

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group
Population and Demand Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2017**

1. Lauri Gillam called meeting to order at 12:34 p.m.

2. Attendees (18)
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
James Sulzemeier – Region K, Counties Rep
David Lindsay – Region K, Recreation Rep (Alternate)
Daniel Berglund – Region K, Small Business Rep
Teresa Lutes – Region K, Municipalities Rep
Barbara Johnson – Region K, Industry Rep
Russ Robertson – Texas Dept. of Agriculture (Region K non-voting member)
Lann Bookout – TWDB (Region K non-voting member)
Jaime Burke – AECOM
Alicia Smiley – AECOM
James Kowis – James Kowis Consulting, LLC
Yun Cho – TWDB
William Alfaro – TWDB
Stacy Pandey – LCRA
Rebecca Batchelder – LCRA
Helen Gerlach – Austin Water

3. Public Comments
No Public Comments.

4. Meeting Objectives
The purpose of this committee meeting was to review Population and Municipal and Non-Municipal Demand projections and feedback from stakeholders, and identify recommendations to take to planning group for the October 11th meeting. The deadline to send information to TWDB is January 12, 2018.

5. **Non-Municipal Demand Projections** – Most of the comments listed below were provided prior to this meeting, and the commenters were not necessarily at the meeting to participate in the discussion.
 - a. **Livestock Demands**
 - i. Comment 1 – Ron Fieseler
 1. Livestock data is already calculated per head of cattle – Perhaps the numbers are not updated. Data is somewhat unreliable. TWDB will provide raw data. Committee agrees to send Mr. Fieseler the raw data for his review.

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group
Population and Demand Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2017**

2. To use an average based on five-year would not account for drought, but when drought hits, small cattle farmers tend to sell, so there is less water usage.
 3. Blanco County has exotic animals - water usage cannot be accounted for from TWDB because it has been difficult to acquire the data.
- ii. Comment 7 – Ann McElroy
1. Concern that domestic and livestock use is not being well-accounted for – it’s embedded in livestock and county-other.
 2. Inflows into domestic and livestock impoundments create a pseudo demand. TCEQ has tried and failed to gauge this demand. If it’s not accounted for, it may be a concern. A gap in supply between livestock and municipal use.
 3. D&L observation is legitimate, but there’s not time or money to develop project. Investing in the research would drive up the cost of research. What would be the return on investment?

iii. No potential revisions recommended other than possibly Blanco County.

b. Steam-Electric Demands

- i. Comment 5 – verbal
1. Llano County
 - a. Reported information is incorrect based on Ferguson Plant, LCRA will submit revised numbers. TWDB acknowledged their draft number should be revised from 6 to 669 acre-feet.
 - b. LCRA plans to submit request closer to historical uses.
 2. Matagorda County Steam-Electric
 - a. Jason Ludwig from STP said Matagorda numbers looked fine.
 3. City of Austin and LCRA will coordinate to determine LCRA-Austin split for Fayette County. Overall numbers should be fine.
 4. TWDB asked for any planned expansions to update demand projections.

ii. No potential revisions recommended other than possibly Llano County.

c. Mining Demands

- i. Projections have stayed the same since last planning cycle.
- ii. Comment 5 – verbal
1. Bastrop County Mining Demands
 - a. Drop-off shown in historical water use from 2012-2015. Look into because no adjustments were made for this cycle.
 - b. Disconnect of this cycle’s draft projections because it was based on 2005-2009 data
 - c. Unlikely that increased mining will occur for next 50 years. Likely 20-25 more years of use (lignite coal mining). Hold through 2040 decade

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group
Population and Demand Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2017**

and cut off by 2050. Greatest pumpage comes towards the end (at deepest) before the reclamation process. Mining use not expected to drop to zero due to gravel mining in the county.

- d. AECOM will work with James Kowis to develop draft revised Bastrop County numbers for consideration by RWPG.
- iii. Central Texas Water Coalition
 - 1. Concern that projected demands may not fully incorporate existing or future planned demands in Burnet County.
 - 2. TWDB feels comfortable with numbers.
 - 3. AECOM will check with GCD in Burnet County to see if they have data they can provide.
- iv. Matagorda County
 - 1. Matagorda mining demands have increased rapidly in the last few years. The historical demands are now higher than the projected demands (since they are based on 2005-2009 data).
 - 2. What is causing the recent peak (historical water use)? Natural gas storage? TWDB will provide data.
- v. **No potential revisions other than possibly Bastrop County, Burnet County, and Matagorda County recommended at this time.**

d. Manufacturing Demands

- i. Quarries are listed as manufacturing – check to see if they’re double counted in mining and manufacturing? TWDB will send additional data.
- ii. Comment 2 – Paul Tybor
 - 1. Gillespie County demands are on the low side, but okay, because based on water use survey
- iii. Comment 5 – Travis County
 - 1. Numbers decreased dramatically – last plan demands were 30,000 acre-feet to 90,000 acre-feet. Draft projections this cycle are 11,000 to 13,000 acre-feet. City of Austin revision request packet has 14,000 to 18,000 acre-feet (for 2040 through 2070).
 - 2. Similar information to draft projections until 2040 but City of Austin sees demand increasing to 2070, instead of staying flat.
 - 3. City requests an upward trend 2040-2070. Additional demand would be approximately 1,300 AFY additional in 2040, growing to an additional amount of 4,900 AFY in 2070.
 - 4. TWDB only has 10-year employment projection, while City of Austin has a longer term. City will provide TWDB with Austin’s employment projections.
 - 5. TWDB mentioned there are several wholesale manufacturing demands that might get added to Travis County.

iv. **No potential revisions recommended other than possibly Travis County at this time.**

e. Irrigation Demands

i. Comment 3 – Donna Klaeger

1. Ms. Klaeger may be remembering that interruptible water supply for irrigation was shown as going to 0 in the later decades. There were not a 0 value for irrigation demands in the previous plan, except for Williamson County.

ii. Daniel Berglund expressed concern that numbers obtained from the TWDB averaging method are artificially low due to impacts of drought in recent years. Five years is a small snapshot. Last cycle used 20 years of data.

1. Committee came to a consensus that using the years 2010-2015 for analysis is not a good option for the surface water component of the agricultural demand projection. Noted that historical groundwater use for that period remained fairly constant and may be okay to use depending on methodology chosen for calculating demands.

Instead of average from 2010-2015, will look at year with high planted acreage (like 2011). As an option to consider take a high acreage planted amount and multiply by normal usage per acre to get a draft demand for future projections.

2. Conservation trends should be incorporated as best possible in the demand projection process. Conservation is also a water management strategy, so it should be considered regardless of the irrigation demand method used.

iii. AECOM will coordinate with David Wheelock, Daniel Berglund, and Stacy Pandey for acreage, water use information, etc. to present draft agricultural irrigation demand projections for the three main rice farming counties. New data and methodology information will be presented to the full RWPG at October 11th meeting for discussion and consideration.

iv. Comments received from CTWC regarding irrigation demands were discussed though discussion documented above.

v. AECOM noted the continual increase in Travis County and suggested we revisit the numbers. TWDB will look at the numbers again, and will respond with details.

1. Suggestion was made that some of the increase in Travis County irrigation is from small vegetable farms producing locally-grown produce.

vi. **No potential revisions recommended other than possibly Colorado County, Matagorda County, Travis County, and Wharton County, at this time.**

6. Draft Population and Municipal Demand projections

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group
Population and Demand Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2017**

- a. Discussion of updated WUG Response Summary, noting new responses. About 55% of WUGs have responded.
 - i. Specific discussion of
 - 1. North San Saba WSC – No documentation, small increase requested
 - 2. San Saba – No documentation, increase requested, but have confirmed with TWDB that the requested increase is not likely to be approved, will work with requestor on supplies and strategies to meet future needs.
 - 3. Wharton – Requesting large increases with a 5% growth rate, but given lack of documentation, committee does not recommend revising Wharton’s numbers. Will look at them next cycle. Will work with Wharton to incorporate strategies and supplies as able.
- b. Discussion of Requested Revision table:
 - i. Granite Shoals – **Decrease approved for recommendation to RWPG**
 - ii. Meadowlakes MUD – no request, but population decrease may be appropriate. Stacy Pandey and Lauri Gillam will reach out.
 - iii. Fayette County WCID Monument Hill – demand increase requested based on documented water use reports. **AECOM will follow up with David Van Dresar, but committee comfortable with recommending revision to RWPG.**
 - iv. North San Saba WSC – small population increase in later decades, based on expectation that current second homes will become retirement homes with permanent population. County-other would need to be decreased. **Committee comfortable with request because it is small, but TWDB may not agree due to lack of documentation.**
 - v. Travis County – identified multiple revision requests for WUGs within county and potential population increase overall for the county. City of Austin submitted their request for revisions at the meeting. AECOM acknowledged that with all of the requests within Travis County, additional effort would be needed to go through all of them to achieve a balance. AECOM also needs to coordinate with West Travis County PUA on their numbers – unclear whether future demands would be retail or wholesale customers. Travis County WUGs would not be ready for any recommendation to the RWPG at the October 11th meeting.
 - vi. Hays County – large requests from West Travis County PUA and Dripping Springs WSC (WTCPUA wholesale customer). Need to further coordinate with WTCPUA before coming back to the committee.
- c. City of Austin – requests 54% split of Travis County-Other. City of Austin requests a revision to increase population numbers to extents of TWDB limits. City of Austin will provide a breakdown of their population increase request by county (Travis, Hays, and Williamson). AECOM will coordinate further with COA. Not ready for committee recommendation at this time.

**Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group
Population and Demand Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2017**

- d. TWDB draft projections for base GPCD numbers were based on city boundaries rather than the new utility boundaries. Historical population, water use, and GPCD estimate data sent out by TWDB at end of June shows GPCD estimates based on utility boundaries. In some cases, the GPCD numbers are very different from what was sent out with the draft projections. **Committee will recommend to RWPG that where different, Region K request to TWDB that the utility boundary GPCD number be used in place of the one sent out with the draft projections, except in cases where additional changes are being requested.** Still a question of how to communicate to the affected WUGs that this is happening.

- 7. Summarize recommendations
 - a. Included above in minutes, highlighted in bold.
- 8. Agenda for next meeting
 - a. Discussion is postponed until after the October meeting.
- 9. New/Other Business
 - a. None
- 10. Public Comments
 - a. None
- 11. Lauri Gillam adjourned at 4:18.