



Region C Water Planning Group

May 19, 2014





Action Items

- A. Consider approval of Draft Prioritization of Projects in the 2011 Region C Water Plan to be submitted to Texas Water Development Board by June 1, 2014
- B. Consideration and action on authorization to submit a brief and a response brief to address TWDB at a future Board meeting concerning TWDB Executive Administrator's (EA) final recommendation on interregional conflict resolution





Action Items

- C. Consider approval for consultants to submit the August 1, 2014 TWDB required deliverable of data tables containing the WUG needs analysis (demand and current supply)





Consider approval of Draft
Prioritization of Projects in the
2011 Region C Water Plan to be
submitted to Texas Water
Development Board by
June 1, 2014

Amy Kaarlela



Prioritization

- SWIFT Funding
- Prioritize strategies from *2011 Region C Plan*
- TWDB Scoring system (13 questions)
- Prioritization Subcommittee
 - Met April 15 & April 29
 - Gave direction on subjective questions
 - Reviewed final draft

Draft Prioritization

- General Observations
 - Conservation strategies ranked very high
 - Strategies in earlier years ranked high
 - Strategies in later years ranked lower
 - Naming convention required for strategies (in DB12) makes it difficult to identify what the project truly is
 - “Grouping” projects was necessary
 - A few “anomalies”

Draft Prioritization Submittal

- Memo to TWDB
 - Methodology
 - List of prioritized projects
 - “Short List” of prioritized projects
 - Concerns of the Subcommittee
- Spreadsheet with all calculations



Consideration and action on authorization to submit a brief and a response brief to address TWDB at a future Board meeting concerning TWDB Executive Administrator's (EA) final recommendation on interregional conflict resolution

Temple McKinnon
Jim Parks



Conflict Resolution

- TWDB Update
 - Process
 - Timeline
 - Steps forward

- Possible Region C Action
 - Designate Member(s) to
 - Submit Brief and Response Brief
 - Address TWDB at future Board meeting





Consider approval for consultants to submit the August 1, 2014 TWDB required deliverable of data tables containing the WUG needs analysis (demand and current supply)

Amy Kaarlela



August 1, 2014 Deliverable

- Aug 1 Deliverable → Data Tables
- Data Tables generated from DB17 (TWDB online Regional Planning Database)
- Elements of Data Tables
 - Population & Demand by WUG 
 - Current Supply Sources 
 - Current Supplies by WUG
 - Needs by WUG
 - Does not include any future strategies

August 1, 2014 Deliverable

- Deliverable requires approval of RCWPG
- Option 1 for Approval
 - Present & Approve at mid-July RCWPG meeting
 - Would need to approve Final Prioritization at mid-July meeting for submittal Sept 1
 - Tight timeline

August 1, 2014 Deliverable

- Deliverable requires approval of RCWPG
- Option 2 for Approval
 - Approve today (prior to completion)
 - Present & Ratify at next RCWPG meeting
 - Allows for next meeting to be delayed from mid-July to later date (~mid-August)
 - Better spacing of meetings
 - Allows consultants a few more weeks to enter data in DB17



Discussion Items

- A. Schedule Update
- B. Membership Update
- C. Update on Remaining Tasks and Next Steps





Schedule Update

Amy Kaarlela



DRAFT
2016 Region C Water Plan Proposed Schedule

Task	2014												2015											
	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec		
1. Regional Description					▲																			
2A. Non-Municipal Demand																								
2B. Population/ Municipal Demand																								
Population & Demand review/ revision																								
Present Population/Demands																								
Approve Population/Demands																								
3. Water Supply Analysis																								
Review groundwater supplies																								
Update surface water supplies																								
Allocate supplies to WUGs and WWPs																								
Database entry				▲																				
4A. ID Water Needs				▲																				
4B. ID Potentially Feasible Strategies																								
4C. Technical Data Tables					▲	● Technical data tables Due Aug 1																		
4D. WMS Evaluation & Selection																								
Update existing strategies					▲																			
Develop new strategies					▲																			
Survey WUGs/ WWPs																								
Refine WMSs based on survey and meetings																								
Update costs													▲											
Update Chapter 4														▲										
5. Water Conservation Recommendations					▲																			
6. Impacts of Regional Water Plan					▲																			
7. Drought Response																								
8. Legislative Recommendations					▲																			
9. Financing Report																					▲			
10. Plan Adoption/Public Participation	▲												▲									● Final Plan Due Nov 2		
11. Implementation																								
12. Prioritization of 2011 Plan projects	▲		▲	● Draft 2011 Prioritization due June 1	▲				● Final 2011 Prioritization due Sept 1															
13. Prioritization of 2016 Plan projects														▲	● Draft 2016 Prioritization due w/ IPP					▲	● Final 2016 Prioritization due w/ Final Plan			
Region C/D Conflict Resolution	April 29/30 Public Hearings		May 19: EA submits Final Recommendation to TWDB		TWDB solicits briefs (date to be determined)		TWDB decision on EA's Final Recommendation (date to be determined)																	
Newsletters							■				■						■					■		
Potential Meetings					↔			?																

■ Newsletter Publication

● Submittal to TWDB

▲ Anticipated Agenda Items at RWPG Meetings

Schedule - 2014

- 2014 Deadline/Deliverables
 - June 1 – Draft 2011 Prioritization
 - August 1 – Technical Data Tables (Needs Analysis entered into TWDB Database)
 - September 1 - Final 2011 Prioritization
- 2014 Meetings
 - May 19 – approve Draft 2011 Prioritization
 - Mid-July or Mid-Aug – approve Technical Data & Final Prioritization
 - Fall (Oct or Nov)

Schedule - 2015

- 2015 Deadline/Deliverables
 - May 1 – Initially Prepared Plan & Draft 2016 Prioritization
 - November 1 – Final Plan & Final 2016 Prioritization
- 2015 Meetings
 - January ?
 - April – approve IPP & Draft 2016 Prioritization
 - October – approve Final Plan & Final 2016 Prioritization



Membership Update

Jim Parks



Alternate Positions

Per By-Laws, Alternates are selected by members (no action required by RCWPG)

- Jim Parks named Tom Kula as new alternate
- Vacancies in Alternate Positions
 - Drew Satterwhite
 - G.K Maenius
 - Bob Riley
 - Gary Douglas



Update on Remaining Tasks and Next Steps

Amy Kaarlela



Next Steps

- Submit Draft Prioritization (June 1)
- Continue work on Needs Analysis
- Submit Needs Analysis (Aug 1)
- Submit Final Prioritization (Sept 1)

- Strategy Evaluation (Aug 2014 thru spring 2015)

- 4 RCWPG meetings until IPP due

Other Tasks

- Begin writing text of *2016 Region C Plan*
 - Chapters 1 & 2 in draft form; present in fall
 - Other chapters to follow
- Task 6 – Impacts of Regional Water Plan
- Task 7 – Drought

Other Tasks

- Task 8 – Unique Stream Segments & Reservoir Sites, Legislative Recommendations
- Task 13 – Prioritization of 2016 Plan projects (draft due with IPP)
- Task 9 – Infrastructure Financing Survey (after IPP submitted)



Other Discussion

- A. Updates from the Chair
- B. Report from Regional Liaisons
- C. Report from Texas Water Development Board





Other Discussion

- D. Report from Texas Department of Agriculture
- E. Report from Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
- F. Other Reports





Other Discussion

- G. Confirm Date and Location of Next Meeting
- H. Public Comments





Adjournment





Thank you for attending.

Materials are available at
www.regioncwater.org



Prioritization Template

- Questions and Scoring system devised by Regional Chairs
- Scoring Template provided by TWDB
- Max Score = 1000
- 5 Categories of Questions
 - Decade of Need (40%)
 - Project Feasibility (10%)
 - Project Viability (25%)
 - Project Sustainability (15%)
 - Project Cost Effectiveness (10%)

Criteria 1 - Decade of Need

(40% or 400 Points)

- *1A - What is the decade the RWP shows the project comes online?*
 - Auto-calculated based on decade of first supply or annual cost
- *1B - In what decade is initial funding needed?*
 - Auto-calculated based on one decade prior to coming online (2 decades prior for projects >\$100M)

Criteria 2 –Feasibility

(10% or 100 Points)

- *2A - What supporting data is available to show that the quantity of water needed is available?*
 - *0 = Models show no water; no model*
 - *3 = Models show enough water*
 - *5 = Field tests/measurements confirm enough water*

Criteria 2 –Feasibility

(10% or 100 Points)

- *2B - If necessary, does the sponsor hold necessary legal rights, water rights and/or contracts to use the water that this project would require?*
 - *0 = Application not submitted*
 - *2 = Application submitted*
 - *3 = Application administratively complete*
 - *5 = Right/contract obtained or not needed*

Criteria 2 –Feasibility

(10% or 100 Points)

- *2C - What level of engineering and/or planning has been accomplished for this project?*
 - *1 = Outlined in RWP*
 - *2 = Feasibility study initiated*
 - *3 = Feasibility study completed*
 - *4 = Conceptual design initiated*
 - *5 = Conceptual design completed*
 - *6 = Preliminary engineering report initiated*
 - *7 = Preliminary engineering report completed*
 - *8 = Preliminary design initiated*
 - *9 = Preliminary design completed*
 - *10 = Final design completed*

Criteria 2 –Feasibility

(10% or 100 Points)

- *2D - Has the project sponsor requested (in writing for the 2016 Plan) that the project be included in the Regional Water Plan?*
 - *0 = No*
 - *5 = Yes*

- *All given score of 5*

Criteria 3 – Viability

(25% or 250 Points)

- *3A - In the decade the project supply comes online, what is the % of the WUG's (or WUGs') needs satisfied by this project?*
- *3B - In the final decade of the planning period, what is the % of the WUG's (or WUGs') needs satisfied by this project?*

Criteria 3 – Viability

(25% or 250 Points)

- *3C - Is this project the only economically feasible source of new supply for the WUG, other than conservation?*
 - *0 = No*
 - *5 = Yes*

- *All given score of 5*

Criteria 3 – Viability

(25% or 250 Points)

- *3D – Does this project serve multiple WUGs?*
 - *0 = No*
 - *5 = Yes*

Criteria 4 –Sustainability

(15% or 150 Points)

- *4A – Over what period of time is this project expected to provide water (regardless of the planning period)?*
 - *5 = Less than 20 years*
 - *10 = More than 20 years*

Criteria 4 –Sustainability

(15% or 150 Points)

- *4B – Does the volume of water supplied by the project change over the regional water planning period?*
 - *0 = Decreases*
 - *3 = No change*
 - *5 = Increases*

Criteria 5–Cost Effectiveness

(10% or 100 Points)

- *5A – What is the expected unit cost of water supplied by this project compared to the median unit cost of all other recommended strategies in the region's current RWP?
(Project's Unit Cost divided by the median project's unit cost)*
 - *0 = 200% greater than median*
 - *1 = 150-199% greater than median*
 - *2 = 101-149% greater than median*
 - *3 = 100% of median*
 - *4 = 15-99% of median*
 - *5 = 0-50% of median*