

EXHIBIT IV

DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK REGION C WATER PLANNING GROUP

Part 1

Project 1. Administrative and Public Participation Activities (\$141,160)

The Texas Water Development Board has allocated funding for administrative and public participation activities for the 2007-08 time period. The TWDB allocated \$141,160 to the Region C Water Planning Group. This project describes how these funds will be used.

Detailed Scope of Work:

A. Meetings

1. The NTMWD has already spent \$3,165 for the required newspaper notification and notifications mailed to the TWDB-specified list of contacts. The NTMWD would like to be reimbursed for this expense.
2. The NTMWD mails a package of documents including the meeting memo and meeting agenda to the planning group members prior to each meeting. This task allows for the reimbursement of such expenses.
3. The consultants meet regularly for consultant meetings and other meetings with the officers of the RCWPG to discuss the status of the project. This task would cover such meetings.

B. Media and Public Relations

1. The RCWPG maintains a web site for the dissemination of information to the planning group and the public. This task would allow for regular updates to maintain the web site.
2. The RCWPG produces newsletters to inform the public about the progress of the planning group. This task allows for up to four newsletters to be produced, published and distributed to the mailing list.
3. Press releases are an effective tool for getting information to the public through the media. Up to five press releases are included in this task.
4. The terms of nine planning group members will expire at the end of 2006. The RCWPG will elect nine people to fill these positions. Media training will be provided to update new members on the planning process. Also, key message will be developed to address specific issues identified by the RCWPG leadership. These messages will be disseminated to the public and media.

Deliverables: up to four newsletters; up to five press releases.

Part 2

PRIORITY I

Project 1. Evaluate the Performance and Further Develop Implementation of Water Conservation Strategies, Including Reuse (\$298,800)

Background: Water conservation, including water reuse, represents a major water management strategy recommended in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*. A significant amount of the recommended strategies has been implemented by various entities. Additionally, reuse water right permits have been acquired or are in the process of being acquired. There is a need to gather information regarding the implemented Water Conservation strategies and to assess their performance based on new data.

Description of Study: Examine the Initial Performance of the water conservation strategies implemented within Region C, including water reuse. Based on an assessment of the performance and additional information available since the development of the *2006 Region C Water Plan*, update the recommendations for implementation of water conservation, including water reuse, strategies.

Necessity of Study: In order to further encourage the implementation of Water Conservation strategies in Region C, there is a need to gather information regarding the implemented Water Conservation strategies. Of particular value will be to gather data necessary to assess the effectiveness of the implemented strategies and the costs associated with implementing them. Additionally, there is a need to enhance coordination between the various Water User Groups to encourage a consistent approach across the Region, particularly with respect to public education.

This study aligns with the Texas Water Development Board's criteria for studies that:

- further the implementation of recommended strategies;
- refine water management strategies;
- further evaluate regional water management strategies to meet the needs in small and rural areas.

This study aligns with the following Texas Water Development Board scoring criteria:

Scoring Criteria	Response
RCWPG Ranking	1
Amount and Timing of Need	336,390 ac-ft/yr in 2010 1,390,423 ac-ft/yr in 2060
Resolving Issues from 2006 Plan	Additional Conservation Studies
Duplication of Ongoing Studies	None
Budget	\$298,800
Local Matching Funds	\$0

Detailed Scope of Work:

- A. Survey water providers in Region C to:
 - 1. Identify which of the Water Conservation Implementation Task Force water conservation Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been implemented within the Region C area.
 - 2. Determine water provider opinions on the effectiveness of the BMPs implemented.
 - 3. Determine public reaction to the BMPs implemented.
 - 4. Determine future water conservation plans of water providers.
 - 5. Gather information on the cost of the BMPs implemented.
 - 6. Gather information on reuse projects implemented and reuse supplies used.
- B. Information and Data Gathering
 - 1. Identify changes in conditions that may have an affect on *2006 Region C Water Plan* recommended water conservation, including water reuse, strategies. Changed conditions may include water conservation plans adopted by local entities, water right permits issued, planning being performed at local level, etc.
 - 2. Gather water use information relative to quantities used before and after implementation of the BMPs.
 - 3. Contact a sub-group of water providers in the area to gather cost information associated with the implementation of the BMPs.
 - 4. Gather and review the public education/information approaches implemented by various entities and develop concepts to enhance the coordination/cooperation of entities to provide a common region-wide message (i.e., use water effectively and efficiently.).
 - 5. Gather and review the procedures being used to address water loss, leakage, and leak detection by up to ten entities within three categories of water suppliers (i.e., small quantity, median quantity, large quantity.) Identify procedures that may be beneficial on a regional basis and define proposed strategies for their implementation.
- C. Assessment of Performance
 - 1. Analyze the water data with consideration to types of measure (i.e., indoor, outdoor, etc.), seasons, climate conditions, etc.
 - 2. Analyze reuse water data for Region C with consideration of purpose of use, replacement of treated water, seasonal use, annual use, etc.
 - 3. Compare the performance of the implemented BMPs with the proposed performance indicated in the Water Conservation Implementation Task Force Committee report and the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - 4. Compare the cost of the implemented BMPs with the proposed costs indicated in the Water Conservation Implementation Task Force Committee report and the costs used for the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - 5. Develop perspectives (i.e., impact on gpcd, etc.) regarding the probability of achieving the Region C water conservation including water reuse goals.
 - 6. Gather detailed information (i.e., ordinances adopted, implementation process, enforcement process, etc.) relative to the implementation of BMPs from a sub-group of water providers in the area and prepare descriptions of up to three case studies.
 - 7. Review the criteria being used by different entities to implement certain strategies (i.e., lawn watering days, etc.) and identify opportunities to coordinate the criteria to provide consistency across the region.

8. Review up to five local planning projects for direct reuse (non-potable use) and assess the impact of the performance of these projects on the Region C Water Supply Plan.
 9. Review up to five local planning projects for augmentation of potable water supply with reuse and assess their impact on the Region C Water Plan.
- D. Update Implementation Plan
1. Based on the information developed by this project, update the recommended Region C Water Plan water conservation strategies, including water reuse.
 2. Develop recommendations relevant to the implementation of the updated recommended strategies.
 3. Attend up to two meetings with Region H consultants regarding the Region H planning effort on environmental flow considerations, which may be related to the implementation of water conservation, including water reuse, strategies within Region C.
 4. Review assessments and planning that are being performed to identify potential regional development patterns that could impact densities in the future. A major effort to address this issue is currently underway with leadership being provided by the North Central Texas Council of Governments in a program known as Vision North Texas. Assess the opportunities for application of water conservation, including water reuse, which may result from the identified regional development patterns. Define potential impacts of implementing identified opportunities on future Region C Planning as the development pattern concepts are adopted.
 5. Based on the level of water use and the level of reuse in the Region C water plan, establish projected levels of return flows from Region C by decade.
 6. Coordinate with Region H consultants to review the TWDB instream flow model developed in the last round of planning. Run the instream flow model for 2060 and up to two other decades selected in concert with the Region C model to present instream flows after planned reuse projects. Provide the results to the Region H consultants for use in environmental flows analyses.
 7. Prepare a report describing the studies and results of this task and present it to the Region C Water Planning Group.

Deliverables: draft report; final report.

Project 3 Additional Yield from Existing Reservoirs (\$141,200)

See Region C and D joint study. Amount that will be funded is uncertain.

Project 5 Interregional Study of Toledo Bend Reservoir (\$40,500 – Region C portion)

Background: Toledo Bend is a recommended strategy in the *2006 Region C Water Plan* to bring additional raw water supplies to the Metroplex by 2050. However, work needs to begin on this project long before the strategy is expected to be in place.

Description of Study: Region I will lead the study with input from Region C. Regions C, D, and I will analyze the water supply available in Toledo Bend Reservoir for delivery to the northern area of Texas. This study is a cooperative effort looking at interregional coordination, potential pipeline routes, importation of species, potential impacts to bays and estuaries and instream flows, and updated cost estimates.

Necessity of Study: Interregional cooperation is important to the future of this project. This project is recommended to provide 400,000 acre-feet per year of water to Region C water providers, and is an alternate strategy to provide an additional 200,000 acre-feet per year to Region C.

This study aligns with the Texas Water Development Board’s criteria for studies that:

- further the implementation of recommended strategies;
- refine water management strategies;
- further evaluate regional water management strategies;
- facilitate interregional coordination.

This study aligns with the following Texas Water Development Board scoring criteria:

Scoring Criteria	Response
RCWPG Ranking	5
Amount and Timing of Need	200,000 AF in 2050
Resolving Issues from 2006 Plan	Improved interregional coordination
Duplication of Ongoing Studies	none
Budget (Region C portion)	\$40,500 (Region C)
Local Matching Funds	\$0

Detailed Scope of Work:

- A. Coordination with Region I
 1. Demand Coordination
 - a. Meet with major participants to refine demands.
 - b. Coordinate with major participants on the potential for supplying raw water to smaller entities along the proposed pipeline route.
 2. Routing Studies
 - a. Review and coordinate with Region C providers and Region I.
 3. Impacts on Receiving Reservoirs
 - a. Review and provide input to Region I.
 4. Bays and Estuaries
 - a. Review and provide input to Region I.
 5. Cost Estimates
 - a. Using the same unit prices as used in the 2006 regional water plans, update the capital cost estimate for the updated Toledo Bend project.
 - b. Develop a 100-year life cycle cost using current electric costs and electric costs at 1.5 and 2 times the current rates. This is to evaluate the sensitivity of the project cost to the uncertain energy market.
 - c. Coordinate with other regions and major participants for inclusion of cost estimates in other regional water plans.

Deliverables: provided by Region I.

Project 6: Pilot Project to develop pertinent information relevant to the implementation of Direct Reuse (non-potable uses) and Indirect Reuse (augmentation of potable water supply) Projects (\$139,900)

Background: The 2006 Region C Water Plan recommended water reuse as a key strategy to meet both potable and non-potable demands. Two projects planned for communities within the Region C planning area provide a unique opportunity to perform a Pilot Project to develop information necessary for implementation of reuse strategies: These project include the City of Fort Worth direct reuse project to serve a developing area located in the southwest area of the City and the Athens Municipal Water Authority/City of Athens indirect augmentation of its water supply.

Description of Study: This study will involve conducting a Pilot Project to develop information that is essential for the implementation of water reuse projects. The information to be developed will benefit the implementation direct and indirect reuse projects within Region C, as well as other projects throughout Texas. This project will provide examples of reuse projects for other entities to follow.

Necessity of Study: In order to implement recommended reuse water projects, there is a need to develop certain information required to establish the appropriate multiple barriers for protecting the safety and health of water users, to confirm the financial feasibility of planned projects, and to further develop design and operating considerations. Information to be developed by the Pilot Project will be beneficial for the implementation of reuse water projects throughout the state of Texas.

This study aligns with the Texas Water Development Board’s criteria for studies that:

- further the implementation of recommended strategies;
- refine water management strategies;
- further evaluate regional water management strategies to meet the needs in small and rural areas.

This study aligns with the following Texas Water Development Board scoring criteria:

Scoring Criteria	Response
RCWPG Ranking	6
Amount and Timing of Need	2,707 ac-ft/yr in 2010 313,367 ac-ft/yr in 2060
Resolving Issues from 2006 Plan	not applicable
Duplication of Ongoing Studies	none
Budget	\$97,400 (TWDB funds)
Local Matching Funds	\$42,500 (Athens funds)

Detailed Scope of Work:

A. Athens Pilot Project

1. Define the potential uses of the reuse water including augmenting the City of Athens water supply and meeting water needs for purposes that are currently being met by natural water and/or treated potable water.
2. Develop the hydrology (water balance) for Lake Athens for historical time period (i.e., 1941-1996) utilizing information available in the Neches River WAM.
3. Analyze the recent five years of data for the North and South wastewater discharges to determine the annual and minimum quantities of treated wastewater and the water quality characteristics.
4. Analyze available Lake Athens water quality data with primary consideration given to nutrient levels, chlorophyll a, TDS, chlorides, and sulfates.
5. Establish the criteria (i.e., detention time, percent blend of reuse water to natural water, wastewater treatment level) to be used in determining the amount of reuse water that can be discharged into Lake Athens.
6. Perform a planning level analysis of the detention time in Lake Athens that would be associated with two discharge quantities being discharged into Lake Athens at up to three discharge locations.
7. Perform a site assessment to identify up to two potential sites for constructed wetlands.
8. Perform a pipeline routing evaluation conveying treated wastewater from the treatment plants into a Lake Athens tributary and/or directly to Lake Athens that would introduce the wastewater at the three locations identified in Task 6, above.
9. Develop a conceptual design of a constructed wetland to provide polishing treatment of wastewater prior to discharging into Lake Athens.
10. Develop a conceptual design of renovation to the existing wastewater treatment plants that would add advanced levels of treatment (i.e., nutrient removal processes, membrane/reverse osmosis processes, etc.)
11. Develop a conceptual design of a reuse water conveyance system to deliver water to be used for non-potable purposes, if such a use is identified.
12. Identify the regulatory requirements relative to implementing the water reuse project.
13. Develop opinions of probable capital and operation and maintenance costs associated with each of the water reuse options.
14. Select the cost-effective option, which may be a combination of options, for implementation.
15. Develop an implementation plan for the selected option that identifies required actions, costs, and schedule.
16. Achieve coordination between Athens Municipal Water Authority and City of Athens to develop a consensus about the recommended options and the implementation plan
17. Develop a guidance document that can be used by the City of Athens and other regional entities to implement indirect Water Reuse projects. The document would identify technical and regulatory issues to be addressed in the design, construction, and startup of indirect Water Reuse projects.

B. Fort Worth Pilot Project:

1. Review and define components of up to three planned Water Reuse projects, including the source of untreated wastewater, wastewater treatment, and the distribution system for the Reuse Water.

2. Review the water use demands that will be met by the Water Reuse projects. Identify the sources of water that would be used to meet these demands if not met by Reuse Water.
3. Identify benefits associated with the use of the reuse water including considerations such as reduced water treatment plant capacity, reductions in potable water delivery systems, reduction in raw water costs, etc.
4. Gather and analyze data required to determine the cost avoidance/deferment associated with each of the benefits identified for the selected Water Reuse projects.
5. Refine the level of details of proposed facilities to provide an improved description of the required facilities (i.e., treatment plant processes and facilities, preliminary pipeline routes, etc.)
6. Update the planning level costs to provide an improved opinion of probable costs based on the refinement of the proposed facilities.
7. Perform a feasibility assessment of the Water Reuse projects based on costs, cost avoidance/deferment, and other relative considerations (etc., reduction in gpcd, etc.).
8. Develop guidelines for assessing the costs and cost savings/deferment associated with water reuse projects.
9. Develop a guidance document that can be used by the City of Fort Worth and other regional entities to implement water reuse projects. The document would identify technical and regulatory issues to be addressed in the design, construction, and startup of direct Water Reuse projects.

Deliverables: draft report for Athens study; final report for Athens study; draft report for Fort Worth study; final report for Fort Worth study

PRIORITY II – ONLY \$300,000 has been tentatively approved by TWDB

Project 7 Regional System Implementation Plans (\$719,000)

Background: The 2006 *Region C Water Plan* recommended regional water systems for several of the relatively rural areas in the region that currently receive substantial water supplies from groundwater. As development becomes more rapid in the urbanizing Region C counties, groundwater will be insufficient to meet growing demands, and implementation of these regional systems will become increasingly important. In the last 5 years, the pace of development in several of these areas has increased substantially.

Description of Study: This study will develop implementation plans for regional water supply systems in rural and urbanizing areas in Region C. These studies are extremely important to small communities that lack the resources to develop supplies individually to meet growing demands.

Necessity of Study: The population and water demands in the rural parts of Region C are increasing rapidly, and even more rapid development seems likely in the future. Some counties have seen changes in the strategies for water supply development. In some areas, increasing demands and limited groundwater supplies make an immediate shift from groundwater to surface water supply necessary. This study will coordinate the approaches and develop specific implementation strategies for each regional system.

This study aligns with the Texas Water Development Board’s criteria for studies that:

- further the implementation of recommended strategies;
- refine water management strategies;
- further evaluate regional strategies to meet the needs in small and rural areas;
- facilitate interregional coordination.

This study aligns with the following Texas Water Development Board scoring criteria:

Scoring Criteria	Response
RCWPG Ranking	7
Amount and Timing of Need	25,000 AF in 2010 and 183,000 AF in 2060
Resolving Issues from 2006 Plan	Implementation Plans for Regional Systems
Duplication of Ongoing Studies	none
Budget	\$719,000
Local Matching Funds	YES

Deliverables: draft report for each study; final report for each study.

7.A Cooke-Grayson County

Background: Cooke and Grayson counties are experiencing an increase in growth as the population of the Metroplex expands northward. The Trinity aquifer provides water supplies for most of the water user groups in Cooke and Grayson counties. Grayson County water user groups also rely on the Woodbine aquifer. The projected demands exceed the long-term reliable supply of these aquifers. The water user groups in the counties will need to convert from groundwater supplies to surface water supplies in the near future. This study will further define the recommended Cooke County and Grayson County Surface Water Supply Projects, identify regionalization opportunities, and develop a specific implementation plan for surface water conversion.

Detailed Scope of Work:

- A-1. Meet with up to 25 water user groups in Cooke and Grayson Counties, with up to 9 trips.
 - Discuss their projections of population and demand compared to projections in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - Discuss their planned water management strategies.
 - Seek other input on water issues and management strategies.
- A-2. Analyze alternative approaches to developing a Cooke-Grayson County Water Supply System, including estimates of capital and operating costs. Develop a recommended system, including phasing.
- A-3. Develop a specific implementation plan for the Cooke-Grayson County System.
- A-4. Produce a draft report summarizing recommendations for water management.
- A-5. Present the draft report to water user groups in Cooke and Grayson Counties in a group forum. Obtain comments from the water user groups and revise the report as appropriate.
- A-6. Submit the draft report to the RCWPG and TWDB for review and comment. Revise the report as appropriate and finalize.

7.B Dallas-Ellis-Johnson-Tarrant County Area

Background: The area in southwest Dallas, northwest Ellis, northeast Johnson, and southeast Tarrant counties is currently undergoing rapid growth. As the area begins to be fully developed, creation of a regional water supply system to meet needs may be desirable. All work items associated with this task require interregional coordination with Brazos G. The final deliverable will be provided by Region C, with assistance from Brazos G. This scope does not duplicate work items included in the Region G scope item 5A. Region C work items will be related to Dallas, Ellis, and Tarrant County participants and work effort coordinated with Brazos G for Johnson County water users. Region C and Brazos G representatives will attend meetings and workshops as appropriate.

Detailed Scope of Work:

- B-1. Meet with study area water suppliers, including Duncanville, Cedar Hill, Midlothian, Grand Prairie, Venus, Alvarado, Mansfield, Arlington, Kennedale, Johnson County Special Utility District, Mountain Creek Water Supply Corporation, the City of Waxahachie, and others:
- Discuss strategies for water supply in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - Discuss recent projections of population and water use and specific development plans.
 - Discuss water supply challenges and areas for which it is difficult to provide supplies.
 - Discuss interest in supplying water for other area water suppliers on a wholesale basis.
 - Discuss current plans to provide water supplies for growth.
 - Discuss other possible sources of supply for the area.
- B-2. Meet with major regional wholesale providers that might participate in the development of water supplies for the area, including TRA, BRA and TRWD. Discuss trends in the study area, currently available supplies, plans for additional supplies, and potential role in developing water supplies for the area.
- B-3. Obtain and review recent studies for water supply in the area, including:
- Johnson County SUD Trinity River Basin Water Supply Study
 - Arlington study on wholesale water supply
 - *Regional Water Supply and Wastewater Service Study for Johnson and Parker Counties*
- B-4. Review population and demand projections through 2030 in the study area considering:
- *2006 Region C Water Plan* projections
 - Projections provided by individual water providers in the study area
 - North Central Texas COG traffic survey zone projections
 - Other information, including school enrollments, known development plans, etc.
- Assimilate information provided by Brazos G regarding Johnson County participants. Prepare a technical memorandum showing a range of possible projections for study area. Provide the projections to water suppliers in the study area, TRA, TRWD, and BRA for review and comment. Revise as appropriate and finalize.
- B-5. Coordinate with Brazos G and develop up to 6 conceptual alternatives to supply water to the study area, in addition to the water supplies outlined in the 2006 Regional Water Plans. Ideas that could be a part of these water supply alternatives include:
- Regional water treatment plant drawing water from 1) Joe Pool Lake, 2) Brazos River Authority, or 3) Tarrant Regional Water District raw water lines.
 - Supplementing supplies in Joe Pool Lake by the addition of treated wastewater from TRA's Central Wastewater Treatment Plant.

- Development of a regional water treatment plant at Midlothian’s existing water treatment plant or a new regional water treatment plant south of Mansfield.
 - Development of a regional supply through wholesale water sales from Arlington.
- B-6. Hold a workshop with area water suppliers, and other entities to present the conceptual plans. Reach consensus on four plans for detailed analysis.
- B-7. Analyze the four selected alternative approaches to developing a water supply for the study area, including reconnaissance-level estimates of capital and operating costs. Develop a recommended system, including phasing and specific implementation plans. Compare the regional system to the individual approaches being considered by area water suppliers.
- B-8. Develop information on approaches to implement the proposed regional system, addressing sources of water, responsibility for treatment/distribution, system development, etc.
- B-9. Hold a workshop with area water suppliers and other entities to present the results of the analysis and the recommended plan. Incorporate comments as appropriate.
- B-10. Present updates to the Region C and Brazos G planning groups during the development of the project. Solicit input from the RWPGs.
- B-11. Produce a draft report summarizing recommendations for water management strategies for the study area. Obtain comments from study participants and revise the report as needed.
- B-12. Submit the draft report to the RCWPG, Brazos G RWPG, and TWDB for review and comment. Revise the report as appropriate and finalize.

7.C Ellis County

Background: Ellis County is experiencing significant growth. It includes several cities of significant size, Waxahachie, Ennis, and Midlothian, which provide treated surface water to meet the needs of its population plus other communities. The Rockett Special Utility District is a major water supplier in the county and uses treated surface water from Waxahachie and Midlothian. Local entities, particularly Waxahachie and Rockett Special Utility District, are exploring alternative water supplies, including development of raw water rights in the Tarrant Regional Water District’s Cedar Creek and Richland-Chambers Lake.

Description of Study: This study will assess the requirements to implement water supply systems(s) to supply treated surface water across Ellis County. The study will update the Region C Water Supply Plan incorporating the results of local planning and the findings of this study.

Detailed Scope of Work:

- C-1. Meet with up to eight water user groups in Ellis County, with up to four trips to the area.
- Discuss their projections of population and demand compared to projections in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - Discuss their planned water management strategies.
 - Seek other input on water issues and management strategies for Ellis County.
- C-2. Analyze alternative approaches to provide water to the county, including estimates of capital and operating costs. Develop a recommended system, including phasing.
- C-3. Develop a specific implementation plan for strategies to serve Ellis County.
- C-4. Produce a draft report summarizing recommendations for water management strategies.
- C-5. Present the draft report to water user groups in Ellis County in a group forum. Obtain comments from the water user groups involved and revise the report as appropriate.
- C-6. Submit the draft report to the RCWPG and TWDB for review and comment. Revise the report as appropriate and finalize.

7.D Fannin County

Background: The water user groups within Fannin County primarily rely on the Trinity and Woodbine aquifers for water supply. The projected demands exceed the long-term reliable supply of these aquifers. The water user groups in Fannin County will need to convert from groundwater supplies to surface water supplies in the near future.

Detailed Scope of Work:

- D-1. Meet with up to 11 water user groups in Fannin County, with a maximum of 4 trips.
- Discuss their projections of population and demand compared to projections in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - Discuss their planned water management strategies.
 - Seek other input on water issues and management strategies for Fannin County.
- D-2. Analyze alternative approaches to the Fannin County Water Supply System, including estimates of capital and operating costs. Develop a recommended system with phasing.
- D-3. Develop a specific implementation plan for the Fannin County Water Supply System.
- D-4. Produce a draft report summarizing recommendations for water management strategies.
- D-5. Present the draft report to water user groups in Fannin County in a group forum. Obtain comments from the water user groups involved and revise the report as appropriate.
- D-6. Submit the draft report to the RCWPG and TWDB for review and comment. Revise the report as appropriate and finalize.

7.E Freestone County

Background: The water user groups in the Freestone County primarily depend on the Carrizo-Wilcox aquifer. The Mid-East Texas Conservation District includes Freestone County and has developed policies for groundwater usage within the county, which will not meet future needs.

Detailed Scope of Work:

- E-1. Meet with up to 4 water user groups in Freestone County, with a maximum of 2 trips.
- Discuss their projections of population and demand compared to projections in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - Discuss their planned water management strategies.
 - Seek other input on water issues and management strategies for Freestone County.
- E-2. Analyze the impact of the Mid-East Texas Conservation District groundwater pumping policies on the groundwater supplies. Determine whether or not the future demands within the county can be met under these conditions. Develop alternative solutions, including surface water possibilities, if appropriate.
- E-3. Analyze alternative approaches to developing a Freestone County Water Supply System, including estimates of capital and operating costs. Develop a recommended system, including phasing.
- E-4. Develop a specific implementation plan for the Freestone County Water Supply System.
- E-5. Produce a draft report summarizing recommendations for water management strategies.
- E-6. Present the draft report to water user groups in Freestone County in a group forum. Obtain comments from the water user groups involved and revise the report as appropriate.
- E-7. Submit the draft report to the RCWPG and TWDB for review and comment. Revise the report as appropriate and finalize.

7.F Navarro County

Background: The City of Corsicana supplies treated water to most of the water user groups in Navarro County. A few water user groups rely on local aquifers, which have limited supplies.

Detailed Scope of Work:

- F-1. Obtain and review the new master plan for the City of Corsicana.
- F-2. Compare the strategies in Corsicana's new master plan to strategies from the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
- F-3. Meet water user groups in Navarro and northern Freestone County with up to 6 trips to the area.
 - Discuss their projections of population and demand compared to projections in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - Discuss their planned water management strategies.
 - Seek other input on water issues and management strategies for Navarro County.
- F-4. Analyze alternative approaches to developing a Navarro County Water Supply System, including estimates of capital and operating costs. Develop a recommended system, including phasing.
- F-5. Develop a specific implementation plan for the Navarro County Water Supply System.
- F-6. Produce a draft report summarizing recommendations for water management strategies.
- F-7. Present the draft report to water user groups in Navarro County in a group forum. Obtain comments from the water user groups involved and revise the report as appropriate.
- F-8. Submit the draft report to the RCWPG and TWDB for review and comment. Revise the report as appropriate and finalize.

7.G North Kaufman County

Background: The water supply for the northern portion of Kaufman County is currently from the City of Terrell. The *2006 Region C Water Plan* assumed that Terrell would continue to supply North Kaufman County after it begins purchasing treated water from the NTMWD. This study would focus on water supply options for the northern portion of the county and look at the potential uses for Terrell Lake. The study will be coordinated with Regions D and I because some supplies from this area extend into Hunt and Van Zandt Counties.

Detailed Scope of Work:

- G-1. Meet with up to 8 water user groups in North Kaufman County, with a maximum of 3 trips.
 - Discuss their projections of population and demand compared to projections in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - Discuss their planned water management strategies.
 - Seek other input on water issues and management strategies for Kaufman County.
- G-2. Analyze alternative approaches to provide water to the northern portion of the county, including estimates of capital and operating costs. Develop a recommended system, including phasing. Include analysis of the alternative potential uses for Lake Terrell.
- G-3. Develop a specific implementation plan for strategies to serve North Kaufman County.
- G-4. Produce a draft report summarizing recommendations for water management strategies.
- G-5. Present the draft report to water user groups in North Kaufman County in a group forum. Obtain comments from the water user groups involved and revise the report as appropriate.
- G-6. Submit the draft report to the RCWPG and TWDB for review and comment. Revise the report as appropriate and finalize.

7.H Parker-Wise Counties

Background: The City of Weatherford and Walnut Creek Special Utility District (SUD) are wholesale water providers that supply treated water to several the water user groups in Parker County. The Trinity aquifer is also a primary water supply source for the county. Walnut Creek SUD also supplies a considerable amount of water in Wise County.

Detailed Scope of Work:

- H-1. Meet with up to 16 water user groups in Parker and Wise Counties, with up to 6 trips.
- Discuss their projections of population and demand compared to projections in the *2006 Region C Water Plan*.
 - Discuss their planned water management strategies.
 - Seek other input on water issues and strategies for Parker and Wise Counties.
 - Discuss possible roles for Weatherford and Walnut Creek SUD as regional providers.
- H-2. Analyze alternative approaches to developing a Parker-Wise County Water Supply System, including estimates of capital and operating costs. Develop a recommended system, including phasing. Include analysis of the alternative of developing a raw pump station and treatment plant for Walnut Creek SUD on Eagle Mountain Lake.
- H-3. Develop a specific implementation plan for the Parker-Wise County Water Supply System.
- H-4. Produce a draft report summarizing recommendations for water management strategies.
- H-5. Present the draft report to water user groups in Parker County in a group forum. Obtain comments from the water user groups involved and revise the report as appropriate.
- H-6. Submit the draft report to the RCWPG and TWDB for review and comment. Revise the report as appropriate and finalize.