

# **Summary of Comments on the Initially Prepared 2011 Region C Regional Water Plan**

## **Comments at Public Hearing**

- 12 Speakers
- 4 in support of the plan
  - Arlington
  - Tarrant Regional WD
  - Upper Trinity Regional WD
  - Ladonia
- Sierra Club expressed significant concerns
- 2 speakers wanted more conservation
- 5 speakers expressed concern about location of Fort Worth reuse project

## **Written Comments**

- Texas Water Development Board
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
- Sierra Club (provided at Public Hearing)
- Other

## **Texas Water Development Board Comments**

- Confirm that hydrologic and climate data was latest available – will do.
- Include categories of water use by river basin for water user groups and wholesale water providers – plan to discuss with TWDB.
- Total in Table 2.4 is incorrect – will fix.
- Provide a statement about water availability requirements in a Priority Groundwater Management Area by a county commissioner’s court – will do. Believe that there were none.
- Remove references to the Sparta aquifer – will do.
- Explain how emergency transfers of non-municipal water were considered – believe covered under current discussion of voluntary transfers. Will supplement discussion.

- Describe how third party impacts were considered – will do.
- Include quantitative reporting of impacts of potentially feasible water management strategies on agricultural resources, as appropriate – plan to discuss with TWDB.
- Include a summary of information regarding water loss audits specific to Region C – will do.
- Clarify adjustments to water management strategies for potential impacts to threatened or endangered species – will do. Not sufficient information to allow for adjustment at this point.
- Justify use of a 30-year debt service period or revise cost estimates – will justify. 30-year period used so all strategies could be compared on the same basis.
- Adjust database problems – will do (in progress).
- Reference Appendix M for baseline water quality conditions – will do.

### **Texas Parks and Wildlife Department**

- Include detailed biological and habitat information where available (as in Lower Bois d’Arc Creek Reservoir and Lake Ralph Hall, which are in permitting) – not appropriate. Detailed data for projects in permitting is covered in other reports.
- Include transport of invasive species and toxic algae as threat to natural resources (zebra mussels and golden algae) – will so.
- Marvin Nichols has different footprint from 2006 plan and data don’t reflect this – incorrect. The footprint is the same as in the 2006 plan, although it is different from the 2001 plan.
- Encourage conservation efforts – acknowledged.
- Tables 4B.3 and 6.7 have incorrect total Region C demands – will clarify that demands in those tables are municipal only.
- Support for working group on unique stream segments – acknowledged.
- Surplus supply in the plan could cause environmental impacts – the surplus supplies in the plan are intended to guard against reduced supplies from droughts worse than the drought of record, projects that cannot be developed or that are delayed, faster than projected growth, and needs beyond the planning period.

### **Sierra Club**

- Surplus supplies are not justified - the surplus supplies in the plan are intended to guard against reduced supplies from droughts worse than the drought of record, projects that

cannot be developed or that are delayed, faster than projected growth, and needs beyond the planning period.

- Approach ignores drought contingency plans – drought contingency plans are discussed on 4B.9 in Section 4B.
- Region C should not credit reuse as a conservation measure in considering the goal of 140 gallons per capita per day water use – The goal of 140 gallons per capita per day water use was set in 2004 by the state’s Water Implementation Task Force. In their report, it was clearly stated that the 140 gallons per capita per day was intended to include credit for indirect reuse.

### **Other Comments and Changes**

- General – plan to rewrite Section 4F to include a separate discussion for each supplier.
- Editorial changes
- Update and revise some cost estimates.
- North Texas Commission
  - Support for plan
- Dallas Regional Chamber
  - Support for plan
- Arlington
  - Numerous questions and suggestions
  - Suggest adding 10 am – 6 pm watering restrictions to the model plan – will do.
- Athens MWA
  - Move new groundwater well strategy from City of Athens to Athens MWA – will do
- Blue Mound
  - Newspaper article on buying water system
  - Have not been able to reach city to discuss changes to plan.
- Celina
  - Show timing of supply from NTMWD to be between 2010 and 2020 rather than 2020 – will reflect in text.
- Copeville SUD
  - No mention of Copeville SUD in the plan – included in Collin County Other.
- Crandall
  - Adjustments to the amount needed from NTMWD and from Dallas Water Utilities (through Seagoville) – will discuss with Crandall’s engineer – cannot change demands projections at this time.

- Dallas Water Utilities
  - Lake Fastrill Replacement omitted from list of recommended strategies for DWU – will correct.
- Danville WCS
  - Population projections too high – Cannot change now. Will note for next plan.
- East Cedar Creek FWSD
  - Population projections adjustment – Cannot change now. Will note for next plan.
- Ennis
  - Numerous comments – Will discuss with the City.
- Garland
  - Questions reuse as a supply for Garland – will discuss with City.
- Grand Prairie
  - Provided information on timing and cost of strategies – will use where appropriate.
- Greater Texas Utility Authority
  - Include Lake Texoma pump station expansion as a water management strategy for GTUA and NTNWD – will do.
- Haltom City
  - Demand projections should be lower – cannot change at this time.
- Irving
  - Include Chapman Booster Pump Station as a strategy for Irving as well as NTMWD – will do.
  - Include alternative strategies for Irving (Marvin Nichols Reservoir, George Parkhouse North, George Parkhouse South, Ralph Hall, Wright Patman, and indirect reuse) – will do
  - Listed sponsors for Oklahoma water in Tables 4C.3 and 4C.5 do not match. Irving is a sponsor – will correct.
- Midlothian
  - Comments on current and potential wholesale supplies from the city – will contact city.
- Runaway Bay
  - Questions about planning process – have contacted city.
- Upper Trinity Regional WD
  - Support for plan.
  - Suggested wording changes – will do.
  - Comments on cost estimates – will do.
- Three written comments from individuals
  - Concern over water taste – forwarded to supplier.

- Need for more conservation and opposition to reservoirs.
- Several specific comments and advocacy for slowing population growth until additional water resources are in place – will consider individual comments.  
RCWPG does not control population growth.