

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group  
Population and Water Demand Committee Meeting  
City of Pflugerville, City Council Chambers  
October 31, 2017**

1. Lauri Gillam called meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.
  
2. Attendees (21)
  - Lauri Gillam – Region K Population and Water Demand Committee Chair, Small Municipalities Rep
  - David Wheelock – Region K, River Authority Rep
  - John Burke – Region K, Water Utilities Rep
  - Daniel Berglund – Region K, Small Business Rep
  - Ann McElroy – Region K, Environmental Rep
  - David Lindsay – Region K, Recreation Rep (Alternate)
  - Jeff Fox – Region K, Municipalities Rep (Alternate)
  - Charlie Flatten – Region K, Environmental Rep (Alternate)
  - Linda Raschke – Region K, Counties Rep (Alternate)
  - Lann Bookout – TWDB (Region K non-voting member)
  - Jaime Burke – AECOM
  - Alicia Smiley – AECOM
  - James Kowis – James Kowis Consulting, LLC
  - Yun Cho – TWDB
  - Stacy Pandey – LCRA
  - Rebecca Batchelder – LCRA
  - Helen Gerlach – Austin Water
  - Heather Cooke – Austin Water
  - Christianne Castleberry – Castleberry Engineering / Region K, Water Utilities Rep (Alternate)
  - Cindy Smiley – Smiley Law Firm
  - Earl Foster – Lakeway MUD
  
3. Public Comments
  - a. No public comments.
  
4. Discuss meeting objectives – Jaime Burke – Meeting objective to discuss all potential revisions and determine recommendations to make to the RWPG.
  - a. Draft Population, GPCD, and Municipal Demand projections
  - b. Non-municipal demand projections
    - i. Irrigation Demands
    - ii. Manufacturing Demands
    - iii. Steam-Electric Demands
    - iv. Mining Demands
    - v. Livestock Demands
  
5. Discuss Draft Population, GPCD, and Municipal Demand projections and potential revisions by county, as needed. Identify recommendations to make to the entire RWPG. – Jaime Burke

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group  
Population and Water Demand Committee Meeting  
City of Pflugerville, City Council Chambers  
October 31, 2017**

- a. Potential revisions for counties and WUGs. WUGs shared with Region G and Region L will not be changed based on utility GPCD vs. city GPCD. Revisions to GPCD are generally only recommended if 10 GPCD or greater, unless specifically requested.
- b. If there are significant decreases, based on a recommended change to GPCD, a notification will be sent to the utility regarding the change in order to provide an opportunity to comment before the January Region K meeting.
- c. Bastrop County
  - i. City of Bastrop - recommended decreased demands. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - ii. Bastrop County-Other - recommended decreased demands. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- d. Blanco County
  - i. City of Blanco - recommended decreased demands. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- e. Burnet County
  - i. City of Bertram – no revisions to demand since no information was received.
  - ii. City of Burnet - recommended decreased demands. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - iii. Chisholm Trail SUD – request name change to Georgetown, as confirmed by Region G.
  - iv. Cottonwood Shores - recommended increased demands. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - v. Burnet County-Other – The population and demands increase for Burnet County-Other to balance population decreases for Granite Shoals and Meadowlakes MUD, in order to keep the County population constant. The Committee agreed to recommend.
  - vi. City of Granite Shoals - requested a population decrease and demand decrease. The Committee agreed to recommend.
  - vii. City of Horseshoe Bay - recommended decreased demands (also in Llano County). (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - viii. Kingsland WSC - recommended increased demands (also in Llano County). (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - ix. Meadowlakes MUD - requested a population decrease due to buildout capacity and demand decrease. The Committee agreed to recommend.
- f. Colorado County
  - i. City of Weimar - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- g. Fayette County
  - i. Fayette County-Other – recommended slight decrease in population to balance Fayette County WCID Monument Hill, and increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - ii. Fayette County WCID Monument Hill - requested to correct GPCD and demands to reflect historical data, and slightly increase 2020 population. The Committee agreed to recommend.
  - iii. Fayette WSC - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - iv. City of La Grange - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- h. Gillespie County – No revisions.
- i. Hays County
  - i. City of Austin - requested overall large population and water demand increase. A small portion of that increase is recommended to be added to the Hays County portion of the City of Austin. City has also requested to increase their GPCD to reflect the utility-boundary number. The Committee agreed to recommend.

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group  
Population and Water Demand Committee Meeting  
City of Pflugerville, City Council Chambers  
October 31, 2017**

- ii. Hays County-Other – Recommend population decreases to balance increases for City of Austin and Dripping Springs WSC, in order to keep County total unchanged. Population decreases also decrease demand.
  - iii. Dripping Springs WSC - requested large population and resultant water demand increase. The WSC has documentation of existing population as well as current and pending development projects to support faster growth. The Committee agreed to recommend.
  - iv. West Travis County PUA – requested decreased retail population in Hays County and increased retail population in Travis County. Decreases incorporate that the overall population numbers WTCPUA requested include wholesale customers such as Dripping Springs WSC. Committee agreed to recommend. Also recommended decreased demands (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD). See also Travis County
- j. Llano County
- i. City of Horseshoe Bay - recommended decreased demands (also in Burnet County). (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - ii. Kingsland WSC - recommended increased demands (also in Burnet County). (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - iii. City of Llano - recommended decreased demands. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - iv. Sunrise Beach Village - recommended increased demand due to irregular source year for 2011. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD) Linda Raschke is reaching out to mayor.
- k. Matagorda County
- i. Markham MUD - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - ii. Matagorda County WCID 6 - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - iii. City of Palacios - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- l. Mills County – No revisions.
- m. San Saba County
- i. North San Saba WSC – requested population and demand increase, but lacked any documentation. Committee recommends no revision due to lack of documentation.
  - ii. Richland SUD - recommended increased demands. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD). Region F is in agreement.
  - iii. City of San Saba - recommended decreased demand in order to keep with methodology. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD). Will reach out to San Saba for feedback.
- n. Travis County
- i. Because Travis County is growing faster than predicted and Region K is 1.5% underprojected, committee will request to TWDB that the excess 1.5% (approximately 23,000 people in 2015) of population be added to Travis County.
  - ii. Aqua Texas-Rivercrest is a sub-WUG to County-Other. Population and demand projections have been developed as part of the revision request to TWDB.
  - iii. City of Austin - requested increase in population, based on the City demographer’s projections. Committee is able to recommend some increase, based on the overall Travis County population increase, but not all. City also requested to increase GPCD from 156 to 162 GPCD, based on utility GPCD number. Committee agreed to recommend. The RWPG may consider action to support the

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group  
Population and Water Demand Committee Meeting  
City of Pflugerville, City Council Chambers  
October 31, 2017**

City of Austin submitting a separate request to the TWDB for their full projected population numbers.

- iv. Barton Creek West WSC - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- v. Barton Creek WSC - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- vi. Cottonwood Creek MUD 1- recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- vii. Travis County-Other used to balance county population projections, but adjusted to keep some population in the County in each decade.
- viii. Hurst Creek MUD - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- ix. Jonestown WSC - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - x. City of Lago Vista - requested an increase in population. Committee recommended staying with draft numbers due to lack of documentation.
- xi. Lakeway MUD - requested decreased population and demand, based on data they provided. Committee agreed to recommend decreases.
- xii. City of Leander - requested increased population for 2020 and 2030 and requested decreased population for 2040-2070. Also requested increased GPCD, based on 2015 rate. Coordination with Region G and TWDB staff has occurred. Committee agreed to recommend revisions.
- xiii. Manville WSC requested decreased population, based on information provided to Region K by Region G staff. Lower demands reflect population changes. Committee agreed to recommend revisions.
- xiv. North Austin MUD 1- recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xv. Oak Shores Water System - requested increased population and demand for 2020 and 2030 and requested decreased population and demand for 2040-2070. Small changes based on anticipated growth and buildout conditions.
- xvi. City of Pflugerville - requested decreased population and demand. Committee agreed to recommend.
- xvii. Rough Hollow in Travis County CRU (new WUG) – no recommendations to change numbers, just providing draft numbers for information.
- xviii. Shady Hollow MUD - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xix. City of Sunset Valley- requested decreased population, providing calculations. Committee agreed to recommend. Also recommending increase to GPCD. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - xx. Sweetwater CRU (new WUG) – no recommendations to change numbers, just providing draft numbers for information.
- xxi. Travis County MUD 10 - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xxii. Travis County MUD 2 - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xxiii. Travis County MUD 4 - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xxiv. Travis County WCID 10 - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xxv. Travis County WCID 17 – requested increase to 2020 population, based on 2016 population submitted to TWDB. Committee agreed to recommend. Also recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xxvi. Travis County WCID 19 - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xxvii. Travis County WCID 20 - recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group  
Population and Water Demand Committee Meeting  
City of Pflugerville, City Council Chambers  
October 31, 2017**

- xxviii. Travis County WCID Point Venture - requested increased population in 2020 based on 2015 population and current growth rates. 2030 population was then adjusted to better balance the growth between 2020 and 2040. 2040 – 2070 population was not changed. Committee agreed to recommend. Also recommended decreased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
- xxix. Wells Branch MUD – requested increased population based on documentation of current single family and multi-family population. GPCD is decreased based on updated population numbers, resulting in decreased demands. Committee agreed to recommend.
- xxx. West Travis County PUA - requested increased retail population in Travis County based on demographic study provided. Also requested lower GPCD, which includes both retail and wholesale and is lower than historical data shows for retail. Committee agreed to recommend a portion of the requested increase, based on the increase to Travis County’s population. Committee did not agree to recommend requested GPCD, but recommended lower GPCD (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD).
- o. Wharton County
  - i. Wharton County-Other -recommended increased demand based on Region P request to slightly increase GPCD (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD).
- p. Williamson County
  - i. City of Austin – initially increased population to reflect moving the County-Other population under City of Austin, based on service area. TWDB asked that we check to see if some population should be left under County-Other. City of Austin is looking at the numbers.
  - ii. Williamson County-Other – initially moved all of County-Other population under City of Austin. TWDB asked that we check to see if some population should be left under County-Other. City of Austin is looking at the numbers.
  - iii. North Austin MUD 1 - recommended increased demand. (utility GPCD vs. city GPCD)
  - iv. Wells Branch MUD - GPCD is decreased based on updated population numbers in Travis County, resulting in decreased demands. Committee agreed to recommend.
- 6. Discuss Draft Non-Municipal Demand projections and potential revisions by category, as needed. Identify recommendations to make to the entire RWPG. – Jaime Burke
  - a. Irrigation Demands
    - i. Concern regarding potential overlap / double-counting of irrigators using both surface water and groundwater. Discussion of using a consistent methodology for both water sources, or detailed inventory of groundwater.
    - ii. Discussion of Daniel Berglund and David Wheelock’s memo that developed proposed new surface water demand numbers for irrigation.
    - iii. David Lindsay discussed possible issues with irrigation demand methodology. Discussed 1988 Adjudication Order. Suggested that for planning purposes, Gulf Coast number needs to be decreased, based on 5.25 acre-foot/acre. See separate meeting handout “*Irrigation Demand Metric and Associated Water Conservation Requirements Summary and Excerpts: Court Order from 1988 Adjudication of Water Rights; Certificates of Adjudication held by LCRA; LCRA’s Water Management Plans (1989 +)*” for full discussion.
    - iv. Committee agreed to schedule another meeting, to be able to discuss materials presented in more detail. No recommendations at this time.

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group  
Population and Water Demand Committee Meeting  
City of Pflugerville, City Council Chambers  
October 31, 2017**

- b. Manufacturing Demands
    - i. Discussion of “potential unaccounted manufacturing water use” data for 2015, provided by TWDB staff. Looked at what counties might have increased demands based on the addition of that data. Six counties would have increased demands that could be requested as revisions to the TWDB.
    - ii. Discussion of City of Austin manufacturing increases for Travis County, based on their projected employment in the manufacturing sector from the City Demographer. The Committee had some concerns that there was a large jump in demand from 2030-2040 that wasn’t well explained.
    - iii. Committee agreed to recommend revisions for all six counties, except for Travis County. The City of Austin will take another look at their numbers, which will be considered at the next Committee meeting.
  - c. Steam-Electric Demands
    - i. Llano County
      - 1. David Wheelock will submit request at next meeting.
    - ii. Wharton County
      - 1. Moving portion of demand from Region P to Region K, based on accidentally being located in the incorrect region.
  - d. Mining Demands
    - i. Bastrop County
      - 1. News article said mine was to be closed. Leaving revision request as-is for now.
  - e. Livestock Demands
    - i. No comments.
7. Summarize recommendations to make to RWPG at January 10th meeting.
- a. Need additional discussion on Irrigation, Manufacturing, Steam-Electric, and Municipal (based on changes discussed at meeting and feedback expected from WUGs regarding GPCD change).
    - i. A Doodle poll will be sent out to determine next meeting.
    - ii. Location: City of Pflugerville.
8. New / Other Business
- a. None.
9. Public Comments – limit 3 minutes per person
- a. None.
10. Lauri Gillam adjourned at 2:40 p.m.