

Summary of Speaker Comments at the August 31, 2004 RCWPG Meeting

Comments Regarding Action Items

The following public comments were provided to the RCWPG regarding the following Action Items:

Action Item A: Unique Stream Segments- Designation of Committee

1. David Nabors, Region D Landowner

Mr. Nabors urged the RCWPG and Region D to appoint a committee to study unique stream segments. He stressed the need to preserve land as 720 acres of land per day is being destroyed by new development. He would like to see a balanced committee, not just water industry people. He said that designation as unique does not affect wastewater discharge permits, only prevents new reservoirs.

Action Item B: Approval of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies

1. Max Shumake, Rt 1 Box 227A, Decalb, Texas

Mr. Shumake spoke about the strategy of "New Surface Water". In the past the water planners have talked about the "found water" (existing sources that are not being utilized—hundreds of thousands or millions of acre-feet). He urged the RCWPG to allocate the existing water and get it to the people who need it. He urged the RCWPG to remove Marvin Nichols and other new reservoirs from the Plan and use up all the water out there before new reservoirs are built. He said that there is ten times the amount of groundwater lying underneath Region C than Mesa Water is wanting to sell us. He stated that conservation should come first.

2. Janice Bezanson, Texas Committee on Natural Resources (TCNR)

TCNR has long been an advocate of conservation, reuse and optimizing existing reservoirs. They support the conservation strategies identified in the APAI memo and the comment letter from the Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club. Janice identified two existing reservoirs as prime candidates for supply to Region C: Lake Wright Patman and Texoma. TCNR feels that available supply from Lake Wright Patman is undercounted. They believe that Texarkana has approximately 100,000 acre-feet per year of water available that they are willing to sell. TCNR also advocates that Region C consider using more water from Lake Texoma. Janice cited that there is 3.5 million acre-feet per year of inflows to Lake Texoma. TCNR recommends studying blending options further with larger quantities. They do not agree that desalination is very costly. Discussions with a desalination firm, Ionics, indicate that treatment can be done effectively. She recommends that Region C talk to this firm. Based on their analysis, TCNR does not see a need for any new reservoirs over the next 50 years. She also recommends that the cost for actual use be developed.

3. Beth Johnson, Freelance Issue Advocacy

Beth said she appreciated the list of existing supply that was being considered. She stated that the priorities should be conservation, reuse, and existing supplies, and that new reservoirs should be avoided. She stated that most people here (at Region C meeting) were against new reservoirs. She would like the RCWPG to take a conservative approach meaning that existing sources of supply should be used wisely. She submitted a handout to RCWPG that she developed from the Region C consultant's numbers. The handout contained a bar graph—one bar showing the estimated gap between supply & demand in Region C in 2060 and other bars showing how this gap could be met using various combinations of conservation, reuse and existing supplies. The graph showed that 45,000 AF/Y could be met by conservation and 392,000 AF/Y could be met from reuse. More of the gap could be met through more aggressive conservation (150 gpcd). The rest of the gap could be met by only one-third or one-fourth of the projects on the existing supplies list. She said that the existing supply--recommended potentially feasible projects all together would fill the gap between supply & demand. She told the RCWPG to save money and don't move forward in the potentially feasible new surface supplies and focus on other strategies.

4. Margot Clarke, Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club

The Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club believes that Region C is best served by giving highest priority to conservation, reuse, and optimal use of existing supplies. Conservation should be given highest priority because:

- a. SB2 requires that the RWPG consider conservation first to meet a need
- b. It is cost-effective
- c. Statutory requirements for conservation plans. These plans will provide information to the RWPG on how to meet water needs.
- d. No interbasin transfers can be granted until the "highest practicable" level of conservation has been achieved.

Ms. Clark hopes Region C will recommend a conservation coordinator and reconsider rainwater collection as a potential conservation strategy.

5. Mary Farmer, Lake Village, Texas

Ms. Farmer passed around a photo of a tree that was the unofficial Texas record holder for scrub tree. She stated that this is the kind of tree that new reservoirs would destroy. She urged the RCWPG to please consider conservation.

6. George Frost, Region D RWPG member, represents the public (from Bowie County) Mr. Frost emphasized the importance of land as a natural resource. He does not want to see the land destroyed, and feels that new reservoirs should be a last option, especially Marvin Nichols Reservoir. Studies show that there are considerable amounts of groundwater in the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in Region D. Mr. Frost believes that conservation and groundwater have little impacts to land. He urges the Region C RWPG to remove Marvin Nichols and George Parkhouse reservoirs from the plan. He recommends that the plan include a map showing all potential reservoir sites and

mitigation areas to show the amount of land impacted.

7. Shirley Shumake

Ms. Shumake presented the group with over 5,000 signatures of people in opposition of Marvin Nichols reservoir. She urges using conservation, reuse, Lake Texoma, and existing reservoirs like Toledo Bend, and Gulf of Mexico, and that we don't need new reservoirs. There is no more need for lakes. She also said that no one will conserve water unless mandated.

8. Van James, Town manager for Town of Flower Mound

Mr. James handed out a summary of his statements to the Region C RWPG. He stated that the Town of Flower Mound has concerns about the proposed Ralph Hall Reservoir. He appreciates the Region C efforts and supports further consideration of Ralph Hall as a potentially feasible strategy because he believes that it will show that there are other more cost effective strategies. The town of Flower Mound has retained Kellogg-Brown and Root to evaluate water supply options. He believes that the Ralph Hall reservoir is not as economical as other projects due to its small yield. The town is opposed to this project due to its low yield, high cost, and the availability of other options.

9. Tom Taylor, Upper Trinity Regional Water District

The Upper Trinity RWD serves 30 cities. Their service area is projected to grow by one million people by 2060 and they will need an additional 60 MGD. The UTRWD strongly supports the following strategies: 1) conservation, 2) reuse, 3) new surface water supplies. They also support interbasin transfer. He projects that conservation (use down to 175 gpcd) won't do enough to meet their need. He provided a handout of UTRWD's recommended strategies. They support Lake Ralph Hall (all but one of his 30 water customers supports the project). According to Mr. Taylor, it is the best site, there is local support, it is near an existing pipeline that has excess capacity. Also, there are tremendous erosion problems in the North Sulphur River and the Lake will help stop the erosion problems.

10. Leon Hurse, Mayor of Ladonia, Southeast Fannin County

Mayor Hurse expressed support of the potential Ralph Hall reservoir. He believes that this project could help alleviate some of the erosion problems on the North Sulphur River. He would like to see Region C support this potentially feasible water management strategy.

11. Dave Ryburn, Director of Water Utilities, City of Irving

Mr. Ryburn supports and recommends RCWPG's approval of the recommended strategies, particularly, reuse of Lake Chapman and development of Lake Ralph Hall with UTRWD. He also supports developing an overall plan for the Sulphur River water basin.

Action Item C: Approval of Key Water Quality Parameters

1. Janice Bezanson, TCONR

Ms. Bezanson urged the consultants to talk to companies that build/design desalination projects. Ms. Bezanson wants to visit with Alan Plummer Associates about Texoma and believe that TCONR can help.

Action Item D: Approval to Hold Public Meeting to Present Proposed Plan Amendment for NTMWD

1. Margot Clarke, Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club

Ms. Clark stated that she felt the amendment request was inappropriate and unfair, considering the new plan will be developed within 9 months. She feels that this strategy needs to be considered as part of all management strategies and impacts determined. She questioned if this strategy was inconsistent with the 2001 plan. She urged the Region C RWPG to not approve the requested amendment and include this strategy in the 2006 updated plan.

General Comments

The following public comments were provided during the general comment period of the meeting:

1. David Nabors, Region D Landowner

Mr. Nabors pointed out that one of the first requirements of RCWPG is to protect agriculture. He said that North Texas should be untouchable to new reservoirs. All land in new reservoirs is or could be agricultural land. He urges the RCWPG to raise water rates to force conservation. He said that the population is the same every year, that people just move from one place to another, and that we don't need any new water. He said that Ralph Hall will not help with erosion because the erosion is in the feeder creeks above. He said there is massive local opposition to Ralph Hall despite what Tom Taylor stated. He also wants someone to come from Ionics to come to a RCWPG meeting.

2. Max Shumake, Sulphur Basin landowner

Mr. Shumake declined to speak.

3. Janice Bezanson, TCONR

Ms. Bezanson declined to speak

4. Beth Johnson, Freelance Issue Advocacy

Ms. Johnson discussed three topics:

- a. She referred to her comment letter on population and water demands that were sent to the Region C RWPG in July. She believes that there is a discrepancy between the Region C population projections and projections developed by COGs and city planning departments, particularly related to build-out dates.
- b. She questioned the consideration of the Oklahoma water strategy in light of the current state law. She emphasized that the city of Texarkana is a willing seller.
- c. She recommended that Region re-consider drought management as a potentially feasible conservation strategy.

5. George Frost

Mr. Frost declined to speak.

6. Red Birdsong, Telephone, Texas

Mr. Birdsong declined to speak.

**REGION C WATER PLANNING GROUP
AUGUST 31, 2004
VAN JAMES, TOWN MANAGER
TOWN OF FLOWER MOUND**

- On behalf of the Town of Flower Mound, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today and to offer a few comments relative to the proposed Lake Ralph Hall project.
- As a customer city of both the Upper Trinity Regional Water District (UTRWD) and Dallas Water Utilities, we greatly appreciate and support Region C's efforts to develop economically viable and cost-effective strategies to address the region's future water supply needs.
- While Flower Mound supports Region C's further consideration of the proposed Lake Ralph Hall Project, we do so only from the perspective that we believe that such study and evaluation will confirm our contention that there are other, more cost-effective alternatives available to the UTRWD than Lake Ralph Hall.
- Because of an on-going concern relative to the high cost of treated water from the UTRWD, the Town has retained Kellogg, Brown & Root (KBR) to prepare an analysis of future water supply alternatives to determine the most cost-effective, long-term strategies for both Flower Mound and the UTRWD.
- The preliminary results of the cost analysis being performed by KBR indicates that over the next 50 - 80 years, Lake Ralph Hall will not be an economically viable project in relation to the other alternative water supplies that are currently and/or potentially available to the UTRWD.
- This is due in large part to the relatively small scale of the project, as Lake Ralph Hall is projected to have an available yield of only 30 MGD, which prevents it from ever realizing the economies of scale associated with the larger projects that Region C is considering.
- While Flower Mound is fully cognizant that the cost of water will increase as future water supplies are developed, we believe it is in the public interest and in the interest of affordability that Region C pursue the development of more cost-effective, economically viable projects before considering the development of smaller projects such as Lake Ralph Hall.
- Consequently, the Town of Flower Mound opposes the development of Lake Ralph Hall and will continue to do so until such time it becomes a more cost-effective alternative in relation to the other current and potential water supplies available to the UTRWD.

- Again, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today, and, when the study being performed by KBR is complete, we will be glad to share it with you.