

Summary of Speaker Comments at the January 13, 2005 RCWPG Meeting

Comments Regarding Action Items

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

Action Item A: Proposed Amendment for North Texas Municipal Water District

1. Beth Johnson, Lone Star Sierra Club

Ms. Johnson noted that she had the same comments on the level of water conservation as she did on the conservation presented by Dallas Water Utilities. She suggested a goal of 5-8% for unaccounted water instead of the 12-18% that is included in the amendment.

Ms. Johnson stated that the RCWPG is required to consider conservation strategies. She stated that the RCWPG cannot do that with the information that has been provided. If the cities don't report the information, then we won't know what amount of water has been saved.

Ms. Johnson also noted that the information was put on the web site last night and the RCWPG should delay action for 30 days to allow time for more comments on the revisions.

2. Karen Park (Assistant to the director of Public Works for the City of Crandall)

The city of Crandall supports the East Fork Reuse Project. Regional water planning for the future is important. The North Texas Municipal Water District provides water to some of the fastest growing communities in the area. Crandall supports NTMWD's proactive and creative approach to planning for future water needs. This project will add benefits to the environment and waterfowl. The project will have positive benefits to our area and all citizens receiving water from the project.

3. Paul Chiang, Info Mark Corp

Info Mark is a development corporation in Region C, currently developing 4,000 acres between Lake Lavon, Rockwall, Pate and Forney. We are aware of the water needs in the region and support North Texas' approach to meet water needs. There is high demand for housing in the eastern portion of the region and we support the development of this environmentally sensitive project to provide water supplies.

4. Alan Plummer, Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.

Mr. Plummer emphasized the importance of the project and the importance of moving forward as soon as possible.

Action Item C: Removal of Wholesale Water Provider

1. Beth Johnson

Ms. Johnson noted that some entities near Joe Pool Lake were contemplating not using that water and instead buying water from Dallas Water Utilities (DWU). She stated that DWU is seeking additional water outside of Region C. According to Ms.

Johnson, these cities had considered selling their water rights to the Midlothian Water District. How would the District's demise affect this idea?

Action Item D: Available Water Supplies by WUG/WWP

1. Beth Johnson

Ms. Johnson told the RCWPG that she was involved in an email exchange on an item with Tom Gooch and Ed Motley. She has heard two variations on supplies and demands being double counted. She cited Flower Mound as an example. She wants to ensure that nothing is doubled up. Ms. Johnson noted that the list that is in the RCWPG packet is not available on-line to the public yet. She understands that more comments can be made. She also asked that slide 13 in today's presentation include the numerical figure.

2. David Nabors

Mr. Nabors asked the RCWPG to consider system operation of the Lake Wright Patman/Cooper for supplies. In the January 2003 report prepared by Freese and Nichols, there is considerable water available from this source. The construction figures may be low, but Marvin Nichols costs are much lower based on 1979 dollars. The cost for the Wright Patman/ Cooper strategy is much less than the costs for building a new reservoir. Mr. Nabors noted that the White Oak Mitigation wants to raise the water level in Wright Patman to 242. According to Mr. Nabors, this strategy is just as feasible as Parkhouse, Marvin Nichols, and Lower Bois D'Arc.

Action Item E: Policy Topics

1. Beth Johnson

Ms. Johnson stated that Mary will be disappointed to not be included on the committee. Ms. Johnson started to speak about a letter to the TWDB on policy topics. Jim Parks stopped her by saying that was not the agenda item currently being discussed.

Ms. Johnson continued by stating that she assumed the committee meetings would be open to the public. She also stated that the agendas should be posted. She also noted that the letter Jim was writing to the TWDB had not been posted on-line.

Action Item F: Letter in Support of Funding for the Regional Water Planning Process

1. Beth Johnson

Ms. Johnson cited the last sentence in the second paragraph as being problematic. She stated that the agenda does not divulge the topics that are included in this letter. In her opinion, the letter changes the authority of the TWDB. She sees this as a problem. Ms. Johnson stated that the topic deserved further discussion. She noted that the letter refers only to water projects and does not mention federal funding for water conservation. She stated that the Power Point presentation talks about planning but that the letter does not. Ms. Johnson also noted that the letter had been placed on the web site this morning and that was not enough time for the public to digest the information being presented.

General Comments

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

1. Beth Johnson

Ms. Johnson referred to page 58 of the DWU review showing the population projections to be 10% lower than Region C's population projections. Previous numbers showed a 20% difference. She commented that this translates to the volume of one or two Marvin Nichols.

Ms. Johnson asked that the CDs be made available to the public.

Ms. Johnson said that she would appreciate information being posted on-line in February when it is sent to the RCWPG. She also asked how public comments should be sent.

Ms. Johnson also mentioned that on page 58, the total land impacted should include the full range of information.

2. David Nabors

Mr. Nabors said that the consultants did a sloppy job of providing information to the public in December and January. The information should be made available to the public immediately before, during, or after these meetings. Information needs to be distributed in a timely manner.