Minutes of the North East Texas Regional Water Planning Group
March 15, 2023 – 10:00 A.M.

The North East Texas Regional Water Planning Group (NETRWPG) – Region D met in an open meeting on Wednesday, March 15, 2023, at 10:00 A.M. The meeting was held at the Region 8 Education Service Center, 4845 US 271 N, Pittsburg, TX 75686. Notice of the meeting was legally posted.

Jim Thompson called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M. and welcomed everyone. Introductions were made and a quorum was present. Twenty-one members of the planning group were present in person or represented by a designated alternate.

The following voting members were present:

Russell Acker	David Akin	Allen Beeler	John Brooks
Joe Bumgarner	Kevin Chumbley	Donnie Duffie	Richard Garza
Cindy Gwinn	Conrad King	Richard LeTourneau	Janet McCoy
Fred Milton	Sharron Nabors	George Otstott	Jim Thompson

The following alternates were present:

Gary Cheatwood	Howdy Lisenbee	Doug Skinner

The following voting members were absent:

Brandon Belcher	Joe Coats	Andy Endsley	Nicolas Fierro
Billy Henson	Ned Muse	Bob Tardiff	Harlton Taylor

The public was provided an opportunity for comment prior to any action being taken by the planning group. There were no public comments at this time.

John Brooks made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 19, 2022 meeting. Fred Milton seconded the motion. Motion carried, all voting aye.

The interregional planning council met on March 9, 2023. Jim Thompson provided that the meeting laid out an outline of how to move forward. They plan to meet again in June 2023.

Ron Ellis with the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) provided an update. Mr. Ellis presented information from TWDB on Infeasible Water Management Strategies (WMS). He provided clarification on identifying Infeasible WMSs in the 2021 RWPs provided on January 31, 2023. There are new one-pagers on the Drought of Record, Consistency Reviews found at https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/rwp/education/index.asp. There are new educational materials posted related to Member Guide and Administrative Guidance found at https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/rwp/regions/newmembers.asp and https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/rwp/planningdocu/2026/documents.asp.
Mr. Ellis skimmed over the timeline for data submission but will refer to the presentation from Tony Smith with Carollo Engineers for a more detailed look at that timeline. He did emphasize that July 14th is the deadline to request revisions for non-municipal demand projections and August 11th is the deadline to request revisions for population and municipal

demand projections. Senate Bill 1511 from the 85th legislative session put into law that the planning groups will look back at the previous plan at the water management strategies and determine if they are feasible or infeasible. Analysis must be completed prior to March 4, 2024 which is the due date for the Technical Memorandum. If infeasible WMSs are identified, planning groups must amend 2021 plans to remove infeasible WMS or WMSP, revise infeasible WMS or WMSP to make feasible, and/or incorporate new WMS or WMSP. RWPG-adopted amendments are due to TWDB June 5, 2024. Planning groups should review strategies & projects that require a permit and/or involve construction and that are shown to be online in 2020 or 2030, are related to new major reservoirs, seawater desalination, Direct Potable Reuse, brackish groundwater, Aquifer Storage & Recovery, and out of state transfers generally require significant resources and time to implement. Analysis is not required for strategies/projects that do not require a permit or involve construction. For more information, please visit the TWDB website and navigate to the 6th planning cycle page. The new webpage can be found here:
https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/rwp/planningdocu/2026/index.asp
This page will be updated throughout the cycle with important documents, the working schedule, task organization, newsletters, as well as contract and administrative documents. The email address for the broadcast communications for the planning group is regionalwaterplanning@twdb.texas.gov. No action taken.

There were no reports from Region C, Region I, GMA 8, or GMA 11.

Jim Thompson presented the current slate of officers and liaisons for Region D. Mr. Thompson is the Chair, Richard LeTourneau is Vice Chair, Cindy Gwinn is the Secretary, Joe Bumgarner and John Brooks are the At Large members. Our liaisons are John McFarland for Region I and GMA 11 and Sharon Nabors for Region C and GMA 8. An election of officers is required annually. Everyone currently serving is willing to continue to do so with the exception of Sharon Nabors. She has asked for nominations for someone to take her place. George Otstott has volunteered as the Liaison for Region C and GMA 11. Any nominations can be made by the board at this time. Fred Milton made a motion to approve the slate of officers as is with the exception of George Otstott to replace Sharon Nabors. Janet McCoy seconded the motion. Motion carried, all voting aye.

Tony Smith, Carollo Engineers, provided information on ongoing work during the 2026 water planning process. Mr. Smith presented the budget. We are at 25% of our initial allocation of the budget expended. An overview of the working schedule for the 6th cycle of regional water planning was presented with a focus on the most pressing deadlines. The action to consider today is the approval to submit the technical memorandum. The July to August timeframe will require a review of the draft projections and finalization of the adjustments with TWDB staff. The non-municipal projections are due by July 14th and the municipal projections due by August 11th. He shared the draft municipal projections of population and water demand for Region D. He also made recommendations on revisions to the draft non-municipal demand projections. Municipal population projections by county are based on Texas Demographic Center's county level projections. There are two migration scenarios based on the census from 2010 to 2020. The Texas Demographics Center uses the census information to project out to 2030 to 2060. TWDB extends it further to 2070 to 2080. They develop what the trend is at the county level between those decades. Then they use a

cohort methodology that incorporates migration rates and birth and death rates. They incorporate those various factors into a scenario of population growth at the county level. The TDC projections are available here:
https://demographics.Texas.gov/Data/TPEPP/Projections
The difference in data analysis this cycle is in the methodology for population projections. Historical declines in population for a county will be projected to decline through this planning cycle. In the past, the methodology held the population numbers flat. They take the county projections (2030 to 2080) and break those apart into each individual Water User Group (WUG) looking at the CCN, and how it overlaps with the county and its population, what that utility's growth has been relative to the county population growth, and they portion that out by growth rate or by the percentage of the population to dial in to get the trending growth for the utility relative to the county growth rate. It incorporates constant population facilities like prisons, military bases, and universities but it does not capture transient population numbers as in tourism but when the demand is calculated those people are included in the per capita usage. The buildouts are held constant from the 2021 projections. The TWDB shared two region-county projections for the 2030 to 2080 migration scenarios. A 0.5 migration scenario and a 1.0 migration scenario. The migration scenario measures how many in and how many out from each county. The 0.5 scenario looks at the last 10 years and estimates the population will grow half as fast. The 1.0 scenario mimics the last 10 years of growth. There is ongoing coordination with the planning group and TWDB. This can be both helpful and hurtful to individual counties. If population has been increasing, then the 1.0 migration scenario will project a larger increase. If population is declining, then the 1.0 migration scenario projects a faster declination in population. The 0.5 is a more moderate migration scenario. There can be a mix between the two scenarios. Not entity by entity but it can be done at the county level. These population numbers are half of the calculation for the water need. The other half is the per capita usage. The question becomes "what can be done to dial in the population growth to be as conservative as we can while we are following the rules set by TWDB? Then what can be done on the demand side of the equation in terms of the per capita usage?" One of the key obligations is that TWDB has population projections from the State of Texas. Therefore, the estimates of growth can be conservative, but TWDB will have a standard as well. Jim Thompson, Region D Chair, stated that it seems this 0.5 or 1.0 migration scenario is the best that can be done. There seems to be a tendency to over-project and overvalue entities that are growing rapidly and undervalue growth in rural areas. He stated that there is a saturation point in every county people moving into where it simply can not hold any more people. Then they will end up moving to more rural areas. Demand is calculated by gallons per capita daily (GPCD). They establish a baseline by issuing water use surveys. The survey breaks down the usage between residential, commercial, institutional, and light industrial. There are many domestic livestock users that are exempt from surface water permitting in the State of Texas. That data is difficult to capture. The projected demand is calculated by taking the baseline GPCD minus plumbing code savings created with new fixtures and appliances and multiply that difference by the population estimate. Carollo dug through the numbers and searched for entities that had their GPCD lowered by the plumbing code savings. The majority had that number lowered by about 10%. One strategy is to remove the plumbing code savings and instead we point to the drought of record in 2011 as the baseline and start there for a higher GPCD. In summary, we will be digging into population growth based on the two migration scenarios, talking with people to identify what more recent information is available, we will look at removing the passive savings from the

GPCD baseline, identify the maximum 'dry year' GCPD but still use the TWDB assumed passive savings for decadal projections, we will continue to engage with entities by sending surveys and making calls. There will also be reviews for data errors, new studies, new infrastructure or if your service areas have changed, and if there are any major differences in long-term demand. Don't forget the revision requests are due August 11, 2023. Water surveys will be mailed to every Water User Group (WUG). If there is not a response, Carollo will reach out to each WUG via phone call, virtual meeting, or physical meeting. During the last planning cycle TWDB provided extra funding to accommodate for travel to every WUG to complete the water use survey. Mr. Smith began his discussion on the non-municipal water demands on which he is requesting action by the Board. Water Demand is Volume of water required to carry out the anticipated domestic, public, and/or economic activities of a Water User Group during drought conditions. Exhibit C of the TWDB Contract identifies what information is required for justification of changes to draft projections. This section provides what evidence the planning group can bring forward to make recommended changes to draft numbers. The draft irrigation 2030 baseline is based on a 2015-2019 average. Then they hold that constant unless there is a limitation on ground water in which case, they will decrease it to whatever that limit on ground water is. Looking at the estimates historically, results in an overall reduction in the projected irrigation demands in the region that is driven by decreases in the past use estimated for those counties with the highest demand. Using the 2015-2019 average excludes the significant 2011 drought. The Board then stated that if the most recent 10 years or less of irrigation trends are more indicative of future trends than the draft water demand projections, then our look-back period can include 10 years ago instead of just 5. For each county we compared the 5-year average to the 10-year average and using the 10-year average is more accurate for trending usage. They used 2011 as a base but didn't go back that far if another year showed to have higher than average usage. Using the 10-year look-back, there are 10 counties where revision will be necessary because the draft numbers are lower than projections. Those revisions results in an increase in the draft irrigation projections per county. The counties with any adjustments in livestock numbers show an increase in projected demand. There was one big change in that they developed new rates per head of livestock. Some of the factors were increased and some were decreased. The methodology in coming up with the new rates were based on interaction with dairy cattle facilities in west Texas. Those large facilities may have more efficient procedures that would benefit water use strategies for local cattle facilities. There are 13 counties that will be adjusted with the 10-year lookback. Manufacturing methodology will generate county baselines from the highest survey use from 2015-2019, they have an estimate for unaccounted water, and they will produce a linear trend based on county business patterns. We will keep Riverbend Water Resources District listed as a major wholesale water provider and that contractual demand with TexAmericas Center will be captured in analysis. The previous plan used the Eastman Facility in Harrison county entirely for manufacturing. They also have steam electric power capabilities at a 10/90 ratio to manufacturing. Eastman will be listed at 90% towards manufacturing, 10% towards steam electric power generation and we will show a growth estimate of 2500 acre feet in the first decade with a new planned facility coming online. There are 11 counties that will have a revision from the baseline based on the 10-year lookback. The result is an increase in the statewide growth rate compared to the last planning cycle. The information from an update on the mining estimates conducted by the UT Bureau of Geology was reviewed. There are projected increases for Bowie county for aggregate use, Harrison county oil and gas usage is increasing, and Wood county has increases in both

aggregate and oil and gas. Overall, there are no recommended changes for mining. Steam Electric methodology did not change. They have an estimated baseline developed from the highest single-year county surveyed water use between 2015 and 2019. Adjustments reflecting near-term facility additions and retirements. Assumed constant projected use through 2080. There are fewer proposed facilities compared to previous plans and removal of retired facilities. This results in a decrease in projections. There are 6 counites with recommendations for changes in steam electric power generation. The decrease in steam electric accounts for facilities going off line and making adjustments in other decreases in Harrison county. Mr. Smith asked for action from the board to authorize the technical consultant to submit the technical memorandum, populate, and distribute to the TWDB including recommended revisions to the draft non-municipal demands for Region D consistent with the information provided in this meeting and approve for the consultant to work with the Chair and Administrator to submit further revisions and make responses to revision request by TWDB by July 14, 2023. A Motion was made by Sharron Nabors as requested and seconded by Kevin Chumley. Motion carried, all voting aye.

Kyle Dooley presented invoices from Carollo Engineers for approval. The invoices are for work spanning from September of 2022 to December 2022. The total for the five invoices is $14,848.47. Please recall that the original contract including funding up to around $205,000 and the amended contract will be approved for around $607,000. Up to this point $29,000 has been approved. Fred Milton made a motion to authorize Kyle Dooley to pay the invoices to Carollo. George Otstott seconded the motion. Motion carried, all voting aye.

David Nabors stated that letting water out of reservoirs needs to be slowed or stopped instead of building another reservoir. Janet McCoy asked if we will cover data on the availability of brackish ground water. Tony Smith with Carollo answered, yes, as soon as our attention is diverted from demand to supply.

Next meeting should be scheduled for mid-July which will giving enough time to prepare municipal data similar to the non-municipal data given today. That will give us enough time to meet the August 11th deadline for the municipal data submission.

With no further business to discuss, Jim Thompson adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.

Cynthia J. Grimm — Secretary

7/12/2023 — Date