

Potential Responses to Consider for the 2009-2011 Planning Cycle

The following are suggested ideas to consider when responding to the TWDB's request for input for the 2009-2011 planning cycle. The TWDB questions are printed in **BOLD** with potential responses listed below.

1. **What activity do you anticipate your region will need to accomplish in order to meet statute and rule requirements in adopting your 2011 Regional Water Plan?**

- The answer to this question depends on the statute and rule requirements that are to be placed upon the RWPGs. Have these changed since the 2006 Plans were completed? What is TWDB's interpretation of what these rules require from us? Does the TWDB anticipate making any changes to the rules as the result of the stakeholder input meetings held at the conclusion of the last round of planning?
- Address changed conditions, including but not limited to updating population and demand projections, including new water management strategies, incorporating the results of the 2007-08 RCWPG special studies, including the water needs associated with the development of the Barnett Shale, and performing special studies that were submitted but not funded for the 2007-08 biennium. This activity does not anticipate revised analyses for all water user groups and wholesale water providers, only those with changed conditions.
- If GMA 8 submits desired future conditions (DFC) to the TWDB within the timeframe specified for inclusion in 2011 plans, a complete review of groundwater availability and allocations will be required. It may also trigger new shortages that will need to be addressed.
- If the DB07 database is to be repopulated for the 2011 plans, significantly more money will need to be allocated to this task. If the database will only require updating for changed items, less effort will be required. The RWPGs must know what database will be used and what will be required of our consultants before we can provide an appropriate scope of work and budget.

2. **What region-specific issues would your planning group like to address and incorporate into your 2011 Regional Water Plan?**

The Region C Water Planning Group would like to:

- Include the results of the 2007-08 special studies,
- Obtain additional funding to perform the remaining county studies,
- Obtain additional money to fund the remaining special studies proposed but not funded for the 2007-08 biennium:
 - Region-wide implementation issues
 - Additional yield from existing reservoirs
 - Study on use of saline water and refinement of costs
 - Cooke-Grayson County study
 - Fannin County study

- Freestone County study
- Navarro County study
- North Kaufman County study
- Sedimentation impact/mitigation
- Work with Groundwater Management Area 8 to properly apply the desired future conditions for the groundwater in Region C,
- Have the ability to make reasonable changes to population and demand projections without the requirement to keep the total region's projections the same,
- Have the ability to update cost estimates for otherwise unchanged strategies without requiring a complete reanalysis for strategies that have already met TWDB rules, and
- Update reuse, conservation, and some but not all water management strategies.

3. What are your recommendations to the TWDB for allocation to the planning groups of the funding appropriated to complete the 2011 Regional Water Plans?

The allocation of funds depends somewhat on what is required by statute and rules mentioned in question 1. Funds could be allocated on some formula that incorporates the number of water user groups who were projected to have shortages without the implementation of water management strategies. If the funding allows for special studies, then the funding for those studies should be allocated based on the specific scope of work.

4. Would the planning group be willing to enter into one contract for the entire scope of work required to complete the 2011 Regional Water Plans with the last year of funding contingent on legislative appropriations?

Yes, if it includes a clause that stipulates any unfunded scopes of work would not be undertaken without legislative appropriations.