CHAPTER 4 IDENTIFICATION OF WATER NEEDS

The objective of this chapter is to compare the water demands within the North East Texas Regional Water Planning Area (RWPA), as presented in Chapter 2, with currently available water supplies, as presented in Chapter 3. This chapter compares the demands and supplies of each Water User Group (WUG) within the region to determine which entities are projected to encounter demands greater than their projected supplies, or water supply shortages. Water shortages for all six user group categories (municipal, manufacturing, mining, steam electric power generation, irrigation, and livestock) are presented in three ways. First, shortages are presented at the county level. WUGs that span two or more counties are listed in each of the counties in which they are located. Second, shortages are shown by river basin. WUGs are listed in the river basin where the demands occur, rather than the basin where the supplies are located. If a WUG demand spans two or more river basins, it is divided proportionately between the appropriate basins. Finally, water shortages are presented for wholesale water providers. If an entity obtains water from more than one water provider, it is listed under each of its water sources.

Within the RWPA, three types of water shortages have been identified. The first is caused by expiration of a water supply contract or permit. Most water supply contracts and permits have expiration dates, and TWDB guidelines require that supplies based on contractual agreements should extend past the existing term of contract if the contract is renewable. In this chapter, an "E" will designate WUGs with shortages due to contract or permit expirations. In most cases, the recommended water supply strategy for these WUGs will be renewal of their existing contract/permit on or before its expiration date, and if supply is available from the seller. The second type of shortage is also contractual. These are instances where a contract expires or is for an insufficient volume to meet projected demand, and the simple renewal of that contract will not adequately compensate for increased demands. In this case, an increase in the contract amount, or additional water supply sources, would be required to meet demands. This type of shortage is designated by "EI". The final type of shortage addressed in this region is the "actual" or "physical" water shortage, designated by an "A". In this case, the entity's current water supply will not be sufficient to meet projected demands and additional water sources will be required.

The North East Texas Regional Water Planning Group (NETRWPG; Region D) has considered the variety of actions and permit applications that may come before the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) and the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) and does not want to unduly constrain projects or applications for small amounts of water that may not be specifically included in the adopted regional water plan. "Small amounts of water" is defined as involving no more than 1,000 acre feet per year, regardless of whether the action is for a temporary or long term action. The NETRWPG provides direction to TCEQ and TWDB regarding appropriations, permit amendments, and projects involving small amounts of water that will not have a significant impact on the region's water supply, such projects are consistent with the regional water plan, even though not specifically recommended in the Plan.



Figure 4.1 Projected Demands of the Six Water User Groups within Region D

Required reports from DB272 on WUG Needs/Surplus are presented in Appendix C4-1. A summary of needs by WUG category is presented in Appendix C4-2. Second-tier water needs identified by the NETRWPG are presented in Appendix C4-3, and a summary of these second-tier water needs by WUG category is presented in Appendix C4-4.

4.1 County Summaries of Water Needs

The following subsections, 4.1.1 through 4.1.49, identify water supply shortages in all six categories of water use within the North East Texas Region. The tables in this section list only the entities that have been determined to have projected water demands that exceed supply at some point within the planning period. Entities that are anticipated to have a surplus have been included in Table 4.76 at the end of this chapter.

4.1.1 Bowie County

The primary source of water in Bowie County is Wright Patman Lake. A majority of the industrial and municipal user groups have either the contractual authority to use water from Wright Patman, or direct contracts with the City of Texarkana, Texas (Texarkana Water Utilities) as served through Riverbend Water Resources District for water supply from Wright Patman. A summary of the estimated water supply shortages in Bowie County is listed below in Table 4.1. Identified shortages in Bowie County are primarily related to infrastructure needs as identified in the Riverbend Regional Water Master Plan (continued functionality of the existing New Boston Road Water Treatment Plant and the associated functional elevation of the existing raw water intake), as well as contractual need to increase the existing conservation storage from an Interim operational rule curve to an Ultimate Rule Curve per contracts with the United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE). Region D entities in the county also import and export water from/to Arkansas; however, due to legal uncertainty regarding water supply to, and use and

distribution by, the City of Texarkana, Texas, for the purposes of the 202<u>6</u>4 Region D Plan it has been assumed that existing Arkansas sources are not presently available for Texas entities and are thus excluded from this Plan.

Table 4.1 Water Supply Shortages in Bowie County

1

Bowie County		Tota	I Water Sh	nortage ac	:-ft/yr		Shortage
Bowle County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
BURNS REDBANK WSC	260	274	291	310	329	349	EI
CENTRAL BOWIE COUNTY WSC	769	769	776	783	790	797	EI
DE KALB	266	263	261	257	254	250	Α
HOOKS	317	313	310	305	301	296	EI
IRRIGATION, BOWIE	5,216	5,216	5,216	5,216	5,216	5,216	Α
LIVESTOCK, BOWIE	165	149	128	109	101	101	Α
MACEDONIA EYLAU MUD 1	710	705	698	688	677	666	EI
MANUFACTURING, BOWIE	1,801	1,869	1,940	2,013	2,089	2,168	Α
MAUD	164	162	161	158	156	153	А
NASH	314	309	306	302	297	292	А
NEW BOSTON	1,309	1,297	1,285	1,265	1,245	1,225	А
REDWATER	337	333	329	323	317	311	А
RIVERBEND WATER RESOURCES DISTRICT	380	375	371	365	359	353	А
TEXARKANA	6,769	6,702	6,649	6,554	6,459	6,362	А
WAKE VILLAGE	649	641	635	625	615	605	А

4.1.2 Camp County

Groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and surface water from the Northeast Texas Municipal Water District (Lake Bob Sandlin and Lake O' The Pines) supply the majority of water for Camp County, with supplies supplemented by small local run-of-river surface water rights. Livestock is projected to have shortages. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Camp County is listed below in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Water Supply Shortages in Camp County

Camp County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr							
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре	
LIVESTOCK, CAMP	496	496	496	496	496	496	А	
MANUFACTURING, CAMP	42	44	46	48	50	52	EI	
PITTSBURG	408	415	417	424	431	439	А	

4.1.3 Cass County

Cass County is supplied by the Carrizo-Wilcox and Queen City Aquifers and surface water from Lake O' the Pines and Wright Patman. Shortages have been identified for livestock, county-other, and the Holly

Springs WSC in Cass County. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Cass County is listed below in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Water Supply	Shortages in	Cass County
------------------------	--------------	-------------

Cass County		Shortage					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
COUNTY-OTHER, CASS	361	291	216	148	82	25	А
HOLLY SPRINGS WSC	15	11	8	5	2	0	EI
LIVESTOCK, CASS	187	187	187	187	187	187	А
MANUFACTURING, CASS	3,534	4,873	6,261	7,698	9,190	10,737	А

4.1.4 Delta County

Delta County is primarily supplied by surface water from Big Creek Lake, Cooper Reservoir, Lake Tawakoni and run of river rights on the Sulphur River with supplemental supplies from groundwater in the Trinity, Nacatoch, and Woodbine aquifers. Water supply shortages have been identified for livestock and the North Hunt SUD in Delta County. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Delta County is presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Water Supply Shortages in Delta County

Delta County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr							
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре	
DELTA COUNTY MUD	0	0	0	0	22	204	A	
LIVESTOCK, DELTA	220	220	220	220	220	220	А	
NORTH HUNT SUD	20	22	23	25	25	24	Α	

4.1.5 Franklin County

Both the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and Lake Cypress Springs are important water supplies in Franklin County. The main wholesale water provider for customers in Franklin County is Franklin County Water District. The main retail suppliers are the City of Mount Vernon and Cypress Springs Special Utility District (SUD). Water supply shortages have been identified in Franklin County for livestock. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Franklin County is presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Water Supply Shortages in Franklin County

Franklin County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr						
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
LIVESTOCK, FRANKLIN	308	308	308	308	308	308	А

4.1.6 Gregg County

The major surface water supply source in Gregg County is the Sabine River, which flows through the southern portion of the county and provides water for the cities of Kilgore and Longview. Longview also gets surface water from Lake Cherokee (Cherokee Water Company), Lake Fork (SRA), and Lake O' The Pines (NETMWD). Groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox is also a significant water source in the Region. The City of Gladewater is supplied by Lake Gladewater. The City of White Oak gets water from Big Sandy Creek. Mining in Gregg County is identified as having shortages throughout the planning period, whereas Starrville-Friendship WSC has identified needs in the latter portions of the planning period. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Gregg County is presented in Table 4.6.

11,7 0		<u> </u>					
Crogg Coupty		Shortage					
oregg county	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
LIVESTOCK, GREGG	16	16	16	16	16	16	А
MANUFACTURING, GREGG	0	38	98	160	224	291	EIA
MINING, GREGG	0	0	0	0	1	1	А
WHITE OAK	66	88	69	26	0	0	А

Table 4.6 Water Supply Shortages in Gregg County

4.1.7 Harrison County

Harrison County uses groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox and Queen City Aquifers and surface water from Lake O' the Pines, Cherokee Lake, Lake Fork and the Sabine and Cypress Rivers. Significant water shortages in Harrison County have been identified during this planning effort. These shortages are related to well production capacity, insufficient contract amounts, and limitations in the representation of surface water availability in the current round of planning. The following table, Table 4.7, is a summary of identified water supply shortages in Harrison County.

Harrison County		То	tal Water SI	nortage ac-f	t/yr		Shortage
Hamson County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
CYPRESS VALLEY WSC	11	14	15	17	18	19	A
HALLSVILLE	0	0	0	0	0	23	А
HARLETON WSC	0	0	0	0	4	8	A
IRRIGATION, HARRISON	474	474	474	474	474	474	А
LEIGH WSC	42	0	0	0	0	0	A
MINING, HARRISON	1,852	1,834	1,816	1,801	1,782	1,782	А
NORTH HARRISON WSC	2	9	10	14	19	23	А
SCOTTSVILLE	122	158	163	200	236	270	А
TRYON ROAD SUD	173	243	252	321	385	461	А

Table 4.7 Water Supply Shortages in Harrison County

4.1.8 Hopkins County

The Carrizo Wilcox and the Nacatoch aquifers are the main source of groundwater supply for the County while Cooper Lake, Sulphur Springs Lake, and Lake Tawakoni are the major sources of surface water. Contracts in Hopkins County are mostly with the City of Sulphur Springs. The City of Sulphur Springs has a contract with the Sulphur River MWD for water from Cooper Reservoir, and also has rights to Lake Sulphur Springs. The following table, Table 4.8, is a summary of identified water supply shortages in Hopkins County.

Table 4.8	Water Supply Shortages in Hopkins Cou	nty
-----------	---------------------------------------	-----

Honkins County		То	tal Water SI	nortage ac-f	t/yr		Shortage
Hopkins County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
BRASHEAR WSC	55	62	58	55	53	61	EI
BRINKER WSC	97	122	130	143	157	171	EI
CASH SUD	4	8	10	9	29	38	EI
IRRIGATION, HOPKINS	3,787	3,787	3,787	3,787	3,787	3,787	А
LIVESTOCK, HOPKINS	128	124	124	120	118	118	Α
MILLER GROVE WSC	30	40	44	51	58	64	А
NORTH HOPKINS WSC	231	271	297	325	354	383	EI
SHADY GROVE NO 2 WSC	14	15	14	13	12	15	EI

4.1.9 Hunt County

Water shortages in Hunt County are both contractual and actual in nature. The Sabine River Authority (SRA) is the leading wholesale water provider for consumers in Hunt County. The majority of SRA water from Lake Tawakoni and Lake Fork has been contracted; thus, there is limited water available from these lakes to meet projected shortages. Several entities also obtain supply from the North Texas Municipal Water District (NTMWD). Water from Lake Lavon and the Greenville City Lakes are also used by some systems in the county. Groundwater is mainly from the Nacatoch, Woodbine and the Trinity aquifers. The following table, Table 4.9, is a summary of identified water supply shortages in Hunt County.

Hunt County		Tot	al Water Sl	hortage ac-	-ft/yr		Shortage
Hulli County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
ABLES SPRINGS SUD	4	8	14	17	20	23	EI
B H P WSC	41	133	216	287	356	413	EI
CADDO BASIN SUD	1,056	662	732	490	19	211	EI
CASH SUD	307	700	814	687	519	784	EI
CELESTE	14	19	24	28	32	35	A
COUNTY-OTHER, HUNT	230	209	259	217	146	103	A
GREENVILLE	13,658	16,254	17,865	19,224	20,604	21,801	A
HICKORY CREEK SUD	224	302	395	502	624	766	A
IRRIGATION, HUNT	193	193	193	193	193	193	A
JOSEPHINE	3	7	13	17	20	24	EI

 Table 4.9
 Water Supply Shortages in Hunt County

Hunt County		Tot	al Water SI	nortage ac-	·ft/yr		Shortage
Hunt County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
LIVESTOCK, HUNT	76	76	76	75	75	75	A
MACBEE SUD	8	1	0	0	0	0	EI
NORTH HUNT SUD	172	160	150	137	124	115	A
POETRY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0	EI
ROYSE CITY	57	179	329	475	629	771	EI
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY COMMERCE	276	275	275	275	275	275	EI

4.1.10 Lamar County

Lamar County utilizes surface water from Crook Lake and Pat Mayse Reservoir and utilizes ground water from Trinity and Woodbine Aquifers. The City of Paris is the major supplier of surface water in the county. Irrigation in the county utilizes run-of-river supplies in the Red River and groundwater. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Lamar County is presented below in Table 4.10.

Lamar County		Shortage					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
BOIS D ARC MUD	0	0	1	1	1	1	A
COUNTY-OTHER, LAMAR	121	114	114	114	115	113	EI
IRRIGATION, LAMAR	4,691	4,691	4,691	4,691	4,691	4,691	А
LIVESTOCK, LAMAR	82	82	82	82	82	82	А
MANUFACTURING, LAMAR	319	324	336	319	336	388	EI

Table 4.10 Water Supply Shortages in Lamar County

4.1.11 Marion County

The Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and Lake O' The Pines supply most of the water demand in Marion County. <u>No</u> The following table, Table 4.11, is a summary of identified water supply shortages were identified in Marion County.

4.1.12 Morris County

Morris County is supplied by surface water from Lake O' the Pines and Ellison Lakes and groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox and Queen City Aquifers. Direct reuse is also a supply for manufacturing in the county. The following table, Table 4.11, is a summary of identified water supply shortages in Morris County.

Table 4.11	Water	Supply	Shortages	in N	/lorris	County	
------------	-------	--------	-----------	------	---------	--------	--

Morris County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr						
Morns County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
HOLLY SPRINGS WSC	20	15	8	4	0	0	EI
LIVESTOCK, MORRIS	61	61	61	61	61	61	А
TRI SUD	45	47	41	35	26	17	EI

4.1.13 Rains County

The Sabine River Authority, via Lakes Tawakoni and Fork, is the main wholesale water provider for Rains County. Groundwater is predominantly from the Carrizo-Wilcox. Shortages in water supply have been identified for the Cash SUD and Miller Grove WSC. Table 4.12 is a summary of identified water supply shortages in Rains County.

Table 4.12 Water Supply Shortages in Rains County

Rains County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr							
Rains County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре	
CASH SUD	14	32	40	39	141	173	EI	
GOLDEN WSC	0	1	1	1	1	1	А	
IRRIGATION, RAINS	3	3	3	3	3	3	А	
MILLER GROVE WSC	6	8	10	11	14	16	А	
SOUTH RAINS SUD	0	12	28	49	70	92	EI	

4.1.14 Red River County

Water supplies for Red River County are met by surface water from run-of-river rights, Pat Mayse Reservoir, and Lake Wright Patman, while groundwater is provided from the Blossom, Nacatoch, Trinity and Woodbine aquifers. Irrigation supplies are from run-of-river water rights for which available supplies can be limited. Water supply shortages have been identified for the City of Clarksville, as well as for irrigation and livestock in the county. Table 4.13 presents a summary of identified water supply shortages in Red River County.

Table 4.13 Water Supply Shortages in Red River County

Red River County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr							
Red River County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре	
410 WSC	135	122	106	94	81	68	EI	
CLARKSVILLE	252	179	106	49	0	0	А	
COUNTY-OTHER, RED RIVER	30	12	0	0	0	0	А	
IRRIGATION, RED RIVER	2,681	2,681	2,681	2,681	2,681	2,681	A	
LIVESTOCK, RED RIVER	145	145	145	145	145	145	A	

4.1.15 Smith County

The portion of Smith County that is in the North East Texas Region is almost entirely supplied by the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, although a relatively smaller amount of supply is from the Queen City Aquifer. Most projected shortages in this county are due to insufficient well capacity to withdraw water from the aquifer. The City of Tyler's supply comes from sources in Region I. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Smith County is listed below as Table 4.14.

Table 4.14 Water Supply Shortages in Smith County

Smith County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr						
Smith County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре

CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	204	296	363	393	417	443	А
EAST TEXAS MUD	172	385	537	678	820	962	А
IRRIGATION, SMITH	156	156	156	156	156	156	А
LIBERTY CITY WSC	1	3	5	7	9	11	А
LINDALE	86	116	153	154	150	158	А
LINDALE RURAL WSC	291	419	514	594	675	756	А
MANUFACTURING, SMITH	0	0	7	8	7	9	EI
PINE RIDGE WSC	0	0	0	0	0	11	А
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	0	0	64	116	170	223	А
STAR MOUNTAIN WSC	31	42	52	57	63	69	А
WINONA	11	30	43	55	66	77	А

4.1.16 Titus County

Water supply in Titus County is predominately from Lake Monticello, Lake Bob Sandlin, Welsh Reservoir, Lake O' the Pines, and Tankersley Lake, and from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. Titus County FWD #1 and Franklin County Water District supply water to the City of Mount Pleasant. Mount Pleasant supplies county-other, manufacturing, and a portion to Tri SUD in addition to its internal demands. Steam electric power generation is primarily self-supplied and supplemented with wholesale water from the Northeast Texas Municipal Water District. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Titus County is listed below in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15 Water Supply Shortages in Titus County

Titus County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr							
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре	
BI COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	7	20	35	А	
LIVESTOCK, TITUS	242	242	242	247	247	247	А	
MANUFACTURING, TITUS	1,718	1,761	1,943	2,380	2,695	2,887	EI	
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	1,076	2,496	3,816	4,584	5,473	6,293	EI	
TRI SUD	452	533	531	506	439	338	EI	

4.1.17 Upshur County

Water supplies for Upshur County are met by surface water from Lake O' the Pines, Gilmer, and Gladewater Lakes and groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox aquifer. A summary of the identified water supply shortages in Upshur County is listed below in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16 Water Supply Shortages in Upshur County

Lipsbur County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr						
Opsnur County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
BIG SANDY	19	20	20	16	12	8	А
EAST MOUNTAIN WATER SYSTEM	175	177	176	172	167	163	А
GLADEWATER	0	0	0	0	0	98	А
MANUFACTURING, UPSHUR	27	28	30	31	32	33	Α

Upshur County	Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr						
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
PRITCHETT WSC	46	49	46	37	28	19	A

4.1.18 Van Zandt County

Water supplies for Van Zandt County are met by surface water from Tawakoni, Fork, and Mill Creek Lakes, the Sabine River, and groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox aquifer. The following table, Table 4.17, is a summary of identified water supply shortages in Van Zandt County.

Table 4.17 Water Supply Shortages in Van Zandt County

Van Zandt County		Т	otal Water S	Shortage ac	⊱ft/yr		Shortage
Van Zandt County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
ABLES SPRINGS SUD	1	1	2	2	2	2	EI
BEN WHEELER WSC	0	36	82	132	183	227	А
CANTON	0	0	0	0	197	400	А
COUNTY-OTHER, VAN ZANDT	54	149	270	350	330	371	А
EDOM WSC	46	51	56	59	60	60	А
FRUITVALE WSC	0	3	18	43	76	95	А
GOLDEN WSC	0	9	19	29	39	49	А
GRAND SALINE	121	128	122	117	120	109	А
LITTLE HOPE MOORE WSC	12	20	28	36	44	48	А
MABANK	9	16	22	30	37	44	А
MACBEE SUD	389	593	843	1,167	1,582	2,123	EI
MANUFACTURING, VAN ZANDT	348	369	383	403	436	456	EI
MYRTLE SPRINGS WSC	130	192	245	314	384	449	А
PINE RIDGE WSC	31	44	55	68	82	95	А
R P M WSC	35	34	34	30	24	19	А
VAN	114	111	110	106	117	118	А

4.1.19 Wood County

Water supplies for Wood County are met by surface water from Cypress Springs Lake and Lake Fork, as well as groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox and Queen City aquifers. Water supply shortages have been identified in Wood County for the City of Quitman, livestock, and manufacturing. A summary of identified projected shortages in water supply is presented in Table 4.18.

Table 4.18	Water Supply	Shortages in	Wood County
------------	--------------	--------------	-------------

Wood County		Shortage					
wood County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
BRIGHT STAR SALEM SUD	0	0	5	46	87	128	A
GOLDEN WSC	1	12	19	30	42	53	А
LIBERTY UTILITIES SILVERLEAF WATER	331	355	370	391	412	434	Α

Wood County		Total Water Shortage ac-ft/yr							
wood County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре		
MANUFACTURING, WOOD	1,410	1,518	1,630	1,746	1,866	1,991	А		
MINING, WOOD	59	60	61	60	60	60	А		
NEW HOPE SUD	167	162	160	141	122	105	А		
RAMEY WSC	0	73	172	285	415	564	А		
SHARON WSC	1	11	17	29	42	54	А		

4.2 River Basin Summaries of Water Needs

The NETRWPA is primarily divided among four main river basins including the Red River Basin, the Sulphur River Basin, the Cypress Creek Basin, and the Sabine River Basin. There is a small area of the Neches Basin in Van Zandt County and a smaller portion of the Trinity Basin in Hunt and Van Zandt Counties.

4.2.1 Red River Basin

The Red River Basin includes portions of Bowie, Lamar, and Red River Counties. Water shortages in the Red River Basin are both contractual and actual shortages. The largest volume of shortages is associated with irrigation use, which utilizes groundwater and run-of-river water from the Red River. Table 4.19 and

Incufficient Contract	Water Shortage ac-ft/yr								
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре		
410 WSC	87	81	74	69	64	58	EI		
BURNS REDBANK WSC	260	274	291	310	329	349	EI		
CENTRAL BOWIE COUNTY WSC	118	118	119	120	121	122	EI		
COUNTY-OTHER, LAMAR	29	29	28	28	28	28	EI		
HOOKS	317	313	310	305	301	296	EI		
MANUFACTURING, LAMAR	319	324	336	319	336	388	EI		

Table 4.20 detail the shortages in the basin.

Table 4.19 Water Shortages due to Expirations and Insufficient Contract Amounts - Red River Basin

Incufficient Contract	Water Shortage ac-ft/yr								
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре		
410 WSC	87	81	74	69	64	58	EI		
BURNS REDBANK WSC	260	274	291	310	329	349	EI		
CENTRAL BOWIE COUNTY WSC	118	118	119	120	121	122	EI		
COUNTY-OTHER, LAMAR	29	29	28	28	28	28	EI		
HOOKS	317	313	310	305	301	296	EI		
MANUFACTURING, LAMAR	319	324	336	319	336	388	EI		

Actual Charters		V	/ater Shor	tage ac-ft	′yr		Shortage
Actual Shortage	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
BOIS D ARC MUD	0	0	1	1	1	1	А
DE KALB	48	48	47	47	46	45	А
IRRIGATION, BOWIE	2,184	2,184	2,184	2,184	2,184	2,184	А
IRRIGATION, LAMAR	3,883	3,883	3,883	3,883	3,883	3,883	А
IRRIGATION, RED RIVER	212	212	212	212	212	212	Α
LIVESTOCK, BOWIE	52	47	40	35	32	32	А
LIVESTOCK, LAMAR	82	82	82	82	82	82	Α
MANUFACTURING, BOWIE	289	300	311	323	335	348	А
MANUFACTURING, LAMAR	319	324	336	319	336	388	Α
NEW BOSTON	403	399	396	389	383	377	А
RIVERBEND WATER RESOURCES DISTRICT	211	209	206	203	200	196	А
TEXARKANA	840	832	825	813	802	790	А

Table 4.20 Actual Water Shortages - Red River Basin

4.2.2 Sulphur River Basin

The Sulphur River Basin includes portions of Bowie, Cass, Franklin, Hopkins, Hunt, Lamar, Morris, Red River, and Titus Counties. It also includes all of Delta County. Water shortages in the Sulphur Basin are primarily due to actual water needs, though there are several entities with needs to renew and/or increase existing contracts. Most of the actual needs are caused by the need for new infrastructure and insufficient supplies from groundwater sources. Table 4.21 and

Incufficient Contract		\	Vater Shor	tage ac-ft/y	/r		Shortage
Insuncient Contract	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
410 WSC	48	41	32	25	17	10	EI
BRASHEAR WSC	19	22	20	18	16	20	EI
BRINKER WSC	97	122	130	143	157	171	EI
CENTRAL BOWIE COUNTY WSC	651	651	657	663	669	675	EI
COUNTY-OTHER, CASS	76	56	34	15	0	0	EI
COUNTY-OTHER, LAMAR	92	85	86	86	87	85	EI
MACEDONIA EYLAU MUD 1	710	705	698	688	677	666	EI
NORTH HOPKINS WSC	231	271	297	325	354	383	EI
SHADY GROVE NO 2 WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0	EI
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY COMMERCE	276	275	275	275	275	275	EI
TRI SUD	164	193	193	184	160	123	EI

Table 4.22 detail the shortages in the basin.

Table 4.21 Water Shortages due to Expiration and Insufficient Contract Amounts – Sulphur River Basin

Insufficient Contract		Water Shortage ac-ft/yr						
insuncient Contract	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре	
410 WSC	48	41	32	25	17	10	EI	
BRASHEAR WSC	19	22	20	18	16	20	EI	
BRINKER WSC	97	122	130	143	157	171	EI	
CENTRAL BOWIE COUNTY WSC	651	651	657	663	669	675	EI	
COUNTY-OTHER, CASS	76	56	34	15	0	0	EI	
COUNTY-OTHER, LAMAR	92	85	86	86	87	85	EI	
MACEDONIA EYLAU MUD 1	710	705	698	688	677	666	EI	
NORTH HOPKINS WSC	231	271	297	325	354	383	EI	
SHADY GROVE NO 2 WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0	EI	
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY COMMERCE	276	275	275	275	275	275	EI	
TRI SUD	164	193	193	184	160	123	EI	

Table 4.22 Actual Water Shortages – Sulphur River Basin

Actual Shortage		V	Vater Sho	ortage ac-	ft/yr		Shortage
Actual Shortaye	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
BRINKER WSC	97	122	130	143	157	171	Α
CLARKSVILLE	252	179	106	49	0	0	А
COUNTY-OTHER, CASS	76	56	34	15	0	0	Α
COUNTY-OTHER, HUNT	230	209	259	217	146	103	Α
COUNTY-OTHER, LAMAR	92	85	86	86	87	85	Α
COUNTY-OTHER, RED RIVER	30	12	0	0	0	0	А
DE KALB	218	215	214	210	208	205	А
DELTA COUNTY MUD	0	0	0	0	22	204	А
HICKORY CREEK SUD	75	101	129	164	204	249	А
IRRIGATION, BOWIE	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	3,032	А
IRRIGATION, HOPKINS	3,673	3,673	3,673	3,673	3,673	3,673	А
IRRIGATION, HUNT	69	69	69	69	69	69	Α
IRRIGATION, LAMAR	808	808	808	808	808	808	Α
IRRIGATION, RED RIVER	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,469	Α
LIVESTOCK, BOWIE	113	102	88	74	69	69	А
LIVESTOCK, DELTA	220	220	220	220	220	220	Α
LIVESTOCK, FRANKLIN	118	118	118	118	118	118	Α
LIVESTOCK, HUNT	39	39	39	39	39	39	Α
LIVESTOCK, RED RIVER	145	145	145	145	145	145	Α
MANUFACTURING, BOWIE	1,512	1,569	1,629	1,690	1,754	1,820	Α
MANUFACTURING, CASS	3,534	4,873	6,261	7,698	9,190	10,737	Α
MAUD	164	162	161	158	156	153	А

Actual Shortage			Shortage				
Actual Shortage	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
NASH	314	309	306	302	297	292	Α
NEW BOSTON	906	898	889	876	862	848	А
NORTH HUNT SUD	192	182	173	162	149	139	А
REDWATER	337	333	329	323	317	311	А
RIVERBEND WATER RESOURCES DISTRICT	169	166	165	162	159	157	А
TEXARKANA	5,929	5,870	5,824	5,741	5,657	5,572	А
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY COMMERCE	276	275	275	275	275	275	Α
WAKE VILLAGE	649	641	635	625	615	605	А

4.2.3 Cypress Creek Basin

The Cypress Creek Basin includes portions of Cass, Franklin, Gregg, Harrison, Hopkins, Morris, Titus, Upshur, and Wood Counties, as well as all of Camp and Marion Counties. There are significant projected shortages in water supply in the Cypress Creek Basin. Table 4.23 and

Insufficient Contract	Water Shortage ac-ft/yr								
Insuncient Contract	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре		
HOLLY SPRINGS WSC	35	26	16	9	2	0	EI		
MANUFACTURING, CAMP	42	44	46	48	50	52	EI		
MANUFACTURING, TITUS	1,718	1,761	1,943	2,380	2,695	2,887	EI		
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	1,076	2,496	3,816	4,584	5,473	6,293	EI		
TRI SUD	333	387	379	357	305	232	EI		

Table 4.24 detail the shortages in the basin.

Table 4.23 Water Shortages due to Expiration and Insufficient Contract Amounts – Cypress Creek Basin

Incufficient Contract	Water Shortage ac-ft/yr								
insuncient Contract	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре		
HOLLY SPRINGS WSC	35	26	16	9	2	0	EI		
MANUFACTURING, CAMP	42	44	46	48	50	52	EI		
MANUFACTURING, TITUS	1,718	1,761	1,943	2,380	2,695	2,887	EI		
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	1,076	2,496	3,816	4,584	5,473	6,293	EI		
TRI SUD	333	387	379	357	305	232	EI		

Table 4.24 Actual Water Shortages – Cypress Creek Basin

Actual Charters	Water Shortage ac-ft/yr								
Actual Shonage	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре		
BI COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	7	20	35	А		
COUNTY-OTHER, CASS	285	235	182	133	82	25	А		
CYPRESS VALLEY WSC	11	14	15	17	18	19	А		
HARLETON WSC	0	0	0	0	4	8	А		
IRRIGATION, HARRISON	283	283	283	283	283	283	А		

CHAPTER 4- IDENTIFICATION OF WATER NEEDS SEPTEMBER 2024 / DRAFT / CAROLLO

Actual Shortage			Water Shor	tage ac-ft/yr			Shortage
Actual Shortage	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
IRRIGATION, HOPKINS	8	8	8	8	8	8	А
LEIGH WSC	42	0	0	0	0	0	А
LIVESTOCK, CAMP	496	496	496	496	496	496	А
LIVESTOCK, CASS	187	187	187	187	187	187	А
LIVESTOCK, FRANKLIN	190	190	190	190	190	190	А
LIVESTOCK, GREGG	16	16	16	16	16	16	А
LIVESTOCK, HOPKINS	128	124	124	120	118	118	А
LIVESTOCK, MORRIS	61	61	61	61	61	61	А
LIVESTOCK, TITUS	242	242	242	247	247	247	А
MANUFACTURING, TITUS	1,718	1,761	1,943	2,380	2,695	2,887	А
MANUFACTURING, UPSHUR	27	28	30	31	32	33	А
MINING, GREGG	0	0	0	0	1	1	А
MINING, HARRISON	433	425	416	409	399	399	А
NORTH HARRISON WSC	2	9	10	14	19	23	А
PITTSBURG	408	415	417	424	431	439	А
SCOTTSVILLE	31	42	45	56	66	76	А
SHARON WSC	5	15	21	33	46	58	А
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	1,076	2,496	3,816	4,584	5,473	6,293	А
TRYON ROAD SUD	173	243	252	321	385	461	А

4.2.4 Neches River Basin

The Neches Basin includes portions of Van Zandt and Smith Counties. The Smith County portion is not located within the NETRWPA and is not included. Supply shortages in the Neches River Basin are primarily related to groundwater sources from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. Table 4.25 details the shortages in the basin.

Table 4.25 Actual Water Shortages – Neches River Basin

Actual Chartage	Water Shortage ac-ft/yr								
Actual Shorlage	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре		
BEN WHEELER WSC	0	36	82	132	183	227	А		
EDOM WSC	46	51	56	59	60	60	А		
LITTLE HOPE MOORE WSC	4	6	9	11	14	15	А		
R P M WSC	35	34	34	30	24	19	А		
VAN	0	0	0	0	16	17	А		

4.2.5 Sabine River Basin

The Sabine Basin includes portions of Gregg, Harrison, Hunt, Smith, Upshur, Van Zandt, and Wood Counties as well as all of Rains County. The Sabine Basin has both contractual and actual shortages, and many of the actual shortages are due to deficits in groundwater supply or production. Increasing growth

in population and limited WTP capacity also results in projected shortages for the City of Greenville. Table 4.26 and

Incufficient Contract		V	ater Short	age ac-ft/yr			Shortage
insuncient Contract	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
ABLES SPRINGS SUD	5	9	16	19	22	25	EI
B H P WSC	41	133	216	287	356	413	EI
BRASHEAR WSC	36	40	38	37	37	41	EI
CADDO BASIN SUD	1,056	662	732	490	19	211	EI
CASH SUD	325	740	864	735	689	995	EI
JOSEPHINE	3	7	13	17	20	24	EI
MACBEE SUD	129	207	304	432	597	809	EI
MANUFACTURING, GREGG	0	38	98	160	224	291	EI
MANUFACTURING, SMITH	0	0	7	8	7	9	EI
MANUFACTURING, VAN ZANDT	348	369	383	403	436	456	EI
POETRY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0	EI
ROYSE CITY	57	179	329	475	629	771	EI
SHADY GROVE NO 2 WSC	14	15	14	13	12	15	EI
SOUTH RAINS SUD	0	12	28	49	70	92	EI

Table 4.27 detail the shortages in the basin.

Table 4.26 Water Shortages due to Expiration and Insufficient Contract Amounts – Sabine River Basin

Insufficient Contract		W	ater Shorta	age ac-ft/yr			Shortage
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
ABLES SPRINGS SUD	5	9	16	19	22	25	EI
B H P WSC	41	133	216	287	356	413	EI
BRASHEAR WSC	36	40	38	37	37	41	EI
CADDO BASIN SUD	1,056	662	732	490	19	211	EI
CASH SUD	325	740	864	735	689	995	EI
JOSEPHINE	3	7	13	17	20	24	EI
MACBEE SUD	129	207	304	432	597	809	EI
MANUFACTURING, GREGG	0	38	98	160	224	291	EI
MANUFACTURING, SMITH	0	0	7	8	7	9	EI
MANUFACTURING, VAN ZANDT	348	369	383	403	436	456	EI
POETRY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0	EI
ROYSE CITY	57	179	329	475	629	771	EI
SHADY GROVE NO 2 WSC	14	15	14	13	12	15	EI
SOUTH RAINS SUD	0	12	28	49	70	92	EI

Astual Charters		٧	Vater Shor	tage ac-ft/y	/r		Shortage
Actual Shortage	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
ABLES SPRINGS SUD	5	9	16	19	22	25	А
B H P WSC	41	133	216	287	356	413	А
BIG SANDY	19	20	20	16	12	8	A
BRIGHT STAR SALEM SUD	0	0	5	46	87	128	А
CANTON	0	0	0	0	197	400	А
CASH SUD	325	740	864	735	689	995	А
CELESTE	14	19	24	28	32	35	А
COUNTY-OTHER, VAN ZANDT	54	149	270	350	330	371	А
CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	204	296	363	393	417	443	А
EAST MOUNTAIN WATER SYSTEM	215	218	217	212	206	202	А
EAST TEXAS MUD	172	385	537	678	820	962	А
FRUITVALE WSC	0	3	18	43	76	95	А
GLADEWATER	0	0	0	0	0	98	А
GOLDEN WSC	1	22	39	60	82	103	А
GRAND SALINE	121	128	122	117	120	109	А
GREENVILLE	13,658	16,254	17,865	19,224	20,604	21,801	А
HALLSVILLE	0	0	0	0	0	23	А
HICKORY CREEK SUD	90	125	170	220	276	343	А
IRRIGATION, HARRISON	191	191	191	191	191	191	А
IRRIGATION, HOPKINS	106	106	106	106	106	106	А
IRRIGATION, HUNT	124	124	124	124	124	124	А
IRRIGATION, RAINS	3	3	3	3	3	3	А
IRRIGATION, SMITH	156	156	156	156	156	156	А
LIBERTY CITY WSC	1	3	5	7	9	11	А
LIBERTY UTILITIES SILVERLEAF WATER	331	355	370	391	412	434	А
LINDALE	86	116	153	154	150	158	А
LINDALE RURAL WSC	291	419	514	594	675	756	А
LITTLE HOPE MOORE WSC	8	14	19	25	30	33	А
LIVESTOCK, HUNT	23	23	23	23	23	23	А
MACBEE SUD	129	207	304	432	597	809	А
MANUFACTURING, GREGG	0	38	98	160	224	291	A
MANUFACTURING, SMITH	0	0	7	8	7	9	А
MANUFACTURING, VAN ZANDT	348	369	383	403	436	456	A
MANUFACTURING, WOOD	1,410	1,518	1,630	1,746	1,866	1,991	A
MILLER GROVE WSC	36	48	54	62	72	80	A
MINING, HARRISON	1,419	1,409	1,400	1,392	1,383	1,383	A
MINING, WOOD	59	60	61	60	60	60	Α

Table 4.27 Actual Water Shortages – Sabine River Basin

Actual Shortage		۷	Vater Shor	tage ac-ft/y	'n		Shortage
Actual Shortage	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
MYRTLE SPRINGS WSC	37	55	70	90	110	129	А
NEW HOPE SUD	167	162	160	141	122	105	А
PINE RIDGE WSC	31	44	55	68	82	106	А
PRITCHETT WSC	46	49	46	37	28	19	А
RAMEY WSC	0	73	172	285	415	564	А
SCOTTSVILLE	91	116	118	144	170	194	А
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	0	0	64	116	170	223	А
STAR MOUNTAIN WSC	31	42	52	57	63	69	А
VAN	114	111	110	106	101	101	А
WEST GREGG SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0	А
WHITE OAK	66	88	69	26	0	0	А
WINONA	11	30	43	55	66	77	Α

4.2.6 Trinity River Basin

The Trinity Basin includes portions of Hunt and Van Zandt Counties. Actual shortages have been identified and are presented in Table 4.28 and Table 4.29 detail the shortages in this basin.

Table 4.28 Water Shortages due to Expiration and Insufficient Contract Amounts – Trinity River Basin

Incufficient Contract	Water Shortage ac-ft/yr						
Insunicient Contract	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре
MACBEE SUD	268	387	539	735	985	1,314	EI

Table 4.29 Actual Water Shortages – Trinity River Basin

Actual Chartage			Water Shor	tage ac-ft/yr	age ac-ft/yr				
Actual Shortage	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	Туре		
HICKORY CREEK SUD	59	76	96	118	144	174	А		
LIVESTOCK, HUNT	14	14	14	13	13	13	А		
MABANK	9	16	22	30	37	44	А		
MYRTLE SPRINGS WSC	93	137	175	224	274	320	А		

4.3 Summary of Needs – Major Water Providers

The following section presents the supply/demand analysis for the <u>2918</u> Major Water Providers and additional WUG Sellers in the North East Texas Region that sell more than 1,000 acre-feet in any one year (which thus also represents Wholesale Water Providers for the purposes of the 20261 Region D Plan). Table 4.30 presents the summary of contractual needs by Major Water Provider, which considers the potential full legal demand of WWP/WUG Sellers' customers. Subsequent tables present a perspective based on the total water supply for each major water provider assuming that current contracts, permits, and water rights are held constant, and need is assessed by comparison of supply to projected demands, as shown in Tables 4.31 – 4.59.

NORTH EAST TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP 2026 REGION D WATER PLAN

WUGS.

Commented [TS1]: THIS SECTION TO BE UPDATED

BASED ON CONTINUING INPUT FROM MWPS AND

The sales/transfer amounts presented in these tables are comprised of current customers' projected demands up to their current contractual maximums. If (1) an individual customer's projected demand is lower than their contractual maximum, these tables display a sale/transfer amount equivalent to the projected demand. For those instances (2) where an individual customer's projected demand exceeds that customer's current contractual maximum, the sale/transfer amount presented is equivalent to the current contractual maximum. For either (1) or (2), if supply is the limiting factor then the resultant sale/transfer amount is equivalent to the available supply, whichever is most restrictive. Self-supplied amounts are identified for those WUGs who have not only wholesale water customers, but also their own projected WUG demand.

While this presentation in Tables 4.31 – 4.59 alone does not portray the total current contracted amounts as the full legal demand on supply such as that shown in Table 4.30, it gives wholesale water providers a good approximation of what future demands will be if all current users continue with existing supplies and contracts at projected TWDB demands. Also included in Tables 4.31 – 4.59 is a breakdown of customers with projected needs for each WWP. This additional depiction provides a supplemental perspective to WWPs regarding their existing customers' identified projected needs in the Region D Plan. This represents an indication of potential customer need that could be relevant to an existing WWP. A characterization of the projected demands on supply, by WWP and WUG seller, is presented in Appendix C3-5, while a characterization of the full legal contractual demand on supply, by WWP and WUG seller, is presented in Appendix C3-6.

Name	WWP/WUG Seller	Use	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
		ΜΑΝΙ		<u>^</u>			<u>^</u>	â
BI COUNTY WSC	WUG Seller		0	0	0	0	0	0
BRIGHT STAR SALEM SUD	WILIG Seller	MUN	0	0	0	0	0	0
CASH SUD	WUG Seller	MUN	541	0	0	075	1126	1101
	WOO Geller	MUN	041	032	099	0/0	0	0
COMPANY	MWP	POWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMMERCE	WUG Seller	MUN	516	516	516	516	516	516
COOPER	WIIG Seller	MUN	96	20	00	02	110	300
EMORY	WUG Seller	MUN	527	526	526	525	525	505
ERANKI IN COUNTY WD	MWP	MUN	1464	1916	2169	2523	020	3204
GLADEWATER	WUG Seller	MUN	0	0	2100	2521	2012	0
GRAND SALINE	WUG Seller	MAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
GREENVILLE	WUG Seller	MUN	1909	1927	1726	1502	1/9/	1/21
		POWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
HUGHES SPRINGS	WUG Seller	MUN	0	0	0	0	0	0
KILGORE	WUG Seller	MUN	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAMAR COUNTY WSD	WUG Seller	MUN	130	130	130	130	130	130
		MAN	2040	2042	2042	2042	2042	2042
LONGVIEW	WUG Seller	MUN	2940	1015	2942	2942	1015	2942
Lonovien		POWER	0	04045	04045	04045	0	0
		MAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARSHALL	WUG Seller	MUN	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
MOUNT PLEASANT	WUG Seller	MUN	1	420	818	1180	1513	1831
		MAN	100	100	100	100	100	100
NORTHEAST TEXAS MWD	MWP	MUN	32302	30300	30300	30300	30300	32302
		POWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAN	0	0	25	103	580	571
PARIS	WUG Seller	MUN	0	0	0	0	0	0
		POWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
POINT	WUG Seller	MAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
RIVERBEND WATER	WILC Seller	MAN	59928	66509	74735	82961	10081 3	10081 3
RESOURCES DISTRICT	WUG Sellel	MUN	12434	12697	12998	13391	13746	- 13748

Table 4.30 Contractual Needs by Major Water Provider

Name	WWP/WUG Seller	Use	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
		IRR	0	0	0	0	0	0
		MAN	0	343	376	408	443	478
		MIN	0	0	0	0	0	0
SADINE RIVER AUTHORIT		MUN	49769	38663	41593	44759	48118	48067
		POWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
		WWP	619	546	636	726	806	908
SULPHUR RIVER MWD	MWP	MUN	1072	1072	1072	1072	1072	1072
		LIV	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MUC Soller	MAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
SULFIUK SFRINGS	WOG Seller	MIN	132	146	159	173	189	214
		MUN	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEXARKANA	WUG Seller	MUN	57370	57377	57384	57385	57385	57385
		MUN	11100	11100	11100	11100	11100	11100
	IVIVIP	POWER	2700	3240	3780	4320	4860	5400
WHITE OAK	WUG Seller	MUN	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRAND TOTAL			239683	237057	249939	263527	286813	288241

4.3.1 Bi County Water Supply Corporation

Bi County Water Supply Corporation (WSC) gets its water supplies directly from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. The water district supplies water to Camp and Titus counties for their manufacturing and power needs, respectively, as well as its own municipal needs. As shown in Table 4.31, Bi County WSC has a small surplus of 17 ac-ft/yr.

Table 4.51 Water Supplies and Demands for Dright Star Salem Water Supply Corporat	Table 4.31	Water Supplies and	Demands for Bright	Star Salem W	/ater Supply	Corporation
---	------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------------	-------------

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	1,846	1,846	1,846	1,846	1,846	1,846
TOTAL	1,846	1,846	1,846	1,846	1,846	1,846
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
MANUFACTURING, CAMP	2	2	2	2	2	2
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	3	3	3	3	3	3
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
BI COUNTY WSC	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824
TOTAL	1,829	1,829	1,829	1,829	1,829	1,829
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	17	17	17	17	17	17

<u>Customers of Bi County WSC are projected to have shortages beginning in 2030.</u> Table 4.32 presents the <u>Bi County WSC customer WUGs with projected shortages.</u>

 Table 4.32
 Bi County Water Supply Corporation Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MANUFACTURING, CAMP	42	44	46	48	50	52
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	0	0	0	1	1	1
TOTAL	42	44	46	49	51	53

4.3.2 Bright Star Salem Special Utility District

Bright Star Salem Special Utility District (SUD) buys supplies from the Sabine River Authority, which come from Fork Lake, and gets additional direct supply from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. The water district supplies water to South Rains SUD, as well as its own municipal needs. As shown in Table 4.33, Bright Star Salem has a surplus.

Table 4.33 Water Supplies and Demands for Bright Star Salem Special Utility District

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	777	777	777	777	777	777
FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	354	758	750	742	734	725
TOTAL	1,131	1,535	1,527	1,519	1,511	1,502
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
SOUTH RAINS SUD	90	90	90	90	90	90
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
BRIGHT STAR SALEM SUD	1,445	1,437	1,429	1,421	1,412	1,412
TOTAL	1,535	1,527	1,519	1,511	1,502	1,502
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	-404	8	8	8	9	0

Bright Star Salem SUD's customer, South Rains SUD, is projected to have shortages beginning in 2040. Table 4.34 presents these projected shortages.

 Table 4.34
 Bright Star Salem Special Utility District Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
SOUTH RAINS SUD	0	4	9	16	23	30
TOTAL	0	4	9	16	23	30

4.3.3 Cash SUD

Cash SUD is a public water supply located primarily in Hunt County. The special utility district sells water to the City of Lone Oak<u>Caddo Mills, Hunt County</u>, and the City of Quinlan. In addition to meeting the needs of its retail customers, Cash SUD supplies water to consumers in Hunt, Hopkins, Rains and Rockwall counties. Current water supply is from the Sabine River Authority (SRA) and North Texas Municipal Water District (NTMWD). Cash SUD is projected to have water supply deficits_in the current planning period, as shown in Table 4.35.

Table 4.35 Water Supplies and Demands for Cash SUD

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	3,325
INDIRECT REUSE	372	355	334	322	307	298
NORTH TEXAS MWD LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	624	521	441	387	352	330
TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,701	1,780	1,839	2,285	3,437	2,364
TOTAL	2,697	2,656	2,614	2,994	4,096	6,317
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
CADDO MILLS	67	67	67	67	67	67
COUNTY-OTHER, HUNT	374	604	790	1,200	1,908	1,908
QUINLAN	240	258	276	292	307	322
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
CASH SUD	2,595	2,558	2,883	3,437	3,699	3,684
TOTAL	3,276	3,487	4,016	4,996	5,981	5,981
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	-579	-831	-1,402	-2,002	-1,885	336

Hunt County-Other, which obtains supply from Cash SUD, is projected to have increasing shortages starting in $20\frac{2}{3}40$, as presented in Table 4.36.

Table 4.36 Cash SUD Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
COUNTY-OTHER, HUNT	193	185	204	184	131	93
TOTAL	193	185	204	184	131	93

4.3.4 Cherokee Water Company

This provider supplies the City of Longview and industry with surface water supply from Lake Cherokee in Gregg and Rusk Counties, Region I. Longview obtains water from three major water providers, Cherokee Water, Sabine River Authority, and Northeast Texas Municipal Water District, as well as owning water rights from the Sabine River. At projected sale/transfer Cherokee Water Company will have adequate supply, as shown in Table 4.37.

Table 4.37 Water Supplies and Demands for Cherokee Water Company

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CHEROKEE LAKE/RESERVOIR	31,456	31,309	31,162	31,015	30,867	30,720
TOTAL	31,456	31,309	31,162	31,015	30,867	30,720
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
LONGVIEW	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, GREGG	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,094
TOTAL	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,094
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	13,456	13,309	13,162	13,015	12,867	12,626

4.3.5 City of Commerce (Commerce Water District)

The City of Commerce is served by the Commerce Water District, located in Hunt County, which buys most of its water from the Sabine River Authority, with additional supply from five wells into the Nacatoch Aquifer. The city also has a contract with the Sulphur River Municipal Water District (SRMWD) for 16,000 ac-ft/yr, which has been leased to the Upper Trinity for 50 years. Commerce supplies North Hunt SUD, Texas A&M University Commerce, Gafford Chapel WSC, rural areas in Delta and Hunt Countyies, and Manufacturing in Hunt County. In addition, Commerce Water District serves its own municipal needs. Available supplies, demands, and needs are shown in Table 4.38.

Table 4.38 Water Supplies and Demands for Commerce

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
NACATOCH AQUIFER	322	322	322	322	322	322
TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,629	6,025	5,975	5,531	3,917	3,884
TOTAL	1,951	6,347	6,297	5,853	4,239	4,206
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, DELTA	74	74	74	74	74	74
GAFFORD CHAPEL WSC	3	3	3	3	3	3
MANUFACTURING, HUNT	67	67	67	67	67	67
NORTH HUNT SUD	147	147	147	147	147	147
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY COMMERCE	1	1	1	1	1	1
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
COMMERCE	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130
TOTAL	2,422	2,422	2,422	2,422	2,422	2,422
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	-471	3,925	3,875	3,431	1,817	1,784

Customers of the City of Commerce are projected to have shortages beginning in 20<u>3</u>20. Table 4.39 presents the City of Commerce customer WUGs with projected shortages.

 Table 4.39
 City of Commerce Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
NORTH HUNT SUD	135	131	126	121	114	107
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY COMMERCE	2	2	2	2	2	2
TOTAL	137	133	128	123	116	109

4.3.6 City of Cooper

1

The City of Cooper supplies Delta County MUD, as well as rural portions of Delta and Hunt counties. The city also supplies its own municipal needs. The City of Cooper buys water from Sulphur River MWD, coming from the Chapman/Cooper Lake Non-System Portion, and supplies its own additional water from Big Creek Lake. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.40.

Table 4.40 Water Supplies and Demands for City of Cooper

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BIG CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR	940	752	564	376	188	0
CHAPMAN/COOPER LAKE/RESERVOIR NON-SYSTEM PORTION	767	749	731	712	694	676
SULPHUR RUN-OF-RIVER	60	60	60	60	60	60
TOTAL	1,767	1,561	1,355	1,148	942	736
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, DELTA	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER, HUNT	0	0	0	0	0	0
DELTA COUNTY MUD	198	202	205	209	188	0
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
COOPER	1,509	1,299	1,090	879	694	676
TOTAL	1,707	1,501	1,295	1,088	882	676
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	60	60	60	60	60	60

<u>Customers of the City of Cooper are projected to have shortages beginning in 2070.</u> Table 4.41 presents <u>City of Cooper customer WUGs with projected shortages.</u>

 Table 4.41
 City of Cooper Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
COUNTY-OTHER, HUNT	0	0	0	0	0	0
DELTA COUNTY MUD	0	0	0	0	23	215
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	23	215

4.3.7 City of Emory

The City of Emory supplies East Tawakoni and rural portions of Rains Countyand South Rains SUD. In addition, the city serves its own municipal needs. The City of Emory buys water from the Sabine River Authority. The current contract with the authority is for 3,229 ac-ft/yr. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.42.

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,218	1,267	1,272	1,276	1,280	1,283
TOTAL	1,218	1,267	1,272	1,276	1,280	1,283
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
EAST TAWAKONI	246	247	247	248	248	248
SOUTH RAINS SUD	192	188	187	187	188	188
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
EMORY	829	837	842	845	847	847
TOTAL	1,267	1,272	1,276	1,280	1,283	1,283
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	-49	-5	-4	-4	-3	0

Table 4.42Water Supplies and Demands for City of Emory

South Rains SUD, a customer of the City of Emory, is projected to have shortages beginning in 2040. Table 4.43 presents these projected shortages.

 Table 4.43
 City of Emory Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
SOUTH RAINS SUD	0	8	19	33	47	62
TOTAL	0	8	19	33	47	62

4.3.8 Franklin County Water District

The Franklin County Water District (FCWD) holds water rights in Lake Cypress Springs of 15,300 ac-ft, which exceeds the firm yield calculated for the reservoir using the Cypress Basin WAM. FCWD serves wholesale customers only, which include Cypress Springs SUD, the City of Mount Vernon, and the City of Winnsboro. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.44.

Table 4.44 Water Supplies and Demands for Franklin County Water District

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CYPRESS SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR	8,036	7,684	7,332	6,980	6,628	6,276
TOTAL	8,036	7,684	7,332	6,980	6,628	6,276
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
CYPRESS SPRINGS SUD	3,806	3,640	3,473	3,306	3,140	2,973
MOUNT VERNON	2,538	2,426	2,315	2,204	2,093	1,982
WINNSBORO	1,692	1,618	1,544	1,469	1,395	1,321
TOTAL	8,036	7,684	7,332	6,979	6,628	6,276
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	0	0	0	1	0	0

4.3.9 City of Gladewater

The City of Gladewater gets its water supplies directly from Gladewater Lake. The city supplies water to rural areas of Gregg, Smith, and Upshur counties, as well as its own municipal needs. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.45.

Table 4.45 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Gladewater

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
GLADEWATER LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,560
TOTAL	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,560
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, GREGG	154	154	154	154	154	54
COUNTY-OTHER, SMITH	23	23	23	23	23	23
COUNTY-OTHER, UPSHUR	112	112	112	112	112	112
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
GLADEWATER	1,579	1,579	1,579	1,579	1,579	1,371
TOTAL	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,560
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

4.3.10 Golden Water Supply Corporation

Golden Water Supply Corporation (WSC) gets its water supplies directly from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. The company currently does not supply any other WUGs, but does provide its own municipal water supplies. Table 4.46 provides available supplies and demands for this company.

Table 4.46 Water Supplies and Demands for Golden Water Supply Corporation

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	565	565	565	565	565	565
TOTAL	565	565	565	565	565	565
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
GOLDEN WSC	392	392	392	392	392	392
TOTAL	392	392	392	392	392	392
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	173	173	173	173	173	173

4.3.11 City of Greenville

The City of Greenville owns several small city lakes, which have a combined firm yield of 3,421 ac-ft/yr. In addition, Greenville has a contract with the Sabine River Authority for supply from Lake Tawakoni. Greenville supplies water to its own municipal, mining, and industrial customers as well as Jacobia WSC, Shady Grove WSC, and the City of Caddo Mills. The City currently owns and operates a 13 MGD WTP (approx. 8,090 ac-ft/yr with 1.8 peaking factor), and supplies 373 ac-ft/yr of raw water supply to steam-electric power generation in Hunt County. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.47₃ Greenville has a projected water supply deficit beginning in 2020.

Table 4.47 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Greenville

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
GREENVILLE CITY LAKE/RESERVOIR	3,318	3,318	3,318	3,318	3,318	3,318
TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR	10,297	20,362	20,194	20,027	19,879	19,690
TOTAL	13,615	23,680	23,512	23,345	23,197	23,008
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
CADDO MILLS	186	201	242	309	319	319
COUNTY-OTHER, HUNT	806	806	806	806	806	734
MANUFACTURING, HUNT	965	1,146	1,319	1,438	1,624	1,624
SHADY GROVE SUD	174	220	280	357	455	580
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, HUNT	373	373	373	373	373	373
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
GREENVILLE	5,752	5,553	5,338	5,147	4,950	4,950
TOTAL	8,256	8,299	8,358	8,430	8,527	8,580
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	5,359	15,381	15,154	14,915	14,670	14,428

Several customers of City of Greenville are projected to have shortages beginning in 2020. Table 4.64 presents the City of Greenville customer WUGs with projected shortages.

4.3.12 City of Grand Saline

The City of Grand Saline supplies manufacturing in Van Zandt county, as well as its own municipal needs. The city supplies its own water from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.48.

 Table 4.48
 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Grand Saline

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	360	360	374	379	376	388
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	112	112	112	112	112	112
TOTAL	472	472	486	491	488	500
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
MANUFACTURING, VAN ZANDT	15	15	15	15	14	14
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
GRAND SALINE	345	345	359	364	362	374
TOTAL	360	360	374	379	376	388
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	112	112	112	112	112	112

Manufacturing in Van Zandt, a customer of the City of Grand Saline, is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030. Table 4.49 presents these projected shortages.

Table 4.49 City of Grand Saline Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MANUFACTURING, VAN ZANDT	18	20	21	22	23	24
TOTAL	18	20	21	22	23	24

4.3.13 City of Hughes Springs

The City of Hughes Springs supplies Holly Springs WSC, as well as its own municipal needs. The city buys water from Northeast Texas MWD, coming from Lake O' the Pines. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.48.

Table 4.50 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Hughes Springs

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR	656	656	656	656	656	656
TOTAL	656	656	656	656	656	656
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
HOLLY SPRINGS WSC	92	92	92	92	92	92
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
HUGHES SPRINGS	562	562	562	562	562	562
TOTAL	654	654	654	654	654	654

SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	2	2	2	2	2	2

Holly Springs WSC, a customer of the City of Hughes Springs, is projected to have shortages beginning in 2030. Table 4.51 presents these projected shortages.

Table 4.51 City of Grand Saline Customer Entity Shortages

Table 4.52 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Hughes Springs

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
HOLLY SPRINGS WSC	35	26	16	9	2	0
TOTAL	35	26	16	9	2	0

4.3.14 City of Kilgore

The City of Kilgore supplies Cross Roads SUD, rural areas of Gregg county, and its own municipal needs. The city buys water from the Sabine River Authority, coming from Fork Lake, and provides additional supplies itself from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.52.

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	1,554	1,554	1,554	1,554	1,554	1,554
FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,240	6,063	5,998	5,937	5,919	6,411
TOTAL	3,794	7,617	7,552	7,491	7,473	7,965
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, GREGG	621	663	730	808	900	900
CROSS ROADS SUD	307	324	349	380	413	413
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
KILGORE	6,630	6,506	6,353	6,226	6,593	6,593
TOTAL	7,558	7,493	7,432	7,414	7,906	7,906
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	-3,764	124	120	77	-433	59

4.3.15 Lamar County Water Supply District

Lamar County Water Supply District (LCWSD) buys water from the City of Paris, the source being Pat Mayse Lake. The water district supplies water to several other water supply companies and cities, manufacturing, and its own retail needs. As shown in Table 4.53, LCWSD has a water supply surplus.

Table 4.53 Water Supplies and Demands for Lamar County Water Supply District

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
PAT MAYSE LAKE/RESERVOIR	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442
TOTAL	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
410 WSC	218	213	212	211	211	211
BLOSSOM	230	245	245	245	245	245
COUNTY-OTHER, LAMAR	280	285	283	281	279	279
COUNTY-OTHER, RED RIVER	250	247	247	247	247	247
MANUFACTURING, LAMAR	900	941	976	1,042	1,077	1,077
RED RIVER COUNTY WSC	184	184	184	184	184	184
RENO (LAMAR)	699	754	814	873	935	935
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
LAMAR COUNTY WSD	8,796	8,715	8,655	8,597	8,512	8,512
TOTAL	11,557	11,584	11,616	11,680	11,690	11,690
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	1,885	1,858	1,826	1,762	1,752	1,752

While LCWSD does not have any projected water supply shortages, Lamar County-Otherseveral of their customers are projected to have shortages beginning in 20<u>3</u>20, as shown in Table 4.54.

Table 4.54 LCWSD Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
410 WSC	135	122	106	94	81	68
COUNTY-OTHER, LAMAR	121	114	114	114	115	113
COUNTY-OTHER, RED RIVER	14	6	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING, LAMAR	315	320	332	315	332	384
TOTAL	584	561	547	507	497	514

4.3.16 City of Longview

The City of Longview purchases water supplies from the Northeast Texas Municipal Water District (NETMWD), Cherokee Water Co., SRA, and owns water rights on Big Sandy Creek and the Sabine River. Table 4.55 shows Longview is projected to have a supply surplus throughout the planning periodstarting in 2040.

Table 4.55 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Longview

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BIG SANDY CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680
CHEROKEE LAKE/RESERVOIR	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
DIRECT REUSE	6,161	6,161	6,161	6,161	6,161	6,161
FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	8,000	18,042	17,850	17,666	17,470	17,271
O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	12,670	12,670	12,670	12,670	12,670	12,670
TOTAL	65,511	75,553	75,361	75,177	74,981	74,782
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, GREGG	50	50	50	50	50	50
ELDERVILLE WSC	566	566	566	566	566	566
GUM SPRINGS WSC	2,940	2,940	2,940	2,940	2,940	2,940
HALLSVILLE	887	887	887	887	887	887
MANUFACTURING, GREGG	1,092	1,092	1,092	1,092	1,092	1,092
MANUFACTURING, HARRISON	5,404	5,404	5,404	5,404	5,404	5,404
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, HARRISON	6,161	6,161	6,161	6,161	6,161	6,161
WHITE OAK	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
LONGVIEW	52,243	52,276	52,308	52,343	52,378	52,378
TOTAL	72,023	72,056	72,088	72,123	72,158	72,158
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	-6,512	3,497	3,273	3,054	2,823	2,624

The City of Longview's identified projected customer shortages are presented in Table 4.56.

Table 4.56 City of Longview Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
HALLSVILLE	0	0	0	0	0	21
MANUFACTURING, GREGG	0	26	68	111	156	202
WHITE OAK	66	88	69	26	0	0
TOTAL	0	12	41	82	121	162

4.3.17 City of Marshall

This water provider, located in Harrison County, supplies water to several water supply corporations including Cypress Valley WSC, Talley WSC, Gill WSC, and <u>Harrison County Leigh WSC</u>, with water from the Big Cypress Bayou and Lake O' the Pines. It also supplies its own water needs. Marshall is projected to have sufficient supplies, as shown in Table 4.57.

Table 4.57 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Marshall

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CYPRESS RUN-OF-RIVER	7,240	7,240	7,240	7,240	7,240	7,240
O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
TOTAL	16,240	16,240	16,240	16,240	16,240	16,240
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, HARRISON	323	323	323	323	323	323
GILL WSC	100	100	100	100	100	100
MANUFACTURING, HARRISON	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
MARSHALL	13,817	13,817	13,817	13,817	13,817	13,817
TOTAL	16,240	16,240	16,240	16,240	16,240	16,240
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

Customers of the City of Marshall are not projected to have shortages during the planning period.

4.3.18 City of Mount Pleasant

The City of Mount Pleasant has water rights in Lake Cypress Springs and Lake Tankersley. The city also has a contract with Titus County Freshwater Supply District for 30,000 ac-ft from Lake Bob Sandlin. Mount Pleasant provides water to its own municipal customers as well as some of the manufacturing users in Titus County. Mount Pleasant's wholesale customers include Tri SUD and the City of Winfield. Lake Bob Sandlin State Park is a separate entity from Mount Pleasant, but is treated as a retail customer. The city is projected to have a surplus of 13,910 ac-ft/yr in 2020, reducing to a surplus of 9,392 ac-ft/yr by 2070, asAs shown in Table 4.58, the city is projected to have surpluses throughout the planning period.

Table 4.58	Water S	Supplies a	and E	Demands	for the	City of	of N	<i>l</i> ount	Pleasant
------------	---------	------------	-------	---------	---------	---------	------	---------------	----------

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BOB SANDLIN LAKE/RESERVOIR	18,900	18,900	18,900	18,900	18,900	18,900
CYPRESS RUN-OF-RIVER	400	400	400	400	400	400
CYPRESS SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,464	2,356	2,248	2,140	2,032	1,924
TANKERSLEY LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
TOTAL	23,264	23,156	23,048	22,940	22,832	22,724
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, FRANKLIN	14	16	17	17	17	17
COUNTY-OTHER, TITUS	687	743	776	810	848	890
MANUFACTURING, TITUS	3,345	3,409	3,472	3,483	3,617	3,651
TRI SUD	1,727	1,859	2,011	2,200	2,417	2,650
SELF-SUPPLIED:						

MOUNT PLEASANT		17,237	16,880	16,538	16,041	15,624	15,516
	TOTAL	23,010	22,907	22,814	22,551	22,523	22,724
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
	TOTAL	254	249	234	389	309	0

Table 4.59 presents the City of Mount Pleasant customer WUGs with projected shortages. Manufacturing customers of the City of Mount Pleasant are projected to have shortages beginning in 2030.

Table 4.59 City of Mount Pleasant Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MANUFACTURING, TITUS	345	339	375	505	602	645
TRI SUD	497	580	572	541	465	355
TOTAL	842	919	947	1,046	1,067	1,000

4.3.19 Northeast Texas Municipal Water District

The Northeast Texas Municipal Water District (NETMWD) obtains water from numerous sources, listed below, and supplies the cities of Avinger, Daingerfield, Hughes Springs, Jefferson, Lone Star, Longview, Marshall, Ore City, and Pittsburg. Also supplied are Diana SUD, Harleton WSC, Tryon Road SUD, and Mims WSC. The NETMWD has existing contracts to supply an aggregate of 46,668 ac-ft to three power plants owned by AEP-SWEPCO and one power plant operated by Luminant. U.S. Steel has a contractual right to 32,400 ac-ft of water in Lake O' the Pines. The NETMWD is projected to maintain a supply surplus throughout the planning period, which is shown in Table 4.60.

Table 4.60 Water Supplies and Demands for Northeast Texas Municipal Water District

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BOB SANDLIN LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	0
ELLISON CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR	22,180	22,180	22,180	22,180	22,180	22,180
MONTICELLO LAKE/RESERVOIR	5,000	4,560	4,120	3,680	3,240	2,800
O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR	159,000	157,500	156,000	154,500	153,000	151,500
WELSH LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,900	2,620	2,340	2,060	1,780	1,500
TOTAL	189,080	186,860	184,640	182,420	180,200	177,980
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
AVINGER	302	302	302	302	302	302
COUNTY-OTHER, CASS	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER, MARION	169	169	169	169	169	169
DAINGERFIELD	1,582	1,582	1,582	1,582	1,582	1,582
DIANA SUD	595	595	595	595	595	595
HARLETON WSC	68	68	68	68	68	68
HUGHES SPRINGS	656	656	656	656	656	656
JEFFERSON	1,509	1,509	1,509	1,509	1,509	1,509
LONE STAR	747	747	747	747	747	747

NORTH EAST TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP 2026 REGION D WATER PLAN

4-34

LONGVIEW	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
MANUFACTURING, CAMP	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING, MORRIS	45,437	45,437	45,437	45,437	45,437	45,437
MARSHALL	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
MIMS WSC	896	896	896	896	896	896
ORE CITY	1,504	1,504	1,504	1,504	1,504	1,504
PITTSBURG	0	0	0	0	0	0
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, HARRISON	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	22,300	21,580	20,860	20,140	19,420	18,700
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, MARION	6,668	6,668	6,668	6,668	6,668	6,668
TRYON ROAD SUD	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822
TOTAL	131,255	130,535	129,815	129,095	128,375	127,655
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	57,825	56,325	54,825	53,325	51,825	50,325

While NETMWD does not have any projected water supply shortages, several NETMWD customers are projected to have shortages beginning in 20230, predominantly from currently projected needs for steam electric power generation as shown in Table 4.61.

Table 4.61 NETMWD Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
HARLETON WSC	0	0	0	0	1	1
MANUFACTURING, CAMP	0	0	0	0	0	0
PITTSBURG	0	0	0	0	0	0
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	800	1,872	2,893	3,435	4,180	4,899
TRYON ROAD SUD	151	211	218	259	287	343
TOTAL	948	2,082	3,110	3,694	4,467	5,244

4.3.20 City of Paris

The City of Paris, located within Lamar County, has water rights in Lake Crook and in Pat Mayse Lake. Paris serves its own municipal, steam electric and manufacturing needs. In addition, the city has wholesale contracts with Lamar County Water Supply District and MJC WSC. The city is projected to have a surplus of 30,111 ac-ft/yr in 2020, slightly reducing to a surplus of 28,523 ac-ft/yr by 2070sufficient supplies throughout the planning period, as shown in Table 4.62.

Table 4.62 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Paris

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CROOK LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,592	1,592	1,592	1,592	1,592	1,592
PAT MAYSE LAKE/RESERVOIR	30,244	30,244	30,244	30,244	30,244	30,244
TOTAL	31,836	31,836	31,836	31,836	31,836	31,836
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
MANUFACTURING, LAMAR	5,340	5,580	5,762	5,780	5,797	5,815
LAMAR COUNTY WSD	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, LAMAR	8,961	8,961	8,961	8,961	8,961	8,961
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
PARIS	4,093	3,853	3,671	3,653	3,636	3,618
TOTAL	31,836	31,836	31,836	31,836	31,836	31,836
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

4.3.21 City of Point

The City of Point supplies manufacturing in Rains county, as well as its own municipal needs. The city buys water from the Sabine River Authority, coming from Tawakoni Lake. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.63.

Table 4.63 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Point

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR	376	391	392	393	395	395
TOTAL	376	391	392	393	395	395
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
MANUFACTURING, RAINS	12	12	12	12	12	12
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
POINT	379	380	381	383	383	383
TOTAL	391	392	393	395	395	395
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	-15	-1	-1	-2	0	0

4.3.22 Sabine River Authority

The Sabine River Authority (SRA) holds water rights in Lake Fork (Wood and Rains Counties) and Lake Tawakoni (Hunt, Rains, and Van Zandt Counties). The SRA supplies the cities of Commerce, Edgewood, Emory, Greenville, Quitman, Kilgore, Longview, Point, West Tawakoni, Wills Point, the Ables Springs WSC, Cash SUD, Combined Consumers SUD, MacBee SUD and South Tawakoni, as well as industry. SRA also serves customers in other regions, but only Region D customers are identified in Table 4.64.

Table 4.64 Water Supplies and Demands for the Sabine River Authority

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	168,966	167,119	165,272	163,424	161,577	159,730
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	129,961	129,961	129,961	129,961	129,961	129,961
TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR	226,239	224,543	222,847	221,152	219,456	217,760
TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	941,900	941,583	941,230	940,949	940,632	940,315
TOTAL	1,467,066	1,463,206	1,459,310	1,455,486	1,451,626	1,447,766
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
BRIGHT STAR SALEM SUD	354	758	750	742	734	725
COMMERCE	1,629	6,025	5,975	5,531	3,917	3,884
GREENVILLE	10,297	20,362	20,194	20,027	19,879	19,690
KILGORE	2,240	6,063	5,998	5,937	5,919	6,411
LONGVIEW	8,000	18,042	17,850	17,666	17,470	17,271
MANUFACTURING, HARRISON	3,500	3,157	3,124	3,092	3,057	3,022
CASH SUD	1,679	1,762	1,824	2,272	3,425	5,678
COMBINED CONSUMERS SUD	594	684	816	1,013	1,304	1,726
COUNTY-OTHER, ORANGE	228	228	228	228	228	228
COUNTY-OTHER, SABINE	37	37	37	37	37	37
DALLAS	310,480	290,490	287,837	285,237	282,553	279,846
EDGEWOOD	272	285	295	307	318	329
EMORY	1,218	1,267	1,272	1,276	1,280	1,283
G M WSC	560	560	560	560	560	560
HEMPHILL	476	476	476	476	476	476
HENDERSON	4,515	4,465	4,416	4,367	4,317	4,268
HUXLEY	280	280	280	280	280	280
IRRIGATION, ORANGE	2,402	2,402	2,402	2,402	2,402	2,402
IRRIGATION, VAN ZANDT	184	184	184	184	184	184
MACBEE SUD	516	572	621	673	724	779
MANUFACTURING, JEFFERSON	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120	1,120
MANUFACTURING, ORANGE	107,512	107,512	107,512	109,924	114,208	118,651
MINING, PANOLA	3,756	3,756	3,756	3,756	3,756	3,756
MINING, SABINE	334	334	334	334	334	334
MINING, SHELBY	3410	3410	3410	3410	3410	3410
NORTH TEXAS MWD	10582	10655	10565	10475	10395	10293
POINT	376	391	392	393	395	395
QUITMAN	316	1010	1000	989	978	967
TOTAL	476,867	486,287	483,228	482,708	483,660	488,005
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	990,199	976,919	976,082	972,778	967,966	959,761

The SRA's Region D customers with projected water shortages are presented in Table 4.65. Shortages presented for Greenville are not due to supply limitations, but rather WTP capacity limitations.

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080				
CASH SUD	165	325	433	507	445	686				
DALLAS	10,491	32,339	39,480	41,894	45,559	51,440				
GREENVILLE	6,024	6,843	7,105	7,216	7,222	7,641				
MACBEE SUD	377	562	786	1,074	1,443	1,951				
MANUFACTURING, JEFFERSON	34	230	450	668	883	1,097				
TOTAL	17,090	40,300	48,254	51,359	55,552	62,815				

 Table 4.65
 Sabine River Authority Region D Customer Entity Shortages

4.3.23 Sulphur River Municipal Water District

The Sulphur River Municipal Water District (SRMWD) holds water rights in Cooper Lake. The City of Commerce, City of Cooper, and City of Sulphur Springs are the three member cities constituting the SRMWD. Water supplies and demands for the SRMWD are presented in Table 4.66.

Table 4.66Water Supplies and Demands for the SRMWD

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CHAPMAN/COOPER LAKE/RESERVOIR NON- SYSTEM PORTION	13,738	13,411	13,085	12,758	12,431	12,104
TOTAL	13,738	13,411	13,085	12,758	12,431	12,104
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COOPER	767	749	731	712	694	676
SULPHUR SPRINGS	12,971	12,662	12,354	12,046	11,737	11,428
TOTAL	13,738	13,411	13,085	12,758	12,431	12,104
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

4.3.24 City of Sulphur Springs

The City of Sulphur Springs, located in Hopkins County, has three sources of water supply. The city has a contract with the Sulphur River Municipal Water District (SRMWD) for supply from Cooper Reservoir, available for the life of the reservoir. Sulphur Springs currently has a surplus of <u>15,132-5,252</u> ac-ft/yr in 20<u>3</u>20. By 20<u>8</u>70, the surplus decreases to <u>12,9772,855</u> ac-ft/yr. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.67.

Table 4.67 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of Sulphur Springs

		-				
SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CHAPMAN/COOPER LAKE/RESERVOIR NON- SYSTEM PORTION	12,971	12,662	12,354	12,046	11,737	11,428
SULPHUR RUN-OF-RIVER	0	0	0	0	0	0
SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR	902	980	1,057	1,133	1,210	1,287

	TOTAL	13,873	13,642	13,411	13,179	12,947	12,715
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:							
GAFFORD CHAPEL WSC		111	115	121	128	135	135
MANUFACTURING, HUNT		50	50	50	50	50	50
BRASHEAR WSC		155	163	170	181	192	192
BRINKER WSC		77	77	77	77	77	77
COUNTY-OTHER, HOPKINS		83	79	24	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK, HOPKINS		1,551	1,720	1,730	1,914	1,996	1,996
MANUFACTURING, HOPKINS		1,830	1,915	1,987	2,126	2,275	2,275
MARTIN SPRINGS WSC		223	223	223	223	223	223
MINING, HOPKINS		68	74	81	88	96	96
NORTH HOPKINS WSC		921	921	921	921	921	921
SHADY GROVE NO 2 WSC		112	118	123	131	138	138
SELF-SUPPLIED:							
SULPHUR SPRINGS		3,440	3,497	3,590	3,646	3,701	3,757
	TOTAL	8,621	8,952	9,097	9,485	9,804	9,860
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
	TOTAL	5,252	4,690	4,314	3,694	3,143	2,855

Customers of the City of Sulphur Springs are projected to have shortages beginning in 20<u>3</u>20. Table 4.68 presents the City of Sulphur Springs customer WUGs with projected shortages.

Table 4.68 City of Sulphur Springs Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BRASHEAR WSC	55	62	58	55	53	61
BRINKER WSC	23	29	31	33	37	40
LIVESTOCK, HOPKINS	24	26	26	27	27	27
NORTH HOPKINS WSC	231	271	297	325	354	383
SHADY GROVE NO 2 WSC	14	15	14	13	12	15
TOTAL	347	402	425	453	483	526

4.3.25 Titus County Fresh Water Supply District (TCFWSD) No. 1

TCFWSD No. 1 currently supplies the City of Mount Pleasant and Luminant with water from Lake Bob Sandlin. TCFWSD No. 1 has no uncommitted water supply in Lake Bob Sandlin. No shortages are projected for this system as shown in Table 4.69.

Table 4.69 Water Supplies and Demands for Titus County Fresh Water Supply District

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BOB SANDLIN LAKE/RESERVOIR	26,200	25,660	25,120	24,580	24,040	23,500
TOTAL	26,200	25,660	25,120	24,580	24,040	23,500
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080

CONTRACTUAL:						
MOUNT PLEASANT	18,900	18,900	18,900	18,900	18,900	18,900
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	7,300	6,760	6,220	5,680	5,140	4,600
TOTAL	26,200	25,660	25,120	24,580	24,040	23,500
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

TCFWSD's identified projected customer shortage is presented in Table 4.70.

Table 4.70 TCFWSD Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, TITUS	276	624	923	1,043	1,169	1,245
TOTAL	276	624	923	1,043	1,169	1,245

4.3.26 Tri Special Utility District

Tri Special Utility District (SUD) buys water from the City of Mount Pleasant, coming from Bob Sandlin Lak. The water district currently does not supply any other WUGs, but does provide its own municipal water supplies. Table 4.71 provides available supplies and demands for this company.

Table 4.71 Water Supplies and Demands for Tri Special Utility District

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BOB SANDLIN LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,727	1,859	2,011	2,200	2,417	2,650
TOTAL	1,727	1,859	2,011	2,200	2,417	2,650
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
TRI SUD	1,727	1,859	2,011	2,200	2,417	2,650
TOTAL	1,727	1,859	2,011	2,200	2,417	2,650
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

4.3.27 City of White Oak

The City of White Oak supplies rural portions of Gregg and Upshur counties, as well as its own municipal needs. The city buys water from the City of Longview, coming from Big Sandy Creek Lake. Available supplies and demands are shown in Table 4.72.

Table 4.72 Water Supplies and Demands for the City of White Oak

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BIG SANDY CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680
TOTAL	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, GREGG	50	50	50	50	50	50

COUNTY-OTHER, UPSHUR	40	40	40	40	40	40
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
WHITE OAK	2,590	2,590	2,590	2,590	2,590	2,590
тс	TAL 2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
тс	TAL 0	0	0	0	0	0

4.3.28 Riverbend Water Resources District/City of Texarkana (Texarkana Water Utilities)

Texarkana Water Utilities supplies the Cities of Texarkana, Texas, and Texarkana, Arkansas. There is supply and demand in both states. As noted previously, given present legal uncertainties regarding Arkansas water supply potentially available for Texas entities' use, it has been assumed for the purposes of the 202<u>6</u>4 Region D Plan that only Texas sources and supplies are available for use by entities within Region D. Therefore, supply and demands in Table 4.73 only reflect Texas' Region D water use.

Through interlocal agreements with a number of local WUGs, Riverbend Water Resources District (Riverbend WRD) formally represents the water supply interests for most of the water suppliers in Bowie County. Riverbend WRD sells and/or supplies surface water to: City of Annona, City of Atlanta, City of Avery, City of De Kalb, City of Hooks, City of Leary, City of Maud, City of Nash, City of New Boston, City of Queen City, City of Redwater, City of Texarkana (Texas), City of Wake Village, and TexAmericas Center. Central Bowie County WSC and the City of Red Lick hold MOUs (Memorandum of Understanding) with Riverbend WRD for the collaboration and partnership of developing the region's water resource needs. Retail customers of the City of Texarkana (Texas) include the Macedonia-Eylau MUD #1, Red River County WSC, County-Other portions of Bowie, Cass and Red River Counties, and Manufacturing in Bowie and Cass Counties. Burns Redbank WSC has connected water supply via the City of Hooks.

Water supply comes from Lake Wright Patman through contracts with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The permitted surface water right in Lake Wright Patman totals 180,000 ac-fy/yr, of supply, but is limited by contractual and infrastructure constraints on reservoir operations, as well as sedimentation. Demands come from three counties and are as follows: City of Texarkana, Texas, City of DeKalb, City of Hooks, City of Maud, City of Nash, City of New Boston, City of Redwater, City of Wake Village, City of Atlanta, City of Queen City, City of Domino, City of Annona, City of Avery, Central Bowie WSC, Macedonia-Eylau MUD #1, Oak Grove WSC, Red River County WSC, Burns Redbank WSC, Park Terrace MHP and manufacturing in Bowie and Cass Counties. Riverbend WRD, its member entities, and customers are projected to have a deficit of contractual supplies beginning in 2020. The deficit is primarily due to the functional treatment capacity of Texarkana's New Boston Road WTP limiting available supply, the elevation of the City of Texarkana's existing intake, outstanding full contractual implementation of the Ultimate Rule Curve increasing conservation storage in the reservoir, and sedimentation effects.

Table 4.73 Water Supplies and Demands for the Riverbend WRD/City of Texarkana

SUPPLIES (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CANEY CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	0
ELLIOT CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	0
RED RUN-OF-RIVER	0	0	0	0	0	0

WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
SALE/TRANSFER (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CONTRACTUAL:						
COUNTY-OTHER, RED RIVER	0	0	0	0	0	0
RED RIVER COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
RIVERBEND WATER RESOURCES DISTRICT	122,630	122,623	122,616	122,615	122,615	122,615
CENTRAL BOWIE COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER, BOWIE	0	0	0	0	0	0
DE KALB	0	0	0	0	0	0
HOOKS	0	0	0	0	0	0
MACEDONIA EYLAU MUD 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING, BOWIE	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING, CASS	122,623	122,616	122,615	122,615	122,615	122,615
MAUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
NASH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEW BOSTON	0	0	0	0	0	0
REDWATER	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEXARKANA	0	0	0	0	0	0
WAKE VILLAGE	0	0	0	0	0	0
SELF-SUPPLIED:						
RIVERBEND WATER RESOURCES DISTRICT	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEXARKANA	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	122,630	122,623	122,616	122,615	122,615	122,615
SURPLUS/NEEDS (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
TOTAL	122,630	122,623	122,616	122,615	122,615	122,615

Member entities and customers of Riverbend WRD/City of Texarkana are projected to have shortages beginning in 20<u>3</u>20. Table 4.74 presents the WUGs with projected shortages.

Table 4.74 Riverbend Water Resources District/City of Texarkana Customer Entity Shortages

Needs (ac-ft/yr)	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CENTRAL BOWIE COUNTY WSC	769	769	776	783	790	797
COUNTY-OTHER, RED RIVER	0	0	0	0	0	0
DE KALB	266	263	261	257	254	250
HOOKS	317	313	310	305	301	296
MACEDONIA EYLAU MUD 1	710	705	698	688	677	666
MANUFACTURING, BOWIE	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING, CASS	3,529	4,866	6,252	7,687	9,177	10,722
MAUD	164	162	161	158	156	153
NASH	314	309	306	302	297	292

NEW BOSTON	856	848	841	827	814	801
REDWATER	0	0	0	0	0	0
RIVERBEND WATER RESOURCES DISTRICT	267	264	261	257	253	248
TEXARKANA	2,396	2,373	2,354	2,320	2,287	2,252
WAKE VILLAGE	649	641	635	625	615	605
TOTAL	10,237	11,513	12,854	14,209	15,621	17,083

4.4 Secondary Needs for Major Water Providers in the North East Texas Region

Secondary needs (after accounting for potential conservation savings) have been calculated for all customers and aggregated by Major Water Provider, as shown in Table 4.75.

		Total S	econdary W	ater Need in	ac-ft/yr	
NIVYF	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BI COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	7	20	35
BRIGHT STAR SALEM SUD	0	0	0	21	61	100
CASH SUD	372	865	1,035	902	840	1,256
COMMERCE	0	0	0	0	0	0
COOPER	0	0	0	0	0	0
EMORY	0	0	0	0	0	0
GLADEWATER	0	0	0	0	0	0
GOLDEN WSC	1	22	39	60	82	103
GRAND SALINE	121	128	122	117	120	109
GREENVILLE	13,658	16,254	17,865	19,224	20,604	21,801
HUGHES SPRINGS	0	0	0	0	0	0
KILGORE	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAMAR COUNTY WSD	0	0	0	0	0	0
LONGVIEW	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARSHALL	0	0	0	0	0	0
MOUNT PLEASANT	0	0	0	0	0	0
PARIS	0	0	0	0	0	0
POINT	0	0	0	0	0	0
RIVERBEND WATER RESOURCES DISTRICT	380	375	371	365	359	353
SULPHUR SPRINGS	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEXARKANA	6,769	6,702	6,649	6,554	6,459	6,362
TRI SUD	497	580	572	541	465	355
WHITE OAK	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.75	Secondary	Needs for	Major	Water	Providers in	the	North	East	Texas	Region
------------	-----------	-----------	-------	-------	--------------	-----	-------	------	-------	--------

4.5 Water Surpluses in the North East Texas Region

Table 4.76 lists the entities within the North East Texas Region that have a supply surplus during the planning period. TWDB designated WUGs and County Other WUGs surpluses are listed in the table. Several WUGs are split and require multiple entries in the following tables. For some WUGs split into multiple counties or basins, there may be a surplus in one area, and a shortage in another. Only those splits with surpluses are shown below.

Table 4.76	Water Surp	pluses in the	North East ⁻	Texas Reg	gion by	County
------------	------------	---------------	-------------------------	-----------	---------	--------

COUNTY	WHO	1	Fotal Wat	er Supply	/ Surplus	in ac-ft/y	r
COUNTI		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
BOWIE	COUNTY-OTHER, BOWIE	1973	2080	2056	2083	2147	2213
BOWIE TOTAL		1973	2080	2056	2083	2147	2213
CAMP	BI COUNTY WSC	505	503	501	496	490	485
CAMP	COUNTY-OTHER, CAMP	348	356	364	371	379	378
CAMP TOTAL		853	859	865	867	869	863
CASS	ATLANTA	94	201	324	359	398	437
CASS	AVINGER	202	207	212	216	220	225
CASS	COUNTY-OTHER, CASS	0	0	0	0	6	29
CASS	E M C WSC	26	27	29	31	32	34
CASS	EASTERN CASS WSC	314	305	290	272	249	222
CASS	HOLLY SPRINGS WSC	0	0	0	0	0	1
CASS	HUGHES SPRINGS	184	202	221	236	251	266
CASS	LINDEN	97	113	129	142	155	168
CASS	LIVESTOCK, CASS	234	234	236	236	236	236
CASS	MANUFACTURING, CASS	231	230	230	229	228	228
CASS	MIMS WSC	118	119	119	120	121	121
CASS	MINING, CASS	804	827	836	869	891	917
CASS	QUEEN CITY	29	39	46	51	55	56
CASS	WESTERN CASS WSC	800	815	830	842	854	865
CASS TOTAL		3133	3319	3502	3603	3696	3805
COLLIN	CADDO BASIN SUD	1	0	0	0	0	0
COLLIN TOTAL		1	0	0	0	0	0
DELTA	COOPER	1045	838	632	427	248	236
DELTA	COUNTY-OTHER, DELTA	27	31	34	39	43	48
DELTA	IRRIGATION, DELTA	2053	2063	2068	2068	2080	2080
DELTA TOTAL		3125	2932	2734	2534	2371	2364
FANNIN	NORTH HUNT SUD	6	2	0	0	0	0
FANNIN	WOLFE CITY	7	8	8	9	9	9
FANNIN TOTAL		13	10	8	9	9	9
FRANKLIN	COUNTY-OTHER, FRANKLIN	138	155	156	156	156	157

COUNTY	WUG	1	Fotal Wat	er Supply	/ Surplus	in ac-ft/y	r
COUNTY	WUG	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
FRANKLIN	CYPRESS SPRINGS SUD	1903	1734	1569	1402	1239	1077
FRANKLIN	IRRIGATION, FRANKLIN	169	169	169	169	169	169
FRANKLIN	MOUNT VERNON	2103	1997	1892	1778	1663	1549
FRANKLIN	WINNSBORO	234	208	185	163	142	122
FRANKLIN TOTAL		4547	4263	3971	3668	3369	3074
GREGG	CLARKSVILLE CITY	119	119	119	121	123	125
GREGG	COUNTY-OTHER, GREGG	1282	1417	1609	1857	2029	2115
GREGG	ELDERVILLE WSC	110	107	113	120	83	113
GREGG	GLADEWATER	131	131	149	177	207	157
GREGG	GLENWOOD WSC	10	11	11	11	12	12
GREGG	IRRIGATION, GREGG	154	154	154	154	154	154
GREGG	KILGORE	2305	2094	1887	1730	2066	2117
GREGG	LIBERTY CITY WSC	315	314	318	327	335	344
GREGG	LIVESTOCK, GREGG	52	52	52	52	52	52
GREGG	LONGVIEW	2766	2740	2716	2714	2711	2704
00000		/	3	9	0	2	3
GREGG	MANUFACTURING, GREGG	20	0	0	0	0	0
GREGG	MINING, GREGG	332	328	241	154	93	93
GREGG	STARRVILLE-FRIENDSHIP WSC	34	34	34	35	36	37
GREGG	STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, GREGG	1302	1302	1302	1302	1302	1302
GREGG	IRYON ROAD SUD	1059	1053	1058	1063	1064	1079
GREGG	WEST GREGG SUD	171	158	141	122	98	77
GREGG	WHITE OAK	0	0	0	0	18	61
GREGG TOTAL		3506	3467 7	3435 7	3436 5	3478	3488
HARRISON	BLOCKER CROSSROADS WSC	60	58	57	56	55	54
HARRISON	COUNTY-OTHER, HARRISON	620	706	742	891	1027	1121
HARRISON	DIANA SUD	56	55	55	54	53	52
HARRISON	GILL WSC	115	117	117	124	131	137
HARRISON	GUM SPRINGS WSC	1690	1558	1537	1411	1289	1171
HARRISON	HALLSVILLE	161	113	106	61	18	0
HARRISON	HARLETON WSC	14	6	5	0	0	0
HARRISON	LEIGH WSC	0	0	5	68	129	188
HARRISON	LIVESTOCK, HARRISON	369	416	465	493	506	506
HARRISON	LONGVIEW	1020	959	932	858	786	728
HARRISON	MANUFACTURING, HARRISON	8197 7	8097 8	7994 4	7887 0	7775 7	7663 9
HARRISON	MARSHALL	9161	9273	9281	9539	9789	1003 2
HARRISON	STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, HARRISON	3363	3363	3363	3363	3363	3363

NORTH EAST TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP 2026 REGION D WATER PLAN

4-45

	WILLO	1	Fotal Wat	er Supply	/ Surplus	in ac-ft/y	r
COUNTY	WUG	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
HARRISON	TALLEY WSC	69	68	67	68	69	70
HARRISON	WASKOM	51	71	74	107	139	170
HARRISON	WEST HARRISON WSC	165	141	137	110	84	59
HARRISON TOTAL		9889 1	9788 2	9688 7	9607 3	9519 5	9429 0
HOPKINS	СОМО	12	13	13	13	13	13
HOPKINS	CORNERSVILLE WSC	91	86	82	78	73	69
HOPKINS	COUNTY-OTHER, HOPKINS	839	828	761	724	716	710
HOPKINS	CUMBY	22	25	21	21	22	23
HOPKINS	CYPRESS SPRINGS SUD	299	286	268	243	217	190
HOPKINS	GAFFORD CHAPEL WSC	36	37	40	44	49	46
HOPKINS	JONES WSC	7	6	5	2	3	3
HOPKINS	LAKE FORK WSC	26	25	25	24	24	23
HOPKINS	LIVESTOCK, HOPKINS	729	725	725	722	721	721
HOPKINS	MANUFACTURING, HOPKINS	788	834	866	963	1069	1024
HOPKINS	MARTIN SPRINGS WSC	187	173	163	154	143	133
HOPKINS	MINING, HOPKINS	258	265	272	281	289	289
HOPKINS	SHADY GROVE NO 2 WSC	9	8	11	13	15	13
HOPKINS	SHIRLEY WSC	91	78	69	57	44	33
HOPKINS TOTAL		3394	3389	3321	3339	3398	3290
HUNT	CADDO MILLS	33	46	84	148	155	152
HUNT	COMMERCE	540	593	633	694	755	816
HUNT	COUNTY-OTHER, HUNT	919	1087	1318	1738	2466	2487
HUNT	IRRIGATION, HUNT	2	2	2	2	2	2
HUNT	MACBEE SUD	0	0	7	21	42	41
HUNT	MANUFACTURING, HUNT	465	622	770	864	1024	997
HUNT	POETRY WSC	25	30	48	99	250	248
HUNT	WEST TAWAKONI	481	443	355	376	344	318
HUNT	WOLFE CITY	88	87	84	84	82	81
HUNT TOTAL		2553	2910	3301	4026	5120	5142
LAMAR	BLOSSOM	93	109	109	110	111	111
LAMAR	LAMAR COUNTY WSD	5890	5812	5766	5721	5650	5663
LAMAR	LIVESTOCK, LAMAR	575	575	575	575	575	575
LAMAR	MANUFACTURING, LAMAR	812	902	976	1005	845	678
LAMAR	PARIS	395	166	0	0	0	0
LAMAR	RENO (LAMAR)	297	353	415	476	539	541
LAMAR	STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, LAMAR	3255	3255	3255	3255	3255	3255
LAMAR TOTAL		1131 7	1117 2	1109 6	1114 2	1097 5	1082 3

COUNTY WUG		-	Fotal Wat	er Supply	/ Surplus	in ac-ft/y	r
COUNTY	WUG	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MARION	COUNTY-OTHER, MARION	550	564	582	593	605	619
MARION	DIANA SUD	2	11	17	22	27	31
MARION	E M C WSC	113	127	142	152	163	174
MARION	HARLETON WSC	33	43	54	61	68	76
MARION	IRRIGATION, MARION	310	310	310	310	310	310
MARION	JEFFERSON	1829	1860	1892	1914	1936	1957
MARION	KELLYVILLE-BEREA WSC	23	26	29	31	32	33
MARION	LIVESTOCK, MARION	242	242	242	242	242	242
MARION	MIMS WSC	640	635	628	624	620	614
MARION	MINING, MARION	95	98	100	102	104	104
MARION	STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, MARION	188	570	1035	1603	1990	1990
MARION TOTAL		4025	4486	5031	5654	6097	6150
MORRIS	BI COUNTY WSC	10	22	35	43	51	60
MORRIS	COUNTY-OTHER, MORRIS	276	281	285	287	290	292
MORRIS	DAINGERFIELD	1130	1119	1103	1095	1086	1077
MORRIS	HOLLY SPRINGS WSC	0	0	0	0	0	3
MORRIS	IRRIGATION, MORRIS	59	59	59	59	59	59
MORRIS	LIVESTOCK, MORRIS	70	70	70	70	70	70
MORRIS	LONE STAR	541	557	575	587	598	611
MORRIS	MANUFACTURING, MORRIS	8769 9	8135 8	8155 1	8932 3	8195 4	8076 8
MORRIS	NAPLES	43	45	46	47	48	49
MORRIS	ОМАНА	135	139	143	146	149	152
MORRIS	STEAM-ELECTRIC POWER, MORRIS	770	770	770	770	770	770
MORRIS TOTAL		9073 3	8442 0	8463 7	9242 7	8507 5	8391 1
PANOLA	GILL WSC	68	75	82	88	93	98
PANOLA TOTAL		68	75	82	88	93	98
RAINS	BRIGHT STAR SALEM SUD	695	659	628	589	548	515
RAINS	COUNTY-OTHER, RAINS	158	146	130	107	88	69
RAINS	EAST TAWAKONI	63	62	58	60	61	62
RAINS	EMORY	97	92	76	73	70	66
RAINS	LIVESTOCK, RAINS	3	3	3	3	3	3
RAINS	MANUFACTURING, RAINS	11	11	11	11	11	11
RAINS	POINT	150	147	142	143	142	142
RAINS	SHIRLEY WSC	43	38	35	31	26	19
RAINS	SOUTH RAINS SUD	11	0	0	0	0	0
RAINS TOTAL		1231	1158	1083	1017	949	887
RED RIVER	BOGATA	340	350	359	367	374	381

	WHO	1	Fotal Wat	er Supply	/ Surplus	in ac-ft/y	r
COUNTY	WUG	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
RED RIVER	CLARKSVILLE	0	0	0	0	10	69
RED RIVER	COUNTY-OTHER, RED RIVER	11	18	37	67	105	157
RED RIVER	LIVESTOCK, RED RIVER	80	80	80	80	80	80
RED RIVER	MANUFACTURING, RED RIVER	5051	5044	5044	5044	5044	5044
RED RIVER	RED RIVER COUNTY WSC	122	151	170	181	184	176
RED RIVER	TALCO	12	11	11	11	10	10
RED RIVER TOTAL		5616	5654	5701	5750	5807	5917
RUSK	ELDERVILLE WSC	101	104	110	115	136	143
RUSK	KILGORE	50	150	276	415	554	612
RUSK	WEST GREGG SUD	13	11	9	5	2	0
RUSK TOTAL		164	265	395	535	692	755
SMITH	CARROLL WSC	23	25	32	43	56	50
SMITH	CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	494	500	504	495	478	464
SMITH	LIBERTY UTILITIES SILVERLEAF WATER	29	0	0	0	0	0
SMITH	LINDALE	86	81	88	79	64	60
SMITH	LINDALE RURAL WSC	414	385	364	348	332	316
SMITH	PINE RIDGE WSC	72	50	32	18	3	0
SMITH	R P M WSC	14	15	15	16	17	18
SMITH	SAND FLAT WSC	227	215	207	203	200	196
SMITH	STARRVILLE-FRIENDSHIP WSC	81	83	83	86	89	92
SMITH	WEST GREGG SUD	28	23	18	16	16	13
SMITH TOTAL		1468	1377	1343	1304	1255	1209
TITUS	BI COUNTY WSC	31	21	6	0	0	0
TITUS	COUNTY-OTHER, TITUS	755	814	887	900	905	937
TITUS	CYPRESS SPRINGS SUD	118	126	141	141	139	136
TITUS	IRRIGATION, TITUS	7	7	7	7	7	7
TITUS	LIVESTOCK, TITUS	77	77	77	37	16	16
TITUS	MOUNT PLEASANT	1318 8	1273 5	1232 9	1178 0	1130 5	1113 4
TITUS	TALCO	348	349	353	356	360	364
TITUS TOTAL		1452 4	1412 9	1380 0	1322 1	1273 2	1259 4
UPSHUR	BI COUNTY WSC	77	76	78	83	89	95
UPSHUR	COUNTY-OTHER, UPSHUR	1117	1266	1334	1446	1566	1668
UPSHUR	DIANA SUD	605	559	504	445	379	307
UPSHUR	EAST MOUNTAIN WATER SYSTEM	8	8	8	9	10	11
UPSHUR	FOUKE WSC	3	2	2	2	1	1
UPSHUR	GILMER	280	275	279	292	306	320

NORTH EAST TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP 2026 REGION D WATER PLAN

4-48

COUNTY	WUG	Total Water Supply Surplus in ac-ft/yr					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
UPSHUR	GLADEWATER	72	64	54	47	38	0
UPSHUR	GLENWOOD WSC	18	16	17	22	27	32
UPSHUR	IRRIGATION, UPSHUR	568	568	568	568	568	568
UPSHUR	LIVESTOCK, UPSHUR	403	403	403	403	403	403
UPSHUR	MINING, UPSHUR	119	129	95	61	36	36
UPSHUR	ORE CITY	1526	1525	1526	1529	1531	1534
UPSHUR	PRITCHETT WSC	186	185	186	189	193	197
UPSHUR	SHARON WSC	133	132	133	136	139	142
UPSHUR	UNION GROVE WSC	144	142	143	147	150	153
UPSHUR TOTAL		5259	5350	5330	5379	5436	5467
VAN ZANDT	BEN WHEELER WSC	14	0	0	0	0	0
VAN ZANDT	CANTON	640	444	254	58	0	0
VAN ZANDT	COUNTY-OTHER, VAN ZANDT	1041	950	825	764	770	669
VAN ZANDT	FRUITVALE WSC	26	0	0	0	0	0
VAN ZANDT	IRRIGATION, VAN ZANDT	17	15	14	12	7	7
VAN ZANDT	LIVESTOCK, VAN ZANDT	884	876	846	897	825	871
VAN ZANDT	MINING, VAN ZANDT	2003	2176	2387	2576	2687	2725
VAN ZANDT	PRUITT SANDFLAT WSC	101	101	110	116	117	127
VAN ZANDT	VAN	68	42	21	3	0	0
VAN ZANDT	WILLS POINT	19	19	19	19	19	19
VAN ZANDT TOTAL		4813	4623	4476	4445	4425	4418
WOOD	BRIGHT STAR SALEM SUD	42	13	0	0	0	0
WOOD	CORNERSVILLE WSC	26	26	26	25	25	24
WOOD	COUNTY-OTHER, WOOD	4010	4023	4054	4071	4097	4134
WOOD	CYPRESS SPRINGS SUD	123	119	111	104	96	86
WOOD	FOUKE WSC	228	197	175	137	100	61
WOOD	HAWKINS	536	530	526	525	523	521
WOOD	IRRIGATION, WOOD	835	835	835	835	835	835
WOOD	JONES WSC	348	315	294	143	208	164
WOOD	LAKE FORK WSC	393	375	364	342	320	298
WOOD	LIVESTOCK, WOOD	527	527	527	527	527	527
WOOD	MINEOLA	806	764	736	685	634	582
WOOD	PRITCHETT WSC	2	1	1	1	1	1
WOOD	QUITMAN	665	656	645	643	639	647
WOOD	RAMEY WSC	10	0	0	0	0	0
WOOD	SHARON WSC	126	106	93	66	40	13
WOOD	SHIRLEY WSC	6	5	5	3	3	2

COUNTY	WUG	Total Water Supply Surplus in ac-ft/yr					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
WOOD	WINNSBORO	797	735	676	607	539	469
WOOD TOTAL		9480	9227	9068	8714	8587	8364

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank-