



## MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** Region C Water Planning Group

**FROM:** Thomas C. Gooch, P.E.

**SUBJECT:** Summary of Water Management Strategy Surveys

**DATE:** July 2, 2004

---

In mid-April, Freese and Nichols, Inc., and Alan Plummer Associates, Inc., sent surveys to water user groups (WUGs), county judges, and wholesale water providers (WWPs) in Region C. In total, 243 WUGs, 27 WWPs, and 16 county judges received surveys. The survey consisted of a letter, survey questions, and a data sheet containing population, water demand data, current water availability by source, and water management strategies for each entity. The surveys were either e-mailed to a designated contact at the entity or sent via U.S. Mail. The purpose of the survey was to gather information that would better help the Consultants to plan for these entities.

WUGs were asked to comment on the projected water demands that have already been approved by the Texas Water Development Board. While these numbers cannot be changed, comments were solicited so that consultants can plan for additional supplies to meet underestimated demands. Entities were also asked to comment on the list of available water supplies by source provided in the data sheet. The surface water available to each WUG and WWP was based on results from the state Water Availability Models (WAMs), considering contractual and infrastructure constraints. WUGs and WWPs were shorted proportionally if a source could not meet the demands of the entities that rely on it as a water supply. The groundwater supplies shown in the data sheet were from the 2001 *Region C Water Plan*. Finally, WUGs and WWPs were asked to comment on water management strategies proposed in the 2001 *Region C Water Plan* and those being considered for the 2006 update.

### County Judges

Input was solicited from county judges in order to plan for non-municipal water use. Of the 16 surveys that were mailed, 10 county judges have responded. More than half of the county judges that

responded have no comments on the information presented in the data sheet. Three counties submitted comments regarding underestimated populations. One county judge commented on irrigation demand numbers; he believes they will decrease over the planning period rather than stay constant.

### **Water User Groups**

Of the 243 surveys sent to Water User Groups, 130 surveys have been returned. Two follow-up calls were made to entities not returning a survey. Of those entities participating in the survey, a range of remarks have been submitted including comments regarding:

- Water demand projections
  - About 60% of WUGs returning the survey were in agreement with water demand projections.
  - The majority of the remainder of WUGs participating in the survey commented that water demand projections for their entity were too low.
  - A few WUGs found water demand projections to be too high, mainly due to build out limitations.
- Water Supply Sources
  - About 70% of WUGs returning surveys were in agreement with supply sources and water available from those sources.
  - 30 WUGs submitted comments on supplies available from sources. Comments included corrections to the survey data sheet and additional information about potential new supply sources for individual WUGs.
- Water Management Strategies
  - 82 entities were in agreement with the proposed potential water management strategies.
  - 28 entities provided information about their future projects or offered new potential water management strategies.

### **Wholesale Water Providers**

Wholesale water providers were asked to comment on TWDB approved demand projections, water availability from their current sources, and proposed water management strategies. Data sheets were provided to each WWP that included TWDB approved population and demand numbers, water available to each WWP based on results from the WAMs, and previous and proposed water

management strategies.

More than 85% of WWPs participated in the survey. Two follow-up calls were made to WWPs if a survey was not returned within the original deadline to ensure that it was received and to answer any questions regarding the survey. Each WWP was offered the opportunity to meet with Freese and Nichols staff if they desired. Twelve wholesale water providers chose to meet with FNI to talk about the survey and their future water plans. The attached tables summarize the response to the water management surveys.