BRAZOS G
WATER PLANNING GROUP

SCOPE OF WORK COMMITTEE MEETING

1:00 P.M.

Tuesday, September 24, 2024

BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY

Lt. Gen. Phillip J. Ford Central Office

4600 Cobbs Dr. Waco, TX 76710

BRAZOS G
WATER PLANNING GROUP

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

2. NOTICE OF MEETING

3. ATTENDANCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

4. PUBLIC INPUT (limited to 5 minutes each)

BRAZOS G
WATER PLANNING GROUP

5. Discussion and possible action on recommended Water Management Strategies for use in the 2026 Brazos G Plan

Scope of Work Committee

Item

5. Report, discussion, and possible action on the report from the Scope of Work Committee

WACO, TX September 24, 2024

Feasible Water Management Strategies

- Statutory and Rule Requirements
  - TWC §16.053(h)(10) and 31 TAC §357.12 (b)
- RWPG shall:
  - Hold a public meeting to determine the process for identifying potentially feasible WMSs;
    - Process shall be documented, and
    - Shall include input received at the public meeting;
  - After reviewing the potentially feasible strategies using the documented process, the RWPG shall list all possible WMSs that are potentially feasible for meeting a water need in the region.

Looking Forward

Today's Items Build Upon Information from Previous Scope of Work Committee Meetings

Recommended 2026 Process

- Adopted 2/13/2024

Recommended List of PF Strategies

- Uses adopted 2026 Process
- Adopted PF List

Recommended Wholesale Water Providers and Major Water Providers

- Adopted 2/13/2024

Recommended Task 5B Scope/Budget Submittal

- Adopted 2/13/2024

Amendment 2

- Contained Notice to Proceed on Task 5B WMS Evaluation

Task for Today

- Review
  - Process
  - Initial list of Potentially Feasible (PF) strategies
  - WWPs/MWPs
  - Task 5B Scope of Work
  - Draft Exhibit C table
  - Previous 2021 Strategies and required regulatory categories in context of identified 2030 – 2080 needs

Report from Technical Consultant on the adopted process for identifying potentially feasible water management strategies identified by the Brazos G Scope of Work Committee.

Background

- Regional water planning rules require that the “process” for identifying, evaluating and selecting water management strategies be formally considered by the regional water planning groups.
- The mid-point Technical Memorandum requires a list of potentially feasible water management strategies.
- Scope of Work Committee met on Oct. 10, Nov. 15, and Jan. 9 to:
  1) Review and recommend a process for identifying potentially feasible strategies,
  2) Review and identify a list of potentially feasible strategies for the purposes of the 2026 Brazos G Plan.

Background (cont'd)

Selection of Water Management Strategies to Address Unmet Needs

- Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies
- Evaluation of Water Management Strategies
- Selection of Water Management Strategies to meet unmet needs specific to WUGs and WWPs

Background (cont'd)

Include strategies identified in previous plans

Cross reference with the types of strategies required

Determined initial list of Potentially Feasible Strategies

Add additional strategies later as requested by stakeholders if time and budget allow

Adopted Process for Identifying Potentially Feasible Strategies

(Modified from 2021 Process)

Adopted 2026 Plan's Process for Identifying Potentially Feasible Strategies

Include strategies identified in previous plans

- Include recommended and alternative strategies from 2021 Plan
- Include strategies evaluated, but not recommended in 2021 Plan
- Include strategies evaluated in previous Plans that were not moved forward
- Include statutory categories

Identify draft needs and develop additional ideas to meet those needs

Maintain ongoing communication from local interests throughout the process

Adopted 2026 Plan's Process for Identifying Potentially Feasible Strategies

Results in an initial list of potentially feasible strategies

Additional WMSs are included if:

- local interests request them and
- the planning schedule and budget allow for the addition.

Investigate for Potential Infeasibility

- If strategy contemplates permitting and/or construction
- If strategy is near-term or necessitates significant time for implementation
- If the potential sponsor(s) have taken, or have indicated they will take, affirmative steps towards the strategy's implementation. Affirmative steps may include, but not be limited to:
  - Spending money on the strategy or project
  - Voting to spend money on the strategy or project
  - Applying for a federal or state permit for the strategy or project

Identify if strategy could potentially provide flood mitigation benefits

Identify if strategy contemplates use of the Brazos Alluvium

Item 8.4

Discussion and possible action on the proposed list of potentially feasible water management strategies recommended by the Brazos G Scope of Work Committee

Identification of Potentially Feasible Strategies

- Technical Consultant reviewed strategies evaluated in all previous plans
- **Initial** list of 135 potentially feasible water management strategies
- Dollars (estimated strategy costs) from 2021 Brazos G Plan (2018 $)
- Additional considerations from the 2021 Plan will be reviewed, allowing for flexibility in application
  - Some WMS for specific WUGs/WWPs
  - Some WMS initially identified w/out specific user(s)
  - Engagement with WUGs/WWPs throughout process (RWPG, Consultant) and at subregional meetings after IPP
  - Official public comment period after IPP

Task for Today

- Review and approve recommendation relating to the list of potentially feasible water management strategies

Potentially Feasible Strategies

Number	Strategy	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021	Required by Rule	Supply Developed (acft/yr)	Project Cost (2018 $)[1]	Cost of Water ($/1,000 gals)[1]
Conservation										
1	Municipal Conservation		X	X	R	R	1	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
2	Industrial Conservation		X	X	R	R	1	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
3	Irrigation Conservation		X	X	R	R	1	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
4	Advanced Municipal Conservation (gpcd<140)				R	R	1	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
5	Advanced Industrial Conservation				R	R	1	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
6	Leave Needs Unmet				R	R	NA	NA	NA	NA
Drought Management										
7	Drought Management		X	X	X	R	2	NA	NA	NA
Reuse										
8	Reuse Supply - various reuse projects throughout Brazos G		X	X	R	R	3	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
9	College Station DPR				A	R	3	8,232	$84,177,000	$1.86
10	College Station Non-Potable Reuse				R	X	3	103	$3,553,000	$8.97
11	City of Bryan Lake Bryan Reuse, Option 1				R	R	3	605	$11,092,000	$7.52
12	City of Bryan Lake Bryan Reuse, Option 2					A	3	2,419	$41,105,000	$7.48
13	City of Bryan Miramont Reuse				R	X	3	600	$3,894,000	$1.61
14	City of Cleburne Reuse, Phases 1 and 2				R	R	3	7,617	$38,926,000	$2.90/$0.76
15	Waco WMARSS Reuse Projects		X	X	R	R	3	14,568	$89,538,000	$23.50
16	Bell County WCID No. 1 Reuse (North and South)			X	R	R	3	2,673	$26,764,000	$3.01
~~17~~	~~TRA Reuse - Joe Pool~~		~~X~~	~~X~~			~~3~~	~~20,000~~	~~$79,257,000~~	~~$1.84~~
18	Cedar Park Reuse					R	3	1,120	$7,184,000	$1.67
19	Georgetown Reuse					R	3	1,456	$6,270,000	$1.07
Management of Existing Water Supplies										
20	Misc. Pipelines, Pump Stations, and GW Options - various entities	X	X	X	R	R	4	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
21	Water Treatment Plant Expansions - various entities	X	X	X	R	R	4	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
22	Rehabilitate Existing Wells			X	R		4	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES

Potentially Feasible Strategies

Number	Strategy	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021	Required by Rule	Supply Developed (acft/yr)	Project Cost (2018 $)[1]	Cost of Water ($/1,000 gals)[1]
Conjunctive Use										
23	Various projects to utilize potential unallocated supply		X	X	R	R	5	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
~~24~~	~~Coordinated use of Fort Phantom Hill and Hubbard Creek Reservoir~~	~~X~~					~~5~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
~~25~~	~~Coordinated use of Lake Leon Water Supply with Local Groundwater~~	~~X~~					~~5~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
26	Oak Creek Reservoir Conjunctive Management			X	R	R	5	4,142	$0	$0.00
27	Lake Granger Augmentation (Ph 1)		X	X	A	X	5	13,716	$96,685,000	$2.51
28	Lake Granger Augmentation (Ph 2)					R	5	19,168	$845,564,000	$12.08
29	Somervell County WSP			X	R	R	5	600	$36,250,000	$18.13
Augmentation of Existing Supplies										
~~30~~	~~Gibbons Creek Reservoir Expansion~~			~~X~~	~~R~~		~~6~~	~~2,605~~	~~$12,979,000~~	~~$1.10~~
~~31~~	~~Lake Aquilla Augmentation - Cleburne (Lake Whitney to Aquilla)~~				~~R~~		~~6~~	~~VARIES~~	~~VARIES~~	~~VARIES~~
~~32~~	~~Lake Cisco Augmentation~~	~~X~~					~~6~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
~~33~~	~~Lake Leon Augmentation~~	~~X~~					~~6~~	~~9,100~~	~~$2,200,000~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
~~34~~	~~Lake Stamford Augmentation~~	~~X~~					~~6~~	~~6,680~~	~~$6,300,000~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
~~35~~	~~Lake Sweetwater Augmentation~~	~~X~~					~~6~~	~~790~~	~~$3,000,000~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
36	Millers Creek Reservoir Augmentation, Canal Option			X	R	X	6	2,075	$29,174,000	$2.58
37	Millers Creek Reservoir Augmentation, Pipeline Option					X	6	2,000	$22,621,000	$2.84
38	Millers Creek Reservoir Augmentation, New Dam and Reservoir					X	6	2,350	$81,334,000	$6.05
39	Millers Creek Reservoir Augmentation, Combined Canal Diversion with New Dam and Reservoir					X	6	3,025	$113,389,000	$6.54
~~40~~	~~South San Gabriel Diversion into Lake Georgetown~~						~~6~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
41	City of Cameron Little River Intake					R	6	2,792	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
Development of New Water Supplies										
~~42~~	~~Purchase and Use of Water from Possum Kingdom - Abilene~~				~~A~~		~~7~~	~~14,800~~[2]	~~$269,334,000~~[2]	~~$7.93~~[2]
43	Aquifer Recharge						7	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN

Potentially Feasible Strategies

Number	Strategy	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021	Required by Rule	Supply Developed (acft/yr)	Project Cost (2018 $)[1]	Cost of Water ($/1,000 gals)[1]
Developing Regional Water Supply Facilities or Providing Regional Management Of Water Supply Facilities										
44	Lake Belton to Lake Stillhouse Hollow Pipeline			X	R	R	8	5,000	$67,993,000	$4.02
45	Bosque County Regional Project	X	X	X	R	R	8	1,070	$38,990,000	$9.94
46	Brushy Creek RUA Water Supply Project	X	X	X	R	R	8	69,128	$327,997,500	$2.51
47	East Williamson County Water Supply Project			X	R	R	8	11,762	$30,264,420	$0.72/$0.06
48	Lake Whitney Water Supply Project (Cleburne), Phase 1 and Phase 2			X	R	X	8	7,400	$122,267,000	$7.11/$3.55
~~49~~	~~Future Phases of Lake Whitney Water Supply Project~~			~~X~~	~~R~~		~~8~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
50	West Central Brazos Water Distribution System	X	X	X	R	X	8	1,400[2]	$21,148,000[2]	$7.65[2]
51	Alcoa Property Supply					R	8	18,600	$241,689,000	$4.28/$1.47
52	West Texas Water Partnership					A	8	8,400	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
Developing Large-Scale Desalination Facilities for Seawater Or Brackish Groundwater That Serve Local or Regional Brackish Groundwater Production Zones Identified And Designated Under TWC §16.060(b)(5)										
53	Developing Large-Scale Desalination Facilities for Seawater Or Brackish Groundwater That Serve Local or Regional Brackish Groundwater Production Zones Identified And Designated Under TWC §16.060(b)(5)						9	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
Developing Large-Scale Desalination Facilities for Marine Seawater that Serve Local or Regional Entities										
~~54~~	~~Developing Large-Scale Desalination Facilities for Marine Seawater that Serve Local or Regional Entities~~						~~10~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~
Voluntary Transfer of Water Within the Region Using, But Not Limited To, Contracts, Water Marketing, Regional Water Banks, Sales, Leases, Options, Subordination Agreements, and Financing Agreements										
~~55~~	~~Restructure Contracts~~			~~X~~	~~R~~		~~11~~	~~VARIES~~	~~VARIES~~	~~VARIES~~
56	Subordination Agreements			X	R	R	11	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
57	Misc. Purchases, Interconnects, and Reallocations - various entities	X	X	X	R	R	11	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
58	Purchase from Walnut Creek Mine - Robertson County SE				R	R	11	9,000	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
59	Voluntary Redistribution From Palo Pinto Manufacturing					R	11	118	N/A	$0.23
60	Reallocation Of Supply From Moffat WSC					R	11	154	N/A	$3.00
61	Killeen Reduction To Harker Heights					R	11	302	N/A	UNKNOWN
62	Hamilton Reduction To Multi Wsc					R	11	100	N/A	UNKNOWN
63	BRA Highland Lake To County-Other					R	11	2,872	N/A	UNKNOWN

Potentially Feasible Strategies

Number	Strategy	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021	Required by Rule	Supply Developed (acft/yr)	Project Cost (2018 $)[1]	Cost of Water ($/1,000 gals)[1]
Emergency transfer of water under TWC §11.139										
64	Emergency transfer of water under TWC §11.139						12	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
Interbasin Transfers of Surface Water										
65	Brazos River Authority System Operation (to Colorado Basin)						13	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
66	Marvin Nichols (328) Strategy for NTMWD, TRWD, and UTRWD						13	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
67	Wright Patman Reallocation for NTMWD, TRWD, and UTRWD						13	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
68	Trinity Basin Supplies (Trinity or Neches River Projects) to Middle Brazos					X	13	5,700	$54,249,000	$2.72
System Operation										
69	BRA System Operation					R	14	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
Reallocation of Reservoir Storage to New Uses										
70	Lake Aquilla Storage Reallocation			X	R	R	15	2,483	$24,353,000	$2.67
71	Lake Granger Storage Reallocation			X	A	X	15	1,535	$33,238,000	$6.03
~~72~~	~~Lake Stillhouse Hollow Reallocation~~				~~A~~		~~15~~	~~2,643~~	~~$36,553,000~~	~~$3.61~~
73	Lake Whitney Reallocation, Hydropower Storage	X			A	R	15	38,480	$36,689,000	$0.21
74	Lake Whitney Reallocation Supplies to Williamson County					R	15	26,000	$306,683,000	4.96/2.42
Enhancement of Yields										
75	Lake Whitney Over-Drafting Supply with Off-Channel Reservoir					A	16	5,200	$171,738,000	$7.60
Improvements to Water Quality										
76	Brackish Groundwater Desalination	X		X	X		17	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
77	Chloride Control Project (SFWQC)			X	R	R	17	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
78	Supplies from Chloride Control Project - Aspermont, Jayton, Region O					R	17	1,496	$70,857,000	$56.19
~~79~~	~~Lake Whitney Desalination~~	~~X~~					~~17~~	~~11,202~~	~~$29,085,000~~	~~$1.58~~
~~80~~	~~BRA SWATS Reallocation of Capacity~~	~~X~~		~~X~~	~~X~~		~~17~~	~~200~~[2]	~~NA~~[2]	~~$1.69~~[2]
~~81~~	~~BRA Sediment Reduction Program~~			~~X~~	~~A~~		~~17~~	~~888~~[2]	~~$1,075,000~~[2]	~~$1.00~~[2]

Potentially Feasible Strategies

Number	Strategy	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021	Required by Rule	Supply Developed (acft/yr)	Project Cost (2018 $)[1]	Cost of Water ($/1,000 gals)[1]
New Surface Water Supply										
~~82~~	~~Breckenridge Reservoir~~		~~X~~				~~18~~	~~28,920~~	~~$82,755,000~~	~~$0.69~~
83	Brushy Creek Reservoir			X	R	R	18	2,000	$33,229,000	$3.82
84	Cedar Ridge Reservoir		X	X	R	R/A	18	23,311	$283,646,000	$2.62
85	Coryell County Off-Channel Reservoir			X	R	R	18	3,135	$82,584,000	$6.19
~~86~~	~~Double Mountain Fort (East) Reservoir~~		~~X~~	~~X~~			~~18~~	~~36,025~~	~~$211,373,000~~	~~$1.37~~
~~87~~	~~Double Mountain Fort (West) Reservoir~~		~~X~~	~~X~~			~~18~~	~~34,775~~	~~$151,456,000~~	~~$1.02~~
~~88~~	~~Lake Bosque~~	~~X~~					~~18~~	~~17,900~~	~~$67,063,000~~	~~$0.83~~
89	Groesbeck Off-Channel Reservoir	X	X	X	R	R	18	1,755	$23,599,000	$3.24
90	Hamilton County Reservoir				X	X	18	9,275	$248,308,000	$9.73
91	NCTMWA Lake Creek Reservoir (formerly Millers Creek Off-Channel Reservoir)				A	R	18	12,900	$259,001,000	$5.08
~~92~~	~~Lake Palo Pinto Off-Channel Reservoir~~		~~X~~	~~X~~	~~A~~		~~18~~	~~3,110~~	~~$34,685,000~~	~~$3.01~~
~~93~~	~~Little River Off-Channel Reservoir~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~R~~		~~18~~	~~56,150~~	~~$248,761,000~~	~~$1.27~~
~~94~~	~~Little River Reservoir~~			~~X~~			~~18~~	~~71,275~~	~~$331,705,000~~	~~$1.01~~
95	Brazos River Main Stem Off-Channel Reservoir				X	X	18	7,200	$107,532,000	$3.35
~~96~~	~~Meridian Off-Channel Reservoir~~	~~X~~		~~X~~	~~A~~		~~18~~	~~615~~	~~$21,702,000~~	~~$12.15~~
~~97~~	~~Millican-Bundic Reservoir~~	~~X~~	~~X~~				~~18~~	~~38,080~~	~~$464,764,000~~	~~$2.80~~
~~98~~	~~Millican-Panther Reservoir~~			~~X~~			~~18~~	~~194,500~~	~~$1,159,907,000~~	~~$1.90~~
~~99~~	~~Paluxy Reservoir~~	~~X~~					~~18~~	~~16,300~~	~~$74,147,000~~	~~$1.03~~
~~100~~	~~Peach Creek Off-Channel Reservoir~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~		~~18~~	~~4,240~~	~~$66,852,000~~	~~$4.40~~
101	Red River Off-Channel Reservoir near Arthur City					X	18	196,000	$2,790,964,000	4.27/1.25
~~102~~	~~Somervell County Off-Channel Reservoir~~	~~X~~					~~18~~	~~2,000~~	~~$24,633,000~~	~~$3.38~~
103	South Bend Reservoir	X	X	X	X	X	18	65,000	$623,882,000	$1.65
104	Throckmorton Reservoir			X	R	R	18	3,500	$68,103,000	$5.18
105	Turkey Peak Reservoir		X	X	R	R	18	6,000	$102,530,000	$2.98
~~106~~	~~Wheeler Branch Off-Channel Reservoir~~		~~X~~	~~X~~			~~18~~	~~1,800~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~

Potentially Feasible Strategies

Number	Strategy	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021	Required by Rule	Supply Developed (acft/yr)	Project Cost (2018 $)[1]	Cost of Water ($/1,000 gals)[1]
New Groundwater Supply										
107	Brazos River Alluvium - various entities	X			X	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
108	Groundwater Supply for County, Others	X	X	X	R	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
109	Gulf Coast Aquifer - various entities			X	R	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
110	Trinity Aquifer - various entities			X	R	R/A	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
111	Edwards Aquifer - various entities			X	R	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
112	Sparta Aquifer - various entities				R	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
113	Dockum Aquifer - various entities				R	X	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
114	Woodbine Aquifer - various entities				R	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
115	Blaine Aquifer - various entities				R	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
116	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer - various entities				R	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
117	Seymour Aquifer - various entities				R	R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
118	Carrizo Aquifer - various entities					R/A	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
119	Williamson County Groundwater - South Option					R	19	23,250	$415,016,000	$5.41/$1.56
120	Marble Falls Aquifer Development - various entities					R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
121	Other Aquifer Development - various entities					R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
122	Cross Timbers Aquifer Development - various entities					R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
123	Ellenburger-San Saba Aquifer Development - various entities					R	19	VARIES	VARIES	VARIES
124	Purchase from SAWS Vista Ridge Project (Williamson County)				R	R	19	5,700	NA	$7.40
Brush Control										
125	Brush Control		X	X	R	X	20	0	$7,308,000	NA
Precipitation Enhancement										
~~126~~	~~Weather Modification~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~			~~21~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~	~~UNKNOWN~~

Potentially Feasible Strategies

Number	Strategy	2001	2006	2011	2016	2021	Required by Rule	Supply Developed (acft/yr)	Project Cost (2018 $)[1]	Cost of Water ($/1,000 gals)[1]
Aquifer Storage and Recovery										
127	Bryan ASR				R	R	22	14,626	$72,404,000	$1.37
128	College Station ASR				R	R	22	3,640	$89,158,000	$10.06
129	Trinity ASR in Johnson County (Johnson County SUD and Acton MUD)		X	X	A	A	22	3,574	$19,789,000	$1.94/$0.75
130	Trinity ASR in McLennan County		X	X	R	R	22	8,000	$65,954,000	$1.98
131	Lake Granger ASR (Trinity Aquifer)				R	R	22	11,900	$24,141,000	$0.83
~~132~~	~~Seymour ASR Project~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~			~~22~~	~~3,750~~	~~$18,826,000~~	~~$1.45~~
133	Trinity - Lake Georgetown ASR					R	22	8,645	$306,276,000	$4.35
Cancellation of Water Rights										
134	Cancellation of Water Rights						23	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
Rainwater Harvesting										
135	Rainwater Harvesting						24	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN

Legend

X = evaluated in the identified regional water plan

R = recommended identified regional water plan

A = alternative strategy identified regional water plan

= not considered in 2021 regional water plan

Notes

1. Some numbers from previous plans were taken from a presentation provided during development of the 2021 Plan. Carollo cannot verify if these values are accurate.

2. These values were taken directly from the 2016 Plan and have not been updated.

Background:
Wholesale Water Providers (WWP)

31 TAC §357

- WWP – Any person or entity that sells wholesale water to water user groups or other wholesale water providers, or that the RWPG expects or recommends to deliver or sell water to water user groups or other wholesale water providers during the period covered by the regional water plan.

RWPGs determine which WWPs to use in their plan development

Specific analysis and reporting requirements

Presented at Oct. 20, 2023, RWPG meeting

Wholesale Water Providers

Wholesale Water Provider
Aquilla WSD
Bell County WCID #1
Bluebonnet WSC
Brazos River Authority
Central Texas WSC
Eastland County WSD
FHLM WSC
North Central Texas MWA
Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1
Upper Leon MWD
Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation
West Central Texas MWD

Major Water Provider (MWP)

MWPs are

- Identified and designated by RWPG to be of particular significance to the region's water supply.

Similar to 2021 Plan, MWPs have been identified as:

- Any WWP that is not also a municipal WUG, or
- 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.

MWPs with 2026 additions

Major Water Provider	Major Water Provider	Major Water Provider	Major Water Provider
439 WSC	College Station	Hutto	Round Rock
Abilene	Colorado River Municipal Water District	Jarrell-Schwertner	Salado WSC
Acton MUD	Copperas Cove	Johnson County SUD	Salt Fork Water Quality Corporation (SFWQC)
Alvarado	Corix Utilities Texas Inc	Jonah Water SUD	Somervell County Water District
Anson	Coryell City Water Supply District	Keene	Sonterra MUD
Aquilla WSD	Cross Country WSC	Kempner WSC	Southwest Milam WSC
Arlington	Dog Ridge WSC	Killeen	Stamford
Bell County WCID 1	Double Diamond Utilities	Lacy Lakeview	Steamboat Mountain WSC
Bell County WCID 3	Dublin	Lampasas	Stephenville
Bellmead	Eastland County WSD	Leander	Sweetwater
Belton	Fern Bluff MUD	Liberty Hill	Tarrant Regional Water District - via other WWPs
Bethesda WSC	FHLM WSC	Lower Colorado River Authority	Taylor
Bistone Municipal Water Supply District	Files Valley WSC	Mansfield	Temple
Bluebonnet WSC	Fort Cavazos*	Manville WSC	Texas A and M University
BRA	Fort Worth	Marlin	Texas State Technical College
Brandon Irene WSC	Gatesville	McGregor	Upper Leon Municipal Water District
Brenham	Georgetown	Mexia	Venus
Bruceville Eddy	Gholson WSC	Mineral Wells	Waco
Brushy Creek MUD	Giddings	Morgans Point Resort	Wellborn SUD
Bryan	Gordon	Mountain Peak SUD	West Central Texas MWD
Burleson	Graham	Navasota	Wickson Creek SUD
Cameron	Granbury	North Bosque WSC	Williamson County MUD 11
Cedar Park	Harker Heights	North Central Texas Municipal Water Authority	Williamson County WSID 3
Central Texas WSC	Hewitt	Palo Pinto County MUD No.1	Woodway
Cisco	Hilco United Services	Potosi WSC	
Cleburne	Hillsboro	Robinson	
Clifton	Huntsville	Rockdale	

* Formerly Fort Hood

Considerations (1)

- Target budget amount is $824,994.00.
- Not based on identified needs, but on recommended process including broad statutory categories.
- TWDB rules do not allow inclusion of WMS/WMSPs or costs associated with:
  1) Maintaining existing supplies;
  2) Replacing existing infrastructure;
  3) Expanding water distribution system capacity;
  4) Delivering more water within the distribution system to address increased system growth of new retail developments; or
  5) Delivering greater volumes of water within the distribution system for existing or future fire protection.

Considerations (2)

- Available supplies will be calculated based on approved methodologies.
- Estimated WMS and WMSP costs will be updated using the updated TWDB Unified Costing Model.
- Each strategy will be evaluated consistent with approved process and guidelines, including reliability, cost, environmental impacts, and other components adopted by the Brazos G RWPG.

Considerations (3)

- GIS maps will be developed for all strategies, illustrating infrastructure improvements and supply sources
- WMS evaluation is aligned with statutory categories (e.g., conservation, reuse, etc.)
- The scope of work (details included in packet) also includes:
  - Coordination with specific WUGs and WWPs as necessary regarding individual plans
  - Database entry
  - Preparation of the associated report (chapter)
  - Required digital TWDB-formatted workbook for all tasks

Subtask WMS	Description	Subtask Budget
1	Conservation	$ 12,880
2	Drought Management	$ 1,840
3	Reuse	$ 77,280
4	Management of Existing Water Supplies	$ 36,800
5	Conjunctive Use	$ 11,040
6	Acquisition of Available Existing Water Supplies	$ 51,520
7	Development of New Water Supplies	$ 9,660
8	Developing Regional Water Supply Facilities or Providing Regional Management Of Water Supply Facilities	$ 47,840
9	Developing Large-Scale Desalination Facilities for Seawater Or Brackish Groundwater That Serve Local or Regional Brackish Groundwater Production Zones Identified And Designated Under TWC §16.060(b)(5)	$ 1,840
10	Developing Large-Scale Desalination Facilities for Marine Seawater that Serve Local or Regional Entities	$ 1,840
11	Voluntary Transfer of Water Within the Region Using, But Not Limited To, Contracts, Water Marketing, Regional Water Banks, Sales, Leases, Options, Subordination Agreements, and Financing Agreements	$ 11,040
12	Emergency transfer of water under TWC §11.139	$ 1,840
13	Interbasin transfers of surface water	$ 5,520
14	System Operation	$ 23,000

Subtask WMS	Description	Subtask Budget
15	Reallocation of Reservoir Storage to New Uses	$ 51,520
16	Enhancement of Yields	$ 1,840
17	Improvements to Water Quality	$ 80,960
18	New Surface Water Supply	$ 92,000
19	New Groundwater Supply	$ 110,400
20	Brush Control	$ 2,760
21	Precipitation Enhancement	$ 1,840
22	Aquifer Storage and Recovery	$ 46,000
23	Cancellation of Water Rights	$ 1,840
24	Rainwater harvesting	$ 1,840
25	Additional Strategies	$ 25,760
26	Plan Development	$ 36,800
27	Database Entry	$ 36,800
28	Chapter 5 Preparation	$ 40,480
	Task 5B Total	**$ 824,780**

BRAZOS G
WATER PLANNING GROUP

6. Consider Agenda Items and Date for the next Scope of Work Committee Meeting

BRAZOS G
WATER PLANNING GROUP

7. ADJOURN