strategy (WMSId 5978) and associated project is included in DB27 as a recommended strategy and project for Temple, however the strategy does not appear to be listed in the Water Supply Plan for Temple (Volume I, Section 5.1.20), nor does Volume II appear to include an evaluation for this strategy. Please include this evaluation, including all evaluation requirements in 31 TAC § 357.34(e), as well as including the expected percent of recovery and expected, lesser volume as the net water supply yield, and ensuring the strategy supplies in DB27 were modified to reflect the lesser, expected percent of recovery, in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(1); Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2; Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2.4Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B]	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, Chapter 5 and Chapter 7 and DB27. New text has been added to Volume I, Chapter 5, Section 5.1.20 for the City of Temple, to include the recommended WMSs reported in DB27 (GW Temple North, GW Temple South, GW Trinity Oasis, and Temple ASR). In addition, new text has been added to Volume II Chapters 5 and Chapter 7 summarizing the evaluation for these strategies for the final, adopted regional water plan.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
46	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, and DB27. The City of Cameron Little River Intake strategy and associated project is listed in Volume I, Section 5.25.1.2 however, this recommended strategy (WMSId 5451) and associated project do not appear to have been evaluated in Volume II. Please include an evaluation of this strategy addressing all considerations and factors under 31 TAC § 357.34(e) in the final, adopted regional water plan. Additionally, in DB27, the strategy is currently structured as a supply reduction by WUG strategy in DB27 and currently appears to not develop new supply. The associated WUGs are both reducing their water supplies and receiving the same amount. Please ensure that the evaluation demonstrates the strategy is increasing the volume of supply under drought of record conditions in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(1); Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2; Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B]	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, and DB27. For the final, adopted regional water plan, text of Vol. I, Chapter 5.25.1.2 and Volume II Section 11.3.23 revised to indicate WMSID 5451 is a recommended strategy to construct a new surface water intake structure and raw water pipeline to restore lost surface water supply due to river migration away from the existing intake structure. The water supply source from the existing intake structure is anticipated to fail before 2030. DB27 has been corrected to show zero existing supply in all planning decades for the City of Cameron. WMSID 5451 has been revised to be an 'existing surplus supply' strategy from a 'supply reduction strategy' to reflect the new supply developed.
47	Volume II, and DB27. The plan does not appear to include evaluations for the following projects and their associated water management strategies that have been entered as alternative projects in DB27: Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer Development – Lampasas (WMSProjectId 5193) and Georgetown - North Option Alternative (WMSProjectId 5616). Please provide evaluations for these alternative projects including a description, discussion of associated facilities, and technical evaluation addressing all considerations and factors under § 357.34(e) for each project, in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(1); Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2; Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B]	Volume II, and DB27. For the final, adopted regional water plan, evaluations for both Georgetown (WMSProjectId 5616) and Lampasas (WMSProjectId 5193) have been developed. For Georgetown, the Brazos G RWPG has added Alternative strategy information to Volume II Chapter 11. 2 as a project requiring raw water intake, pump station, transmission line, ground storage tank and water treatment plant. For IPP Database corrections Detail 228, revise in DB27 the strategy supply starting decade to 2040 from 2030. For Lampasas, new text has been added to Volume I, Chapter 5.2.1 and Volume II Section 11.3.
48	Volume II, and DB27. The plan does not appear to include evaluations for the following water management strategies that have been entered as alternative strategies in DB27: WMSIds 5759; 6273; 6274. Please provide evaluations for these alternative projects including a description, discussion of associated facilities, and technical evaluation addressing all considerations and factors under § 357.34(e) for each project, in the final, adopted regional water plan. Additionally, as these strategies appear to be related to a permit, please confirm whether these strategies are increasing the volume of supply, and not simply transferring existing water. [31 TAC § 357.34(e)(1); Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.2; Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B]	Volume II, and DB27. Volume I, Chapter 5, Section 5.25.8 has been revised to list only two alternative water management strategies which reflect currently existing groundwater infrastructure and pending groundwater permit supplies and infrastructure to develop those supplies (Carrizo Aquifer Development - Milam County-Other Makeup for reduced supplies and Carrizo Aquifer Development - Milam County-Other Future Permit). Groundwater is MAG limited, which is why these strategies are listed as alternative. Volume I, Chapter 5, Section 5.36.28 has been revised to list an alternative WMS for SLR to develop groundwater and supply Williamson County Manufacturing. The accompanying UCM reports have been added to Volume II, Chapter 11 for the final, adopted regional water plan. DB27 has been updated accordingly.
49	Volume I, Table 5.38-10 and DB27. It is not clear from the strategy evaluation for Central Texas WSC - Water System Expansion when the strategy and associated project (Central Texas WSC - Transmission Pipeline Upgrade, WMSProjectId 4866) are anticipated to come online. DB27 shows this strategy as providing supply in 2030 with the associated project coming online later in 2040. Please confirm the anticipated online decade for this strategy and project and revise as necessary to ensure that the projects needed to implement strategies are online prior to the strategy supply online decade. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Table 5.38-10 and DB27. The strategy for Central Texas WSC - Water System Expansion has mulitple projects which are phased to come online over two planning decades. The WMS and three of the four WMSProjectIDs 4863, 4864, and 4865 come online by 2030 and Central Texas WSC - Transmission Pipeline Upgrade, WMSProjectId 4866 is anticipated to come online in 2040. Volume I Chapter 5, Section 5.38.7 and Vol II Chapter 11, Section 11.5.1.4 have been modified to describe the phasing of the multiple projects for the final, adopted regional water plan.
50	Volume II, Section 5.3.1. The evaluation for the City of Georgetown's Lee County Groundwater Strategy includes language about Georgetown's potential partnership with Recharge Water. Please clarify whether the Recharge Water option is intended to be a recommended or alternative WMS, and, if either, include a full evaluation for the strategy, including all evaluation requirements in 31 TAC § 357.34(e) in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1); 31 TAC § 357.35(g)(2)]	Volume II, Section 5.3.1. Clarifying text has been added to Chapter 5, Section 5.3.1, to ensure that it is understood that the partnership with Recharge Water is a recommended strategy. The RWPG supports the project in whichever sponsorship configuration is implemented.
51	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, and DB27. Strategy supply volumes associated with several water management strategy projects appear to be inconsistently reported between the plan and DB27, including for the following WMSProjectIds: 1747; 1750; 1758; 1760; 1824; 1850; 1882; 1890; 1897; 1898; 1907; 1949; 1960; 1970; 1981; 2889; 3297; 4112; 4119; 4262; 4263; 4268; 4285; 4286; 4289; 4291; 4388; 4389; 5118; 5158; 5189; 5367; 5370; 5416; 5431; 5450; 5452; and 5117. For example, the related strategy supplies reported in DB27 for the Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer Development project for the Southwest Milam WSC (WMSProjectId 4263) are inconsistent with the supply volumes listed in Table 5.25-7 in Volume I and page 11- 101 in Volume II. Please review the supply volumes for all strategies and revise as necessary to ensure that strategy supplies in DB27 are consistent with those presented in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, and DB27. The following actions and modifications have been completed related to these water management strategies, so that the final, adopted regional water plan and DB27 are aligned. WMSProjectID 1747 Added clarifying text in Volume II Chapter 5.1 that project is designed for a specific supply capacity and reduced due to MAG limitations. WMSProjectID 1750 corrected supply volumes in Volume I Chapter 5.4.7. WMSProjectID 1758 updated DB27 to add a missing water source associated with project. WMSProjectID 1760 corrected supply volume in Volume II Chapter 11.3.8. WMSProjectID 1824 aligning costs with DB27 cost. Confirmed WMSProjectID 1850 supplies are consistent between DB27 and report, text revision in Volume II Chapter 3.11. WMSProjectID 1882, revised Volume I Chapter 5.23.6 to align with DB27. WMSProjectID 1890 confirmed supplies are consistent between DB27 and report. WMSProjectID 1897 confirmed supplies are consistent between DB27 and report. WMSProjectID 1898 corrected supply volume and updated project costs in Volume I Chapter 5.34.1, 5.37.2, and Volume II Chapter 4.6. WMSProjectID 1907 is consistent between DB27 and Volume I Chapter 5.24.20, removed old project from DB27. WMSProjectID 1949 and 1981 corrected supply volumes in Volume I Chapter 5.38.2. WMSProjectID 1960 confirmed tabular data, add project description to customer WUGs sections of Volume I Chapter 5.36. Updated DB27 to reflect reported unit cost.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
		WMSProjectID 1970 corrected supply volume and updated project and unit costs in Volume II Chapter 8.6; updated in conjunction with response to TWDB Comment # 37. WMSProjectID 2889 corrected supply volume in Volume I Chapter 5.35.1 WMSProjectID 3297 corrected supply volume and missing cost information in Volume I Chapter 5.28.5, corrected cost evaluation in Volume II 11.3.26, Updated DB27 unit cost values to $1,495 and $513. WMSProjectID 4112 corrected supply volume and added alternative strategy description to Volume I Chapter 5.17.8. WMSProjectID 4119 correced supply volume in Volume II Chapter 11.3.25. WMSProjectID 4262 corrected supply volume in Volume I Chapter 5.25.4 WMSProjectID 4263 corrected supply volume in Volume I Chapter 5.25.6 spliting out recommended and alternative strtegy supplies and updated Volume II Chapter 11.3.23. WMSProjectID 4268 corrected supply volume represented in cost summary in Volume II Chapter 3.6, correct unit cost in Volume I Chapter 5.36.4 and update DB27 Unit costs. WMSProjectID 4285 corrected supply volume represented in the cost estimate in Volume II Chapter 11.5.1.5. Revise unit cost in DB27 to 2814 in 2060 and 2070 and 1342 in 2080. WMSProjectID 4286 corrected supply volume, cost and project description represented in Vol Chapter 5.1.20 and corrected cost in Vol II 11.5.1.9 to reflect supply at PF=2. Revise unit cost in DB27 to 1,142 and 511 in 2030-2040 and 2050-2080 respectively. WMSProjectID 4289 corrected supply volume and updated project and unit costs in Volume I Chapter 5.16.1 and in DB27. WMSProjectID 4291 (Expand WTP SWATS) Volume I Chapter 5.17.10.2 and DB27 have been revised Project Cost to $23,877,000 from $11,853,000 and set unit cost to $857 for 2040-2050 and $352 for 2060-2080. WMSProjectID 4388 corrected supply volume in Volume I Chapter 5.25.3 and noted in Vol 1 Chapter 5.25.3 and 5.25.5 that cost is tied to City of Cameron. WMSProjectID 4389 corrected supply volume in table 5.3-6 of Volume I Chapter 5.3. WMSProjectID 5117 corrected supply volume and added recommended and alternative project information in Vol I Chapter 5.28.7. WMSProjectID 5118 and 5431 added clarifying text in Volume II 11.3 that project is designed for a maximum supply but limited by MAG. WMSProjectID 5158 corrected supply volume in table 5.3-1 of Volume I Chapter 5.3. WMSProjectID 5189 corrected supply volume and project and unit costs in Volume I Chapter 5.21.2, Volume II Chapter 11.5.1.7, and DB27. WMSProjectID 5367 corrected supply volume in Volume I Chapter 5.25.7 spliting out recommended and alternative strategy supplies WMSProjectID 5370 corrected supply volume in Volume I Chapter 5.24.28. WMSProjectID 5416 corrected supply volume in Volume I Chapter 5.24.6. WMSProjectID 5431 corrected supply volume in Volume I Chapter 5.3.4. WMSProjectID 5450 corrected supply volume in DB27. WMSProjectID 5452, revised Volume I Chapter 5.3.2 and added clarifying text in Volume II Chapter 5.2 that project is designed for a specific supply capacity and reduced due to MAG limitations.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
52	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, and DB27. The project capital costs associated with several water management strategy projects appear to be inconsistently reported between the plan and DB27, including for the following WMSProjectIds: 1750; 1758; 1824; 1850; 1873; 1891; 1897; 2889; 3298; 4113; 4285; 4291; 4396; 4865; 5413; 5421; and 5422. For example, the cost presented in Volume I, Section 5.1.3.2 for the Groundwater Development – Trinity Aquifer WMSP for Bell County WCID No. 2 (WMSProjectId 3298) is $979,000, whereas the capital cost is reported as $1,523,000 in DB27. Please review the costing data for all projects and revise as necessary to ensure that costs in DB27 are consistent with those presented in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II and DB27. The project capital costs for the projects listed below have been reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure that costs in DB27 and consistent with those presented in the final, adopted regional water plan. WMSProjectID 1750 corrected project capital cost in Volume I Chapter 5.4.7. WMSProjectID 1758 confirmed project capital costs are consistent between DB27 and report. Corrected text for WMSProjectID 1824 aligning costs with DB27 cost. WMSProjectID 1850 Revised DB27 Project cost to $17,870,000 from $35,740,000. Added WMS Project Information to Volume I Chapter 5.24.30 and updated recommended strategy supply table. WMSProjectID 1873 Revised DB27 Project cost to $13,959,000 from $27,918,000. WMSProjectID 1891 Revised DB27 Project cost to $35,278,000 from $23,599,000. WMSProjectID 1897 corrected project costs in Volume II Chapter 4.2. WMSProjectID 2889 corrected project cost in Volume I Chapter 5.35.1 WMSProjectID 3298 corrected project cost in Volume I Chapter 5.1.3 WMSProjectID 4113 Volume I Chapter 5.17.10.2 and DB27 have been revised to reflect a 2060 start date for the WMS and correction of project and unit cost. WMSProjectID 4285 Revised Project Cost to $14,148,000 from $10,125,000, revise unit cost to $2,814 in 2060 and 2070 and $1,342 in 2080. Unit cost in Vol I Section 5.1.6 corrected in WMS summary. WMSProjectID 4291 (Expand WTP SWATS) Volume I Chapter 5.17.10.2 and DB27 have been revised Project Cost to $23,877,000 from $11,853,000 and set unit cost to $857 for 2040-2050 and $352 for 2060-2080. WMSProjectID 4396 corrected project and unit costs in Volume I Chapter 5.16.2. WMSProjectID 4865 Revised DB27 Project cost to $619,000 from $621,000. WMSProjectID 5413 Revised DB27 Project cost to $2,184,000 from $1,528,000. Corrected project costs in Vol I 5.24.18. WMSProjectID 5421 and 5422 corrected project costs in Vol 1 5.17.3.
53	Volume I, Chapter 5 and DB27. Capital or unit costs for several recommended projects appear to be missing in the entities' water supply plan sections, including the following WMSProjectIds: 5365; 5367; and 5368. Please include these costs in the appropriate sections of the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Chapter 5 and DB27. The recommended projects listed below have been resived to include capital or unit costs in the appropriate sections of the final, adopted regional water plan. WMSProjectID 5367corrected project and unit cost in Volume I Chapter 5.25.7 spliting out recommended and alternative strategy supplies WMSProjectID 5368 added Project and Unit cost in Volume I Chpater 5.25.11. For Washington Manufacturing WMSProjectID 5365 Added to Chapter 5.35.6 project name, implementation decade and costs. Costing table is located in Volume II Chapter 11.
54	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, and DB27. The online decades for several water management strategies and their associated projects appear to be inconsistently reported in the plan and DB27, including for WMSProjectIds 1891 and 2889. For example, the online decade for the Groesbeck Off Channel Reservoir strategy and project is reported as 2040 in DB27, whereas the plan presents the online decade as 2030 on page 5.23-4 of Volume I. Please review the online decades for all strategies and projects and revise as necessary to ensure that online decades in DB27 are consistent with those presented in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II and DB27. The online decades for the water management projects listed below have been corrected so that DB27 and the final, adopted regional plan are consistent. Corrected the online decade text in Chapter 5-23 for Grosebeck OCR from 2030 to 2040. Edited Chapter 5-35 section 5.35.1 City of Brenham to correct the project online date, supply volume, total project cost, unit cost, and supply volume for City of Brenham WMS Development of groundwater from Gulf Coast Aquifer.
55	Volume I, Section 5.28.9.2, Volume II, Table 3.2-1, and DB27. The strategy supply source in DB27 for the Purchase from Walnut Creek Mine-Reuse (WMSId 3590) for Robertson County steam-electric power appears to be inconsistent with the source described in the plan. DB27 shows the source as surface water (other local supply), however Table 3.2 shows the WUG as receiving reuse water from the City of Hearne. Please clarify the reuse source and reconcile DB27 data for this strategy so that data is consistent with those presented in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Section 5.28.9.2, Volume II, Table 3.2-1, and DB27. Volume II Table 3.2-1 lists potentially feasible reuse supply sources and potential customers, however this table is not a direct reflection of a specific WMS for Robertson Steam Electric. The Identified WMS in Volume I Section 5.28.9 defines the potential source supply as reuse of mine dewatering discharge water. Per DB27 data review comments, the source has been updated to a water recycling source.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
56	Volume II, Section 11.3.15, and DB27. The plan and DB27 include a recommended strategy for Johnson County SUD - Trinity Aquifer Development (WMSId 2609), however, this strategy was determined to be infeasible by the planning group and removed via an amendment from the 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan. Please clarify in the final, adopted regional water plan the reason that this recommended strategy is now feasible and suitable for a recommended strategy. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume II, Section 11.3.15 and DB27. Johnson County SUD - Trinity Aquifer Development (WMSId 2609) the version of the strategy that was removed from the 2021 RWP as developing the WMS by 2020 and 2030 was infeasible and the WUG was actively pursuing an alternative water source. The original strategy had supply in 2020 and 2060 -2070 only. For the current planning effort, supply from a similar strategy would not be required until 2060 which does represent a potential feasible strategy. Volume I Chapter 5.17.10.2 and DB27 have been revised to reflect a 2060 start date for the WMS and correction of project and unit cost.
57	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, Section 7.5, and DB27. The plan appears to present inconsistent information for the City of Bryan ASR of Still Creek WWTP IPR strategy. The strategy is evaluated in Volume II, Section 7.2, and is listed in the Bryan Water Supply Plan in Volume I, Section 5.3.1.2 and Table 5.3-2 as a recommended strategy, however, the strategy does not appear to be included in DB27 as a recommended or alternative strategy. Please clarify whether this is intended to be a recommended or alternative strategy and, if so, update the plan and DB27 accordingly. If not, please include an explanation of why it is not a recommended or alternative strategy. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, Section 7.5 and DB27. Information for the City of Bryan ASR of Still Creek WWTP IPR has been modified in the following ways for the final, adopted regional water plan: Modified Vol I Chapter 5.3 to list Bryan ASR of Still Creek WWTP IPR in table of alternative WMSs, moving the WMS from Table 5.3-2 to Table 5.3-3. Added to DB27 WMS and WMS Project for City of Bryan, This is an Alternative WMS. WMS name "Bryan ASR of Still Creek WWTP IPR" 2040 start date project cost of $105,485,000 unit cost of $2595, decadal supply of 4,856 acft/yr from 2040 to 2080 unit cost of $2,873 in 2040 and 2050 and unit cost of $1,347 for 2060-2080. Project components WTP, pumpstation, and pipeline.
58	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, Section 7.5, and DB27. The Acton MUD ASR strategy, evaluated in Volume II, Section 7.5 does not appear to be included in DB27, nor is it included in the list of recommended strategies for Acton MUD in Volume I, Section 5.16. Please clarify if this is intended to be a recommended or alternative strategy and, if so, update the plan and DB27 accordingly. If not, please include an explanation of why it is not a recommended or alternative strategy. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Chapter 5, Volume II, Section 7.5, and DB27. The Acton MUD ASR strategy will be removed from Volume II, Section 7.5. Acton MUD has confirmed that they are no longer pursuing this strategy, and are continuing their focus on conservation and surface water strategies.
59	Volume I, Chapter 5 and DB27. Several projects are included in DB27 as recommended but are not reflected in the respective entity's water supply plan section in Chapter 5, including the following WMSProjectIds: 1864; 4287; 5184; and 5117. Please update the plan accordingly, so that information is presented consistently with DB27. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Chapter 5 and DB27. The final adopted regional water plan has been updated to include the missing recommended strategies in each of the entity's water supply plans. Updates are as follows: WMSProjectID 5117 added recommended and alternative project information in Vol I Chapter 5.28.7. WMSProjectID 5184 - Text was added in Vol. I Ch. 5.27.3 WMSProjectID 1864 - Text was added in Vol. I Ch. 5.33.1 WMSProjectID 4287 - Text was added in Vol. I Ch. 5.7.6.
60	Volume I, Section 5.1.6.2 and DB27. The water supply plan section for Belton lists two water treatment plant expansions in Volume I, Section 5.1.6.2, however, Table 5.1-7 in Volume I and Table 11.5-1 in Volume II contain only one expansion project. Please review the data for this recommended strategy and project (WMSProjectId 4285) and reconcile inconsistencies in capital costs, supplies, and online decade for the related project between the final and DB27. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Section 5.1.6.2 and DB27. Text within this section has been revised to remove reference to multiple WTP expansion projects. DB27 has been corrected to align with the changes made to the RWP. Both the Plan and the database are consistent for the final, adopted regional water plan.
61	Volume I, Section 5.36.20.2 and DB27. The water supply plan section for Taylor states that "Conservation is not recommended because the entity's usage is 120 GPCD, which is equal to the selected goal of 120 GPCD for Williamson County WUGs." However, conservation is listed as a recommended strategy for Taylor in Table 5.36-22 and is included as a recommended strategy for Taylor in DB27 (WMSId 5755). Please update the plan accordingly, so that information is presented consistently with DB27. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume I, Section 5.36.20.2 and DB27. The water supply plan for Taylor has been revised to clarify that advanced water conservation is not recommened based on the WUGs GPCD and identified that a water loss reduction conservation strategy is recommended based on water loss audit report data.
62	Volume II. For evaluations of strategies that include both a recommended and an alternative version, please clearly present the strategy supplies associated with the recommended and alternative versions of the strategies to avoid confusion. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(3); 31 TAC § 357.35(g)(3)]	Volume II. Where alternative water management strategies are present they have been identified with the word "Alternative" with the strategy name. Generally, Alterantive WMSs are summarized together with recommended strategies if there are only one or two alternative strategies. There are some cases whre multiple alterantive WMSs have been identified and thus a sepearte summary table is provided listing only the alternative strategies.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
63	Volume II and DB27. The following water management strategy evaluations include costing tables for the associated projects that include a non-zero capital cost, however projects do not appear to have been entered into DB27 for the following strategies: Rolling Plains GCD - Managed Aquifer Recharge in Haskell and Knox Counties (WMSId 6085) and Seymour Aquifer Development (5789). Please update DB27 accordingly, so that information is presented in the plan consistently with DB27. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(1)]	Volume II and DB27. The following water management strategies have been entered into DB27: Rolling Plains GCD - Managed Aquifer Recharge in Haskell and Knox Counties (WMSId 6085) and Seymour Aquifer Development (5789). WMSProjects (WMSProjectId 5823) and associated costs have been added in DB27 for Rolling Plains GCD - Managed Aquifer Recharge in Haskell and Knox Counties (WMS ID 6085). For the Seymour Aquifer Development WMS (WMS ID 5789), three new WMSProjects have been added to DB27 for this WMS including the assocaited costs.
64	Volume II. The plan does not appear to contain an evaluation for the following strategies that were scoped under the contract SOW, Task 5B. Please include an evaluation for all scoped strategies or include an explanation as to why each one of these strategies was not evaluated, in the final, adopted regional water plan [Contract Scope of Work, Task 5B]: a.) Reuse: TRA Reuse – Joe Pool b.) Conjunctive Use: Coordinated use of Lake Leon Water Supply with Local Groundwater c.) Acquisition of Available Existing Water Supplies: All d.) Development of New Water Supplies: Purchase and Use of Water from Possum Kingdom – Abilene e.) Developing Regional Water Supply Facilities or Providing Regional Management of Water Supply Facilities: Future Phases of Lake Whitney Water Supply Project, West Central Texas Brazos Water Distribution System, Alcoa Property Supply f.) Reallocation of Reservoir Storage to New Uses: Lake Stillhouse Hollow Reallocation g.) Improvements to Water Quality: All h.) New Surface Water Supplies: Breckenridge Reservoir, Double Mountain Fork (East) Reservoir, Double Mountain Fork (West) Reservoir, Lake Bosque, Hamilton County Reservoir, Lake Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir, Brazos River Main Stem Off-Channel Reservoir, Meridian Off-Channel Reservoir, Paluxy Reservoir, Peach Creek Off-Channel Reservoir, Red River Off- Channel Reservoir near Arthur City, Somervell County Off-Channel Reservoir, South Bend Reservoir, and the Wheeler Branch Off-Channel Reservoir	Volume II, Chapter 1. Table 1.2 of Chapter 1 of Volume II has been updated to identify the WMSs evaluated under the contract SOW, Task 5B. Section 1.11 was added to Volume II, Chapter 1 to describe WMSs evaluated and not carried forward for detailed evaluation. These strategies have either been implemented since prior planning cycles or have been abandoned by the Project Sponsor, with their associated needs now addressed by other WMSs evaulated and included in the 2026 Brazos G RWP.
65	Volume III, Appendix O. The plan does not appear to present management supply factors for MWPs. Please include this information in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(2)]	Vol. I, Appendix O. DB27 SARA Report 126 presenting management supply factors for MWPs has been added to Vol. I, Appendix O in the final, adopted regional water plan.
66	Volume II, Section 6.1and DB27. The plan appears to present information that is inconsistent with DB27 on the recommendation level for the Lake Granger Augmentation-Ph 2 (Groundwater) strategy (WMSId 2895). For example, the plan states in Section 6.1.2.2 that “Presently there is insufficient MAG available in the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Milam County thus this strategy is presented as an alternative water management strategy.”, however this strategy is entered into DB27 as a recommended strategy. Please reconcile the recommendation level of this strategy and project so that information is presented consistently between the plan and DB27 in the final, adopted regional water plan and presented in DB27. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(3)]	Volume II, Section 6.1 and DB27. The BRA has requested that WMS "Lake Granger Augmentation - Phase 2" both Groundwater (WMSId 2895) and Surface Water (WMSId 5432) be made an Alternative WMS for the final, adopted regional water plan. DB27 has been corrected to align with the 2026 Plan details. The City of Round Rock has requested that WMS "Lake Granger Augmentation - Phase 2" be a recommended strategy for the final, adopted regional water plan. Thus, this WMS has been added to DB27 with the City of Round Rock as project sponsor and Section 5.36.18 revised for consistency.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
67	Volume II, Section 6.1. The plan includes an evaluation for the Lake Granger Augmentation – Phase 1 Conjunctive Use with the Trinity Aquifer, and indicates that there is no remaining groundwater availability to use for this project. Please clarify in the final, adopted regional water plan why the planning group determined not to include this as an alternative strategy and incorporate the strategy in DB27. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(3)]	Volume II, Section 6.1. The final, adopted regional water plan has been modified to now include the evaluation for Lake Granger Augmentation - Phase 1 Conjunctive Use with the Trinity Aquifer as an Alternative WMS. The changes include the following: Added a sentence in Volume II 6.1.2.1 stating that a water supply project to develop water from an alternative aquifer for conjunctive use with Lake Granger should be considered consistent with the WMS. Added an Alternative WMS Lake Granger Augmentation - Phase I Conjunctive Use with online date of 2030 with supply source of Trinity Aquifer in Williamson County for a supply of 14890 acft/yr from Lake Granger and 2,700 acft/yr from Trinity Aquifer each decade. Total Project Cost $116,732,000 and unit cost of $903 in 2030-2040 and $351 for 2050-2080. project components include new groundwater wells, WTP expansion, transmission pipeline and pump stations.
68	Volume I, Volume II, and DB27. Strategy supplies associated with the following alternative water management strategy projects appear to be inconsistently reported between the plan and DB27: WMSProjectIds 1832; 4260; 4261; 5446; 5445; and 5193. For example, the supplies reported in DB27 for the Carrizo Aquifer Development - Bistone MWSD strategy and related project (WMSProjectId 1832) do not match the supply listed in Section 11.3.21 in Volume II. Please review the water supplies for these alternative strategies and projects and revise as necessary to ensure that strategy supplies in DB27 are consistent with those presented in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(3)]	Volume I, Volume II, and DB27. Strategy supplies associated with the following alternative water management strategy projects have been updated to be consistent between the Plan and DB27. WMSProjectID 1832, Added alternative WMS information to Vol I Chapter 5.23.1. Revised in DB27 WMSPRojectID 1832 allocation to 'Bistone Municipal Water Supply District - Unassigned Water Volumes' to be 0, 0, 0, 43, 5, and 5 for 2030-2080. For WMS project IDs 4260 and 4261, Added costing sheets to Volume II Chapter 11.3.21 WMSProjectID 5193 Lampasas - text added in Vol. I Ch. 5.21.2 and Vol. II 11.3.19, consistent with DB27 (also addressed as part of Comment 47); no DB27 changes required.
69	Volume I, Chapter 5, and DB27. Several projects entered into DB27 as alternative projects appear to be missing from the corresponding entity's water supply plan section in Chapter 5 of Volume I, including the following WMSProjectIds: 5616; and 4129. For example, the Trinity Aquifer Development strategy and project are alternative for East Crawford WSC in DB27 but is not listed in Section 5.24.9 of Volume I. Please update the plan accordingly, so that information is presented consistently with DB27. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(3)]	Volume I, Chapter 5 and DB27. The plan has been updated accordingly, so that information presented in both DB27 and the Plan are consistent. Updates include the following changes: WMSProjectID 5616, Added Alternative WMS, cost source, implementation date, project cost and unit cost to text of Vol I Chapter 5.36.7. Updated Alternative Plan Costs by Decade table 5.36-9 to include North Option with 50,000 ac-ft/yr supply beginning in 2040. WMSProjectID 4129, Added Alternative WMS cost source, implementation date, project cost and unit cost to text and table of Vol I Chapter 5.24.9.
70	Volume I, Chapter 5, DB27. Several strategies entered into DB27 as alternative strategies do not appear to be identified as such in the water supply plan sections of Volume I, including for the following WMSProjectIds: 4260; 4261; 5445; and 5446. For example, Carrizo Aquifer Development - Limestone County Manufacturing is entered into DB27 as an alternative strategy and project, however Table 5.23-9 of Volume I identify it as a recommended strategy. Please clearly identify strategies as either recommended or alternative in the final, adopted regional water plan and ensure that the recommendation levels are consistent with DB27. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(3)]	Volume I, Chapter 5, DB27. Water Supply Plans have been updated for the following alternative strategies: WMSProjectID 4260 clarifying text added to Volume I Chapter 5.23.11 to identify the strategy as an alternative WMS. WMSProjectID 4261 clarifying text added to Volume I Chapter 5.23.12 to identify the strategy as an alternative WMS. WMSProjectID 5445 clarifying text added to Volume I Chapter 5.36.7 to identify the strategy as an alternative WMS. WMSProjectID 5446 has been removed from DB27.
71	Volume II, Section 5.36.7 and DB27. It is unclear from the data reported in DB27 for the Georgetown - North Option Alternative (WMSProjectId 5616) when the strategy and associated project are anticipated to come online. In addition to not including the required evaluation for the strategy in Volume II, DB27 reports the strategy as providing supply in 2030 while the associated project is shown as coming online in 2040. Please confirm the anticipated online decade for this strategy and project and revise as necessary to ensure that the projects needed to implement strategies are online prior to the strategy supply online decade in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.35(g)(3)]	Volume II, Section 5.36.7 and DB27. Strategy information has been updated for clarity purposes related to WMSProjectId 5616 for the final, adopted regional water plan: WMSProjectID 5616, Added Alternative WMS cost table to Vol II 11.3.31. Revise DB27 to have zero supply from WMS in 2030 to reflect Project Online date of 2040.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
72	Volume I, Chapter 5, and Volume II, 6.1. The plan does not appear to include explanations for the following recommended strategy volumes that remain 100 percent unallocated to WUGs: FHLM Utilize BRA Contract and Lake Granger Augmentation-Ph 2 (Surface Water). Please provide a specific explanation for each of these strategies for why they remain 100 percent unallocated in the final, adopted regional water plan. [Contract Exhibit C, Section 2.5.3]	Volume I, Chapter 5, and Volume II, 6.1. New text has been added to Chapter 5.38 stating that the FHLM strategy develops a supply for customers within WSC area but specific end user not identified for the plan. In addition, Lake Granger Augmentation - Ph 2 (Surface Water) has been revised to alternative (per response to Comment #66) in the final, adopted regional water plan.
73	Volume I, Chapter 6. The plan does not appear to include a description of the impacts of the plan regarding agricultural resources. Please include a description of the impacts regarding agricultural resources in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.40(b)(1)]	Volume I, Chapter 6. Consistency with Protection of Agricultural Resources has been added to Chapter 6, Section 6.3.3 for the final, adopted regional water plan.
74	Volume I, Chapter 6. The plan does not appear to include a description of the impacts of the plan regarding identified threats to agricultural and natural resources. Please include a description of the impacts regarding identified threats to agricultural and natural resources, in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.40(b)(3)]	Volume I, Chapter 6. Consistency with Protection of Natural Resources has been added to Chapter 6, Section 6.3.4 for the final, adopted regional water plan.
75	Volume I, Section 6.5. The unmet need values presented in Table 6-5 appear to be inconsistent with data reported in DB27. For example, the unmet needs value for County-Other, Williamson in DB27 is 2,336 acre-feet/year in 2030, whereas the plan reports the unmet need as 4,786 acre-feet/year in 2030. Additionally, the following municipal WUGs with an unmet need within the Region G WUG split appear to be missing from the table: Navarro Mills WSC and North Runnels WSC. Please review the unmet needs data in Table 6-5 and revise as necessary to present data consistent with DB27 in the final, adopted regional water plan, or, at minimum include a new table documenting the total unmet needs within Region G based on WUG splits – to align with TWDB reporting of unmet needs by region. [31 TAC § 357.40(c)]	Volume I, Section 6.5. The unmet needs data presented in Table 6-5 has been revised to present data consistent with DB27 (to include WUG splits) for the final, adopted regional water plan.
76	Volume I, Section 7.7. Table 7.10 appears to be missing emergency response information for the following WUGs which have an estimated 2030 population less than 7,500 and relies on a sole source of supply: Graham, Leroy Tours Gerald WSC, Vista Oaks MUD, and Williamson County WSID 3. Additionally, the analysis in Table 7.10 is blank for several WUGs under the "New WUGs added" heading. Please revise the evaluation in Table 7.10 to include the evaluation for the missing WUGs and WUGs where the information was blank, in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.42(g)(1)]	Volume I, Section 7.7. Table 7.10 has been updated to include the four WUGs, and missing information has been filled in for the final, adopted regional water plan.
77	Volume I, Section 8.2. The plan does not appear to include the following information regarding the recommended unique reservoir site re-designations of Millers Creek Off-Channel Reservoir and Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir: a description of the site, reasons for the unique designation, and expected beneficiaries of the water supply to be developed. Please include this information within Chapter 8 or clearly provide a reference to where this information is found elsewhere in the plan, in the final, adopted regional water plan [31 TAC § 357.43(c)]	Volume I, Section 8.2. Language has been added to clarify that information is provided in Vol. II. Sections 4.3 and 4.5 that provides details supporting the designation of these sites of unique value for construction of reservoirs. These sites are identified in this section of the Plan as sites for site-specific reservoir development as a recommended water management strategy. The sections cited provide the location, hydrologic, geologic, topographic, water availability, water quality, environmental, cultural, and current development characteristics, making each site uniquely suited for reservoir development to provide water supply for the current planning period.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

Comment No	Level 1 Formal Comment	Comment Response
78	Volume I, Section 9.3. The counts of water management strategies benefitting more than one WUG provided in Section 9.3 is inconsistent with strategies reported in DB22 and DB27 as benefitting more than one WUG. Please review the data reported in TWDB SARA Report ID 125 and either reconcile the counts presented in Section 9.3 to align with the report or clarify the difference in counts reported in the final, adopted regional water plan. [31 TAC § 357.45(b)(1)]	Volume I, Section 9.3. In Section 9.3 the counts of water management strategies benefitting more than one WUG has been updated to align with the data reported in TWDB SARA Report ID 125 for the final, adopted regional water plan.
79	Volume I, Section 9.4. The plan appears to be missing a summary of how the plan differs from the previously adopted RWP in regards to the drought of record. Please include this information in the final, adopted plan. [31 TAC § 357.45(c)(2)]	Volume I, Section 9.4. A new subsection (Section 9.4.7) has been added to Chapter 9 summarizing how the 2026 Plan differs from the 2021 Plan in regards to the drought or record, for the final, adopted regional water plan.
80	The plan does not appear to meet minimum accessibility requirements. Please ensure that the primary language is set to English in the final, adopted regional water plan. See item 2c in TWDB's accessibility checklist for more information. [Contract, Article III, Paragraph G]	The Plan has been updated to meet minimum accessibility requirements to be aligned with the Contract, Article III, Paragraph G for the final submittal Oct. 20, 2025.
81	GIS. WMS Project vector data was submitted across more than one shapefile/feature class for the same feature type. The vector data shall be divided into point, line, and polygon feature types across a maximum of three shapefiles in a single folder or three feature classes in a single file geodatabase (one for each feature type). Please combine the following layers into a separate geodatabase or collection of shapefiles per the folder structure outline: Brazoz_G_RWP_Area, Brazos_Reservoirs, Brazos_WAM_Streams, Cities, Counties, Existing_Reservoirs_TWDB, Hydrology_texas, Major_Aquifers, Minor_Aquifers, RegionG_Boundary, and StratMap_City_Polygons. [Contract Exhibit D, Section 2.5.2.1]	GIS. All WMS Project vector data has been compiled into a single geodatabase (WMSProject_RegionG.gdb), with separate line, point, and polygon feature classes. Additionally, the following layers have been combined into a single geodatabase (RegionG_Basedata.gdb): Brazos_G_RWP_Area_RegionG_Poly, Brazos_Reservoirs, Brazos_WAM_Streams, Cities, County_Boundary_24k, Existing_Reservoirs_TWDB, Hydrology_Texas, Major_aquifers, Minor_Aquifers, RegionG_Boundary, and StratMap_City_Poly_v4.
82	Geographic Information System (GIS) files do not adhere to the contractually required naming convention. The file name shall include "WMSProject," Region letter, and geometry type with no spaces (EX: WMSProject_RegionG_Point). Please rename the GIS files following the naming convention outlined in Exhibit D, Section 2.5.2.1 in the final GIS files submitted. [Contract Exhibit D, Section 2.5.2.1]	The geodatabase containing all WMS project data has been named "WMSProject_RegionG.gbd" and the three feature classes have been named "WMSProject_RegionG_Line", "WMSProject_RegionG_Point", and "WMSProject_RegionG_Poly".
83	GIS data deliverables do not include all of the required attribute fields listed in Table 1 of Exhibit D, Section 2.5.2.1. Please include the following attribute fields in all submitted WMS project GIS data with the final GIS files submitted: Status, and ShapeDescription. [Contract Exhibit D, Section 2.5.2.1]	GIS data deliverable. "Status" and "ShapeDescription" attribute fields have been added to each item in the WMS Project data geodatabase (WMSProject_RegionG.gdb).
84	The following WMS Projects are missing from the GIS data submitted. Please include the locations of every recommended and alternative WMS Project listed in the final adopted regional water plan with the final GIS files submitted. [Contract Exhibit D, Section 2.5.2, Exhibit C, Section 2.12.2(9)]	GIS layers for each of the WMS Projects listed have all been added to the WMS Project data deliverable (WMSProject_RegionG.gdb).

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-

10.7.2 Level 2 TWDB Comments

Level 2 comments are comments and suggestions for consideration that may improve the readability and overall understanding of the regional water plan. Table 10.5 summarizes the Level 2 comments received from TWDB and the corresponding responses from BGRWPG.

Table 10.5 Level 2 Comments Received from TWDB

Comment No	Level 2 Formal Comment	Comment Response
1	Volume I, Executive Summary. Please consider presenting the instructions and link to access the DB27 data reports and list of the reports together in either the Executive Summary, or the Executive Summary Appendix.	Volume I, Executive Summary. The Plan presents the instructions and link to access the DB27 data reports within the Executive Summary, Section ES.7 for the final, adopted regional water plan.
2	Volume II, Section 4.4. Please consider correcting the first sentence of the first paragraph on page 4.4-12 to include a table/figure reference.	Volume II, Section 4.4. The first sentence of the first paragraph has been corrected to include a table/figure reference.
3	Volume II, Section 4.5. Please consider updating the references to Figure 4.7-1 to read Figure 4.5-1	Volume II, Section 4.5. The reference to Figure 4.7-1 has been updated to read Figure 4.5-1.
4	Volume II, Figure 8.3-1. Please consider correcting the name of Lake Georgetown in Figure 8.3-1.	Volume II, Figure 8.3-1. Figure 8.3-1 has been updated to correctly name Lake Georgetown in the final, adopted regional water plan.
5	Volume II, Sections 11.4.1 and 11.4.3. Please consider updating the name of Fort Hood to Fort Cavazos on pages 11-148 and 11-157.	Volume II, Sections 11.4.1 and 11.4.3. The name of Fort Hood has been updated to Fort Cavazos on pages 11-148 and 11-157.
6	Volume II, Pages 5.2-1 – 5.2-15. Please consider correcting the header to match the section for the City of College Station Groundwater Strategies.	Volume II, Pages 5.2-1 through 5.2.15. The header has been updated to match the section for the City of College Station Groundwater Strategies for the final, adopted regional water plan.
7	Volume I, Section 11.3.30. Please consider correcting the name of the WUG for Brenham.	Volume II, Section 11.3.30. Within Vol. II Section 11.3.30, the WUG name has been corrected to Branham, not Washington Brenham for the final, adopted regional water plan.
8	Volume I, Section 5.7.4. Please consider correcting the name of the Flat Creek WSC.	Volume I, Section 5.7.4. The name of the WUG has been corrected to Flat Creek WSC in the final, adopted regional water plan.
9	Volume II, Tables 3.5-3, 3.6-3, 3.7-2, and 7.6-1. The costing tables for the aforementioned tables list intake pump stations for “0 MGD”. Please consider clarifying the expected capacity of these pump stations.	Volume II, Tables 3.5-3, 3.6-3, 3.7-2, and 7.6-1. The identified costing tables listed in the comment have been updated to list the expected capacity of each of the pump stations.
10	Volume II, Section 5.2.1 states that brackish groundwater “should not be subject to MAG limitations.” Please consider revising this language to convey that brackish groundwater is part of the MAG value if the aquifer that contains brackish water is covered by the extent of the model.	Volume II, Section 5.2.1. The statement has been revised to convey that brackish groundwater is part of the MAG value, which is covered by the extent of the model.

Comment No	Level 2 Formal Comment	Comment Response
11	Volume I, Chapter 2. Table 2.1 appears to have a typo, please consider updating the header to "WUG/County" in the final plan.	Volume I, Chapter 2. The header in Table 2.1 within Chapter 2 has been updated to WUG/County for the final, adopted regional water plan.
12	Volume I, Section 3.4. Since Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer availability in Bosque County is a non-MAG estimate, please consider using the superscript (1) as per the convention used in Table 3.12, in the final plan.	Volume I, Section 3.4. The superscript (1) for the Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer in Bosque County has been added to Table 3.12 for consistency in the final, adopted regional water plan.
13	Volume I, Section 3.4, Table 3.12. Please consider using consistent references to the Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer. It is sometimes referred to as Brazos River Alluvium or Brazos River Alluvium A.	Volume I, Section 3.4, Table 3.12. Table 3.12 has been updated so that there is consistency in the naming convention of the Brazos River Alluvium Aquifer.
14	Volume I, Section 7.7. The emergency response analysis for the 2026 Regional Water Plans should have been based on projected 2030 populations to align with the planning horizon and Table 7.10 reflects a 2030 population. Please consider updating the text of this section to reflect the decade 2030 for the analysis for municipal WUG population, instead of 2020.	Volume I, Section 7.7. The text within Section 7.7 (3rd paragraph) has been updated to reflect the decade of 2030 and not 2020, for the analysis for municipal WUG population.
15	Volume I, Section 7.10. Please consider removing reference to the TWDB Chapter 7 template. TWDB did not provide a template for the 2026 Regional Water Plan drought chapter, and drought chapter requirements have been revised since the template was developed for the 2021 Regional Water Plans.	Volume I, Section 7.10. The reference has been removed to the TWDB Chapter 7 template for the final, adopted regional water plan.
16	Volume III, Appendix M. The table in Appendix M presents the results of the implementation survey of the 2021 Regional Water Plan. Please consider updating the title of the appendix to reflect the survey shows results for implementation survey of the 2021 Regional Water Plan.	Volume III, Appendix M. The table title in Appendix M which presents the results of the implementation survey has been updated to show results for the 2021 Regional Water Plan.
17	Volume I, Chapter 9. Section 9.3 and 9.5 both pertain to regionalization. Please consider combining them into one section in the final plan.	Volume I, Chapter 9, Section 9.3 and 9.5. Content in the IPP Section 9.5 has been combined with Section 9.3 for the final, adopted regional water plan.
18	Volume I, Table 9.2. Please consider removing the sentence in Table 9.2 that states that a MAG Peak Factor was used in the determination of water availability for the 2026 Brazos G Plan.	Volume I, Table 9.2. Table 9.2 has been modified by removing the sentence that states that a MAG Peak Factor was used in the determination of water availability for the 2026 Brazos G Plan.

10.8 Plan Adoption

The BGRWPG formally adopted this 2026 Brazos G Regional Water Plan on October 7, 2025, and directed BRA and the Technical Consultant to submit the 2026 Plan to the TWDB on or before October 20, 2025.