

WUGs Responding with No Changes Needed

1. Bastrop County WCID 2
2. Brookesmith SUD
3. Burnet
4. Corix Utilities
5. Cottonwood Shores
6. El Campo
7. Fredericksburg
8. Hays (city)
9. Hornsby Bend Utility
10. Kingsland WSC
11. Llano (city)
12. Matagorda County WCID 6
13. Richland SUD
14. Travis County MUD 10
15. Travis County WCID 10
16. Weimar
17. Windermere Utility
18. Blanco County (representing County-Other and Mining)

WUGs We've had Direct Communication with, but Have Not Received Feedback

1. Leander

WUGs Responding with Requested Changes

1. Canyon Lake Water Service
  - a. Requested changes are primarily for Region L (primary region), so I (Jaime) passed along contact info.
2. Chisholm Trail SUD
  - a. The City of Georgetown (Region G) owns the Chisholm Trail SUD CCN. They will talk to TWDB about combining Chisholm Trail SUD projections under Georgetown. The name of the WUG for Region K may change to Georgetown.
3. City of Elgin
  - a. Will be sending a Comprehensive Plan to support request to increase population numbers.
4. Fayette County WCID Monument Hill
  - a. Expressed concern that their 2020 demands show 106 acre-feet, while the past nine-year average water use they've reported to Fayette County GCD is 144 acre-feet. Their 2011 water use was 178

acre-feet. Population looked a little low compared to TCEQ database numbers. Region K will probably want to try to increase their demands, and possibly their population.

5. Granite Shoals

- a. City Manager wants to decrease population due to lower anticipated growth than the numbers show. Homes are on individual septic, and do not expect fast growth. Requested decrease to 2020: 5,401; 2030: 6,211; 2040: 6,832; 2050: 7,515; 2060: 8,643; 2070: 10,371

6. Horseshoe Bay

- a. Concerns about seasonal population greatly impacting GPCD. Explained that we can't adjust the population numbers, but that we can add a note in the plan explaining their situation.

7. Oak Shores Water System

- a. Requests modification to numbers. "Buildout should occur in 2030 decade after 55 more homes are built. Thinks demands are little low, should be 150 AF in 2020 and 170 AF in 2030 and beyond. Population may need tweaks to reflect 55 additional homes in 2030, then numbers stay constant."

8. San Saba (city)

- a. City Manager says numbers are underprojected. "At the present time our population is over 3,100 and not included in that total is a State prison with about 500 inmates. We have been experiencing a good growth rate in businesses and many new jobs have come to our town allowing for more families to move here. Please revise your numbers to reflect that growth. I believe a more real number of 4000 should be used for the 2020 population and then carry your numbers out."
- b. TWDB responded to us regarding the prison population, stating that the prison population and water use were included in the draft projections for San Saba. The 2014 city's utility population reported was 3,099. The 2010 Census for the city was 3,099 that included the prison population. The city's growth rate between 2010 and 2015 was -3.4% according to the State Demographic Center.
- c. AECOM will follow up with the City.

9. Travis County WCID 17

- a. General Manager. Reported population of 34,290 to TWDB for current year (2016). Thinks growth of 300 accounts per year to reach 36,720 population by 2020. Assumes single family PPC of 2.7. Remaining population numbers may be fine, although she hopes they won't get as high as projected. Municipal demands look okay.

10. West Travis County PUA

- a. Requested the following changes to population, GPCD, and demands. General Manager mentioned they include all of their retail and wholesale customers, not just the retail like the TWDB projections

show. Numbers are based on a Comprehensive Plan that was done (hasn't been provided). GM said he didn't think he would be able to break out just the retail portion for us.

County	2020	Population (Capita)						GCPD	Municipal Demands (Ac-Ft/Yr)					
	Connect	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070		2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Travis	10819	33539	41924	52405	65506	81882	102353	145	5448	6810	8512	10640	13300	16625
Hays	7802	24186	30233	37791	47239	59048	73810	145	3929	4911	6138	7673	9591	11989
<b>Total</b>	<b>18621</b>	<b>57725</b>	<b>72156</b>	<b>90195</b>	<b>112744</b>	<b>140930</b>	<b>176163</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>9376</b>	<b>11721</b>	<b>14651</b>	<b>18313</b>	<b>22892</b>	<b>28615</b>

11. Wharton (city)

- a. "We have reviewed TWDB's population projections and are concerned that they do not account for the probability of future growth. Water utilities must be able to prepare for what might happen, if they are to be able to evaluate whether future water supplies are adequate. The City of Wharton is the county seat of the county just down the Southwest Freeway from Fort Bend County. The next county is Harris County. The City's fifty year plan must be allowed to plan for growth similar to that occurring in other Houston suburbs. This graph shows that growth may be expected to continue as it has (TWDB) for the next 15 years, but then could begin accelerating at 5% per year. We believe this is a much more acceptable projection for the City of Wharton. Additional information will be included in the "Regional Planning grant for the Cities of Wharton and East Bernard" report which will be submitted to TWDB very soon."
- b. Region K research - Sealy and Hempstead (on major highways similar distances from Houston) show a doubling of population by 2070. Might be able to use those as a model for similar growth for Wharton, getting close to 20,000 population by 2070.

Year	Wharton
2010	8,832
2015	8,726
2020	9,372
2025	9,673
2030	12,091
2035	14,510
2040	16,928
2045	19,346
2050	21,764
2055	24,183
2060	26,601
2065	29,019
2070	31,437

