



Region I
East Texas Regional Water Planning Group
REVISED AGENDA

Wednesday, October 14, 2009 – 10:00 a.m.
Nacogdoches Recreation Center and Library
1112 North Street , Nacogdoches, TX 75961

1. Call to order - Kelley Holcomb, Chairman
2. Invocation & Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call/Determination of Quorum
4. Consideration and approval of the minutes of the July 8, 2009 meeting
5. Report from City of Nacogdoches - Lila Fuller
6. Reports of adjoining regions activity (only as needed)
 - A. Region C - Mike Harbordt/Connie Standbridge
 - B. Region D - Worth Whitehead/Mindy Rabicoff
 - C. Region H - David Alders/Steve Tyler
7. Reports from Standing Committees (only as needed)
 - A. Executive Committee - Kelley Holcomb
 - B. Finance Committee - Darla Smith
 - C. Bylaws Committee - David Alders
 - D. Technical Committee - Mike Harbordt
 - E. Nominations Committee - George Campbell
8. Reports from other state agencies
 - A. Texas Department of Parks & Wildlife - Terry Stelly
 - B. Texas Department of Agriculture - Linda Parker
9. Report from Texas Water Development Board staff - Temple McKinnon
10. Report from consultant team - Rex Hunt/Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.
 - A. Discussion on Chapter 4 methodology and Status of Chapter 4 update.
 - B. Discussion on Draft Chapters 7, 8, 9.
11. Educational Presentation - To Be announced
12. Public Comment (limited to three minutes)
13. Unfinished Business
 - A. Consideration and Approval of Population and Water Demand Revisions, process for making revisions based on comments received during public comment period and approval for submittal to the TWDB - Rex Hunt
(The proposed changes may be viewed at www.ETEXwaterplan.org)
 - B. Consideration and Approval of Draft Chapter 3 - Rex Hunt
14. New Business
 - A. Consideration and Approval of Draft Chapter 5 - Rex Hunt
 - B. Consideration and Possible Approval of a request from Houston County WC&ID No. 1 to amend their available water supply – Houston County WC&ID No. 1 Representative**
 - C. Consideration and Approval of Draft Chapter 6 - Rex Hunt
 - D. Consideration and Approval of Contract Amendment between the City of Nacogdoches and the Texas Water Development Board - Temple McKinnon
15. Chairman's Report
16. General discussion
Proposed dates for future meetings: December 9, 2009
17. Adjourn



Region I
East Texas Regional Water Planning Group
Standing Committees
AGENDA

Wednesday, October 14, 2009
Nacogdoches Recreation Center
1112 North Street
Nacogdoches, TX

The Region I East Texas Regional Water Planning Group has four standing committees. These committees function under the direction of the Region I East Texas Regional Water Planning Group as defined in the approved By-Laws. Committee meetings are held on an as needed basis. These Committee are:

Executive Committee **(no meeting)**

Nominations Committee **(no meeting)**

By-Laws Committee **(no meeting)**

Finance Committee **(meeting to begin at 9:30 AM)**

1. Review FY 2009 receivables and expenses
2. Review FY 2010 receivables and expenses
3. Review of Financial Statements

Technical Committee **(meeting to begin at 9:00 AM)**

1. Consider updates to water management strategies in Chapter 4.



MINUTES

Attached are the minutes from the July 8, 2009
ETRWPG meeting.

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
of the
REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP “I”
Wednesday, July 8, 2009 – 10:00 a.m.
Nacogdoches Recreation Center
1112 North Street, Nacogdoches, Texas

1. Call to Order – Chair Kelley Holcomb called the regular meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.
2. Invocation & Pledge of Allegiance –Kelley Holcomb led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance. David Alders gave the invocation.
3. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum –The roll was called by Lila Fuller and a quorum was determined as follows:

Voting Members Present (16 of 23)

Kelley Holcomb
David Alders
Jeff Branick
David Brock
George P. Campbell
Josh David
Scott Hall
Mike Harbordt
Bill Kimbrough
Glenda Kindle
Duke Lyons
Monty Shank
Darla Smith
Worth Whitehead
John Windham
J. Leon Young

Voting Members Absent (6)

Jerry Clark
Ernest Mosby
Chris Davis
William Heugel
Hermon Reed
Dale R. Peddy

Proxies:

Kelley Holcomb for Jerry Clark
Monty Shank for Chris Davis
Darla Smith for William Heugel

Non-Voting Members Present:

Walter Glenn, SETGCD

Governmental Reporting Agencies Present:

Temple McKinnon, Texas Water Development Board

Terry D. Stelly, Texas Parks and Wildlife-CF

Other Guests Present:

Rex Hunt, Alan Plummer Associates, Project Consultant

Lauren Gonzalez, APAI

Simone Kiel, Freese and Nichols, Inc.

James Beach, LBG-Guyton Associates

John Martin, Southeast Texas GCD

Phil Yocom, Toledo Chronicle

Brice Clements, City of Nacogdoches

J. Clayton LaGrove

Bill Jacobs

Gary Graham, GE Walker & Assoc.

Mary C. Decker

Terry D. McFall

D. Qualls

Billy D. Sims

Jimmi Cooley

4. **Consideration and Approval of the Minutes for the April 8, 2009 meeting.** Chair Kelley Holcomb referenced the minutes in the packet. Glenda Kindle moved to approve as presented. The motion was seconded by George Campbell and unanimously passed.
5. **Report from City of Nacogdoches** – Lila Fuller presented those in attendance with a Membership Directory. Ms. Fuller also directed the membership to the most recent newsletter and stated that a distribution list was being developed and the newsletter would be emailed to as many individuals as possible to save costs. She asked that if anyone knew of someone that would benefit from the newsletter, to notify her. Ms. Fuller also stated Region I had obtained a bulk mail permit that would result in a 59% cost savings on the large mailings required through the grant, as well as on the newsletter.
6. **Reports from adjoining regions activity:**
 - A. **Region C** – Mike Harbordt stated Region C was forming three new GWDs in their region. He stated there were concerns with cost estimates for infrastructure and discussed some of the concerns. He stated the next meeting would be held in September.
 - B. **Region D** – Worth Whitehead stated there was a public hearing held regarding Lake Marvin Nichols where approximately 40 people spoke against the proposed lake. Mr. Whitehead stated population adjustments for water demands were made in preparation for their plan update.

C. **Region H** – David Alders reported that Region H held a meeting July 1. He stated population adjustments for water demands were in the comment period. The next meeting would be held September 2. He referred the members to the Region H website where some material could be found.

7. **Reports from Standing Committees:**

A. **Executive Committee** – Chair Kelley Holcomb stated that Bob Bowman had resigned as the public relations consultant. He stated APAI was working on obtaining the website content information and stated the Region I website would be revamped soon to provide more information and documentation on the website.

B. **Finance Committee** – Darla Smith, finance committee chair referred to the financial report handout. She stated no funding had been received from Angelina or Henderson Counties. Monty Shank agreed to contact the Henderson County Judge.

C. **Bylaws Committee** – No report.

D. **Technical Committee** – Michael Harbordt stated the Technical Committee had done extensive work by conference call since April in preparation for the plan update. He referred to Rex Hunt and his staff who would be giving details later in the meeting.

E. **Nominations Committee** – George Campbell introduced Scott Hall and John Windham, who were the newest members appointed to the ETRWPG. He stated for the first time in quite a while there was a full committee with all vacancies filled. He did mention that Ernest Mosby was no longer living within the region and would be submitting a letter of resignation soon, which would create a vacancy in the small business category.

8. **Reports from other state agencies:**

A. **Texas Parks & Wildlife Department** – Terry Stelly with TPWD Port Arthur commented on an article in the Texas Parks and Wildlife Magazine on water management and stated he would provide copies at the October meeting. Mr. Stelly commented on the dead zone and stated it was good because there had been no hurricanes to mix it up, but bad because the dead zone was now near Sabine.

B. **Texas Department of Agriculture** – No report.

9. **Report from Texas Water Development Board Staff** – Temple McKinnon with TWDB stated The Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund (DWSRF) was in the comment period and would go to the board July 16. She referred to the statewide drought management study that could be viewed on the TWDB website, and stating they were taking applications for water infrastructure funds through August 1. Ms. McKinnon also stated Ruben Solis was the new surface water division director at TWDB.

10. **Report from Consultant Team** – Engineering consultant Rex Hunt of Alan Plummer Associates, Inc. discussed anticipated changes to three chapters of the Regional Water Plan to be presented to the ETRWPG at the next meeting. Chapter 4-6 will address water management strategies within the region and their effect on water quality and give recommendations on water conservation and drought management strategies.

Mr. Hunt stated that for these chapters they would look at current water conservation and management strategies already in place and would refer to Special Study #3, which analyzed water use in Region I. The study was during the fall of 2008 and found that Region I generally had a lower per capita water than other water planning regions.

11. **Educational Presentation**: Temple McKinnon with TWDB reviewed legislation that directly affected regional water planning groups and presented the following bills that were presented, but did not pass:

HB 2313 (Gattis): Relating to the repeal of the designation of the Little River reservoir and the Little River off-channel reservoir as sites of unique value for the construction of a reservoir.

HB 2722 (Flynn): Relating to the appointment of certain representatives to regional water planning groups.

HB 4206 (Farabee): Relating to a requirement that an applicant for a permit to construct an electric generating facility demonstrate that a sufficient amount of water is available for use in connection with the operation of the facility.

SB 1405 (Shapleigh): Relating to the establishment of an advisory committee to assist the Texas Water Development Board in incorporating the potential effects of climate variability into the state water plan.

SB 1406 (Shapleigh): Relating to the consideration of the effects of climate variability on water supplies in regional and state water plans.

SB 2006 (Hegar): Relating to groundwater permitting considerations of adopted water plans.

SB 2311 (Averitt): Relating to Texas Water Development Board surveys for water infrastructure financing.

Ms. McKinnon commented on the following bills that may be of interest to regional planning groups that passed this session:

HB 2374 (Guillen): Relating to financial assistance by the TWDB for the connection of residences in economically distressed areas to public water supply and sanitary sewer systems.

HB 2667 (Ritter): Relating to performance standards for plumbing fixtures sold in this state.

SB 2312: (Averitt): Relating to eligibility for funds from the water infrastructure fund from the Texas Water Development Board.

12. **Public Comments**: None

13. **Unfinished Business**: None

14. **New Business**:

- A. **Consideration and approval of Population and Water Demand Revisions for 2011 Region I Water Plan** – Chair Holcomb stated that this item would not be considered due to posting requirements not being met. He stated this item would be brought back in October for consideration.

The meeting was recessed at 11:07 a.m. for lunch and reconvened at 11:40 a.m.

Leon Young left at 11:40 p.m.

Discussion of water demand revisions was continued after lunch. Rex Hunt reviewed he proposed water demand changes. Simone Kiel with Freese and Nichols presented irrigation demand changes methodology that was developed at the request of the ETRWPG. She stated they looked at trends and levels of fluctuation for the past five years and focused on significant differences. Ms. Kiel stated four counties warranted a closer look – Houston County, Hardin County, Jefferson County and Orange Counties. The data tests used to determine if water use for irrigation had changed significantly since the 2006 plan were 1) assessment of water use trend, 2) comparison of average water use to projected demands in 2006 plan and 3) compared trend indicators and absolute differences to 2006 projections.

Ms. Kiel reported that Jefferson County showed a decreasing trend and Houston County showed an increasing trend. Hardin, Houston, Jefferson and Orange Counties had differences between the near-term and long-term averages and 2006 plan projections that were greater than 1,000 acre-feet. She further stated Houston and Jefferson Counties showed both trends and absolute differences.

Ms. Kiel presented the following recommendations:

1. No changes to irrigation demands for Houston County.
2. Irrigation demands in Jefferson County be reduced from 208,035 acre-feet per year to the highest reported use over the last five years of 126,400 acre-feet per year.
3. The demand for Hardin County is reduced from 7,213 acre-feet per year to the highest reported use over the historical record of 3,500 acre-feet per year.
4. The demand for Orange County is increased from 2,509 acre-feet per year to the highest reported use over the historical record of 6,250 acre-feet per year.

- B. Consideration and approval of Draft Chapter 1** –Rex Hunt described the modifications to Chapter 1. Changes include updated historical uses and the elimination of some wholesale water providers. Chapter 1 will still need to be revised to include a discussion of the state’s most recent water audit.

Jeff Branick left at 12:01 p.m. and gave his proxy to Bill Kimbrough.

John Windham moved to approve the draft of Chapter 1. The motion was seconded by Glenda Kindle and unanimously passed.

- C. Consideration and approval of Draft Chapter 2** – Rex Hunt with APAI reviewed Draft Chapter 2 “Current and Projected Population and Water Demand” explaining the importance of this chapter for the plan update. He reminded the members that it was decided in April to only identify the new water user groups. He also pointed out that the population changes and water demand changes proposed in the draft chapter would need to be ratified at the October meeting of the RWPG.

Glenda Kindle moved to approve the draft of Chapter 2 as presented. The motion was seconded by Bill Kimbrough and unanimously passed.

Worth Whitehead left at 12:24 p.m.

- D. Consideration and approval of Draft Chapter 3** – James Beach with LBG-Guyton Associates reviewed the draft of Chapter 3 “Evaluation of Current Water Supplies in the Region”. He reviewed groundwater issues and stated Region I counties fell in GMA-11 and GMA-14 and that the Texas Water Code now required that RWPGs rely on the Managed Available Groundwater (MAG) estimates that are determined from the Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) in each GMA, however, neither of the GMA’s in ETRWP have officially determined DFCs or MAGs at this point. He stated that the Southeast Texas GCD, consisting of Jasper, Newton, Tyler and Hardin Counties, located over the Gulf Coast Aquifer had passed a resolution regarding the DFC in the district, working with TWDB to complete several GAM runs to evaluate groundwater availability with the predictive Gulf Coast GAM, which was not available in the last round of planning.

Mr. Beach stated they compared the total demand in the county to the groundwater availability estimates from GAM run 08-80, which best represents the district’s proposed desired future conditions, and the availability estimates from the 2007 State Water Plan. He stated their findings showed that for Hardin and Jasper Counties the 2010 estimate was lower than the previous estimates, however the groundwater availability is equal to or greater than the 2007 SWP estimates. He stated similar trends are shown for Newton and Tyler Counties as well.

Mr. Beach stated the ETRWP could go with the numbers in the current plan or go with the preliminary numbers for the four counties in the Southeast Texas GCD.

Simone Kiel presented surface water updates, explaining they used the TCEQ water availability models in the Sabine Basin and Neches Basin.

It was the consensus that the GMAs shown in the current plan be used for the 2011 plan.

No action was taken on this item.

John Windham left at 1:55 p.m.

E. Consideration and approval of methodology for adopting Management Strategies and Alternative Management Strategies for the 2011 Region I Water Plan.

Simone Kiel with Freese and Nichols explained that the methodologies used in developing the 2011 Water Plan must be presented at a public meeting. She stated they used a proactive approach to identify potential strategies. She reviewed the considerations presented.

Michael Harbordt moved to accept the methodologies used as presented. The motion was seconded by Glenda Kindle and unanimously passed.

F. Consideration and possible approval of the Methodology for and/or recommendation of Unique Reservoir Sites.

Rex Hunt with APAI presented an excerpt of Chapter 8 from the 2006 ETRWPG Water Plan, which identified Lake Columbia and Fastrill Reservoir as future reservoir sites currently associated with meeting water demands. Other proposed reservoir sites listed are identified as long-term water management strategies for the time period more than fifty years in the future.

Mr. Hunt stated the ETRWPG could select one or more sites to propose status as a unique stream with beneficiaries, or use the same methodology as in the 2006 ETRWPG Water Plan. Possible identification of unique stream segments and unique reservoir sites within the region were discussed. It was the desire of the ETRWPG that no action is taken on unique reservoir sites.

Glenda Kindle moved to direct the consultants to develop criteria and recommend a list of reservoir sites as unique for presentation in the future. The motion was seconded by Scott Hall and unanimously passed.

G. Consideration and possible approval of the methodology for and/or recommendation of Unique Stream Segments.

Michael Harbordt moved to accept the recommendation not to designate any stream segments. The motion was seconded by David Alders and unanimously passed.

Bill Kimbrough left at 2:08 p.m.

H. Consideration and possible approval of FY 2010 annual budget.

Darla Smith, chair of the Finance Committee presented the FY 2010 Administrative Budget for consideration. She stated the budget was reduced by 10% from the FY 2009 budget and that she was able to reduce the amount requested from the counties for their annual allocations. She indicated the administrative services line item was increased by \$3,000; the Planning line item was reduced by \$4,000, and the Miscellaneous Supplies line item was reduced by \$3,000.

George Campbell moved to accept the FY 2010 Administrative Budget as presented. The motion was seconded by Josh David and unanimously approved.

15. **Chairman's Report** – No report.

16. **General discussion** – Chair Holcomb stated the next meeting was scheduled for October 7, 2009.

Monty Shank made the group aware of a senate bill to designate the Neches River as a scenic river and stated the forestry and agriculture groups were in opposition due to restrictions in reservoir construction that the legislative could establish.

Scott Hall stated LNVA was taking action to oppose the bill and he would be happy to present information at the next meeting if desired.

17. **Adjournment:**

Glenda Kindle moved to adjourn the meeting at 2:28 p.m. The motion was seconded by Monty Shank and unanimously passed.

APPROVED THIS 14th DAY OF OCTOBER 2009.

Kelley Holcomb, Chair
ETRWPD – Region I

ATTEST:

Jerry Clark, Secretary



13. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

13-A. Consideration and Approval of Population and Water Demand Revisions, process of making revisions based on comments received during public comment period and approval for submittal to the TWDB.

Rex Hunt – Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Job No.: 1600-001-00
Date: September 21, 2009
To: East Texas Regional Water Planning Group Technical Committee
From: Rex H. Hunt, P.E., Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.
Simone Kiel, P.E., Freese and Nichols, Inc.
Gary Graham, P.E., G.E. Walker
Lauren Gonzalez, Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.
Subject: Proposed Revisions to Population Projections and Water Demands
for the East Texas Regional Water Planning Area

This memorandum summarizes the proposed changes to the population projections and water demand projections for the East Texas Regional Water Planning Area (Region I). These are proposed changes to the adopted 2006 Regional Water Plan (2006 Plan) for incorporation into the 2011 Regional Water Plan (2011 Plan). The 2011 Plan is being prepared at this time.

Chapter 31 Texas Administrative Code (31 TAC) §357.5(d)(2) states, in part, the following:

“Before requesting a revision to the population and water demand projections, the regional water planning group shall discuss the issue at a public meeting for which notice has been posted pursuant to the Open Meetings Act in addition to being published on the internet and mailed at least 14 days before the meeting to every person or entity that has requested notice of regional water planning group activities. The public will be able to submit oral or written comment at the meeting and written comments for 14 days following the meeting. The regional water planning group will summarize the public comments received in its request for projection revisions.”

This memorandum will be posted pursuant to the Open Meetings Act. Specific requirements are referenced in the Notice Requirements and Approval Procedures section of this memorandum.

Water demand projection changes are proposed in the following categories of use:

- Municipal
- Manufacturing
- Irrigation

Water demand projection changes to Livestock and Mining use categories are not proposed for the 2011 Plan at this time. Steam-electric water demand projections are approved separately by the Texas Water Development Board and do not need to be proposed and noticed as are the other proposed changes.

POPULATION PROJECTION CHANGES

Population projection changes were first discussed with the Region I RWPG at its April 8, 2009, meeting. At that time, 13 proposed new water user groups (WUGs) were identified. These were identified by the Texas Water Development Board as potential new WUGs, based on increased population served. The list included the following:

Anderson

- Frankston Rural WSC

Angelina

- Angelina WSC
- Redland WSC

Jasper

- Rayburn Country MUD

Nacogdoches

- D&M WSC
- D&M Water Cedar Ridge
- Sacul WSC
- Melrose WSC
- Woden WSC

Shelby

- Sand Hills WSC

Smith

- Wright City WSC 1
- Wright City WSC 2
- Walnut Grove WSC

At the April 8, 2009, meeting, the general consensus of the Region I RWPG was that the proposed new WUGs identified in Smith County should not be included in the 2011 Plan because to do so would force the RWPG to “shift” population projections from other counties to Smith County in order to comply with the Texas Water Development Board ruling that the overall population of the region could not be increased for this round of planning. Instead, the new Smith County WUGs would be considered for inclusion in a subsequent planning cycle, after the 2010 United States Census has been completed. Since inclusion of the other WUGs could be accomplished by adjusting “County-Other” populations within their respective counties, the consensus of the Region I RWPG was to include them in the 2011 Plan.

Since the April 8 meeting, work has proceeded with finalizing population projections and water demand projections. During this time, it has been determined that several of the proposed new WUGs do not qualify at this time for inclusion in the 2011 Plan because their water demands are below the minimum 280 acre-feet per year demand as specified by the Texas Water Development Board. These included the following:

Anderson

- Frankston Rural WSC

Nacogdoches

- D&M Water Cedar Ridge
- Sacul WSC

Jasper

- Rayburn Country MUD

Shelby

- Sand Hills WSC

It is proposed that the five systems listed above should not be included in the list of new WUGs for the 2011 Plan.

Therefore, a total of five new WUGs, two located in Angelina County and three in Nacogdoches County, are proposed to be included in the 2011 Plan. Population changes to the counties in which these WUGs are located are summarized in Table 1.

MUNICIPAL WATER DEMAND PROJECTION CHANGES

The proposed changes to municipal water demand projections follow the population projection changes, and are summarized in Tables 2 and 3. Municipal water use was calculated based on estimates of historical water use, expressed in gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The historical gpcd for each new WUG was calculated and compared to the gpcd used for County-Other in the 2006 Plan. If there were not significant differences between the calculated gpcd and the County-Other gpcd, the gpcd for County-Other in the 2006 Plan was used for the projections for each decade. For both Angelina and Nacogdoches Counties, the gpcd values for County-Other were used to calculate the municipal demands for the new WUGs. Reductions in per capita water use over time, due to the implementation of the plumbing code, were also included in the demand projections.

MANUFACTURING WATER DEMAND PROJECTION CHANGES

Proposed changes to manufacturing water demand are limited to two counties in Region I, Angelina and Jefferson Counties, and are summarized in Table 4. The reduced demand in Angelina County is the result of a major paper mill that has permanently ceased to operate since the adoption of the 2006 Plan. The water supplies for this facility were recently sold to the City of Lufkin.

Most of the increased demand in Jefferson County is associated with future Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facilities. Study 5 of the Special Studies evaluated the future demands and infrastructure needed to meet these demands. The increased demands are based, in part, on information developed in this study. Additional information regarding ownership of the proposed facilities and adjusted demands for water were subsequently provided by the Lower Neches Valley Authority (LNVA). Two LNG plants are proposed to be served by LNVA at this time. The status of each facility is as follows:

- Golden Pass – Under construction and expected to begin operation by 2010.¹
- Sempra – In development and awaiting finalized commercial arrangements.
Construction start date not identified.²

¹ Goldenpasslng.com

² Sempralng.com

A significant feature of LNG plants is a need to warm the stored liquefied natural gas from an initial temperature of approximately minus 260° Fahrenheit prior to transfer to the gas pipeline system for distribution. Warming is accomplished using some form of external source to transfer heat to the LNG.

LNVA is proposing to provide water to these facilities as a heat transfer fluid for warming the LNG. Because of the significant temperature increase required, LNVA estimates that approximately 179,225 acre-feet per year of water will be necessary for each of the two plants. According to LNVA, the Golden Pass plant will need this volume of water annually by 2020. LNVA estimates that the Sempra plant will need this annual volume by 2030. The adjusted manufacturing demand for Jefferson County in Table 4 reflects the proposed LNG use.

It should be noted that neither of the LNG plants is currently planning to utilize water to warm the LNG in the manner proposed by LNVA. The plants will warm the LNG using a closed-loop piping system to re-circulate a heat transfer fluid through the LNG. The re-circulating fluid is currently planned to be re-warmed by burning natural gas.

As part of the process of evaluating the environmental impact of these LNG facilities, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has prepared Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The EIS address a wide range of potential environmental issues and provide a conditional approval of the projects based on the findings. Changing the method of warming the LNG to an open system utilizing large volumes of fresh water, as proposed, could potentially require FERC to review the findings of the EIS and reopen the EIS process.

IRRIGATION WATER DEMAND PROJECTION CHANGES

Proposed changes to irrigation water demand projections are proposed in three counties in Region I. The changes are primarily a function of recent historical trends in irrigation. Proposed changes to demands in Hardin, Jefferson, and Orange counties are summarized in Table 5.

September 21, 2009

Reduction in irrigation anticipated for Jefferson County is primarily due to significant decreases in rice farming within the past several years. In particular, Hurricane Ike in 2008 caused saltwater inundation of many rice fields that will take these fields out of production for an extended period of time.

The reduction in irrigation in Hardin County is a correction to reflect more realistic historical irrigation levels. Irrigation in Hardin County has never been above 3,502 acre-feet per year.

CONTACT FOR INFORMATION

For information regarding these proposed changes contact Rex Hunt, P.E., Alan Plummer Associates, Inc., 6300 La Calma, Austin, TX 78752; by telephone at (512)452-5905 or by email at rhunt@apainv.com.

NOTICE REQUIREMENTS AND APPROVAL PROCEDURES

Pursuant to the Open Meetings Act, this memorandum must be published on the Internet and mailed at least 14 days prior to the October 14, 2009, Region I meeting to the following entities:

- Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) Members
- Texas Secretary of State
- Persons or entities that have requested written notice of RWPG activities
- Entities with changes to population projections or water demands:
 - o Angelina WSC
 - o Redland WSC
 - o D & M WSC
 - o Melrose WSC
 - o Woden WSC
- County Clerk for counties in which entities with changed population projections or water demands are located:
 - o Angelina County
 - o Hardin County

September 21, 2009

- Jefferson County
- Nacogdoches County
- Orange County

In addition, the proposed changes will be discussed at the October 14, 2009, Region I meeting to be held at 10 a.m., at the Nacogdoches Recreation Center at 1112 North Street, Nacogdoches, Texas. The Region I RWPG will receive public comments relative to the proposed population and water demand changes from the issuance of notice until the October 14, 2009, meeting. The RWPG will consider and evaluate any public comments, and will vote on the proposed changes at the October 14, 2009, meeting. The changes will be finalized after consideration of any additional public comment received during a 14-day period following the October 14, 2009, meeting.

Table 1							
Proposed Population Projection Changes							
County/WUG		2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Angelina County							
County-Other	2006 RWP	21,111	22,526	24,269	26,466	29,479	33,473
	Requested 2011	15,180	16,197	17,451	19,031	21,197	24,069
	Difference	- 5,931	- 6,329	- 6,818	- 7,435	- 8,282	- 9,404
Angelina WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	3,537	3,774	4,066	4,434	4,939	5,608
	Difference	+ 3,537	+ 3,774	+ 4,066	+ 4,434	+ 4,939	+ 5,608
Redland WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	2,394	2,555	2,752	3,001	3,343	3,796
	Difference	+ 2,394	+ 2,555	+ 2,752	+ 3,001	+ 3,343	+ 3,796
Angelina County Total	2006 RWP	91,399	104,853	120,936	140,497	165,783	197,878
	Requested 2011	91,399	104,853	120,936	140,497	165,783	197,878
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches County							
County-Other	2006 RWP	21,463	23,669	25,755	28,054	32,380	36,944
	Requested 2011	9,802	10,810	11,762	12,812	14,788	16,872
	Difference	- 11,661	- 12,859	- 13,993	- 15,242	- 17,592	- 20,072
D&M WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	5,742	6,331	6,890	7,506	8,662	9,883
	Difference	+ 5,742	+ 6,331	+ 6,890	+ 7,506	+ 8,662	+ 9,883
Melrose WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	3,381	3,729	4,057	4,419	5,101	5,820
	Difference	+ 3,381	+ 3,729	+ 4,057	+ 4,419	+ 5,101	+ 5,820
Woden WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	2,538	2,799	3,046	3,317	3,829	4,369
	Difference	+ 2,538	+ 2,799	+ 3,046	+ 3,317	+ 3,829	+ 4,369
Nacogdoches County Total	2006 RWP	67,357	75,914	84,183	92,628	108,753	124,453
	Requested 2011	67,357	75,914	84,183	92,628	108,753	124,453
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2 Proposed Municipal Water Demand Changes (gallons per capita per day)							
County/WUG		2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Angelina County							
County-Other	2006 RWP	107	104	101	98	97	97
	Requested 2011	107	104	101	98	97	97
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Angelina WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	107	104	101	98	97	97
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Redland WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	107	104	101	98	97	97
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches County							
County-Other	2006 RWP	102	99	96	94	93	93
	Requested 2011	102	99	96	94	93	93
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
D&M WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	102	99	96	94	93	93
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Melrose WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	102	99	96	94	93	93
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woden WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	102	99	96	94	93	93
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3							
Proposed Municipal Water Demand Changes							
(acre-feet per year)							
County/WUG		2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Angelina County							
County-Other	2006 RWP	2,530	2,624	2,746	2,905	3,203	3,637
	Requested 2011	1,819	1,886	1,975	2,089	2,303	2,616
	Difference	-711	-738	-771	-816	-900	-1,021
Angelina WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	424	440	460	487	537	609
	Difference	+ 424	+ 440	+ 460	+ 487	+ 537	+ 609
Redland WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	287	298	311	329	363	412
	Difference	+ 287	+ 298	+ 311	+ 329	+ 363	+ 412
Angelina County Total	2006 RWP	13,650	15,224	17,080	19,302	22,359	26,315
	Requested 2011	13,650	15,224	17,080	19,302	22,359	26,315
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches County							
County-Other	2006 RWP	2,452	2,625	2,770	2,954	3,373	3,849
	Requested 2011	1,120	1,199	1,265	1,350	1,541	1,758
	Difference	-1,332	-1,426	-1,505	-1,604	-1,832	-2,091
D&M WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	656	702	741	790	902	1,030
	Difference	+ 656	+ 702	+ 741	+ 790	+ 902	+ 1,030
Melrose WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	386	414	436	465	531	606
	Difference	+ 386	+ 414	+ 436	+ 465	+ 531	+ 606
Woden WSC	2006 RWP	*Not a WUG in 2006 RWP					
	Requested 2011	290	310	328	349	399	455
	Difference	+ 290	+ 310	+ 328	+ 349	+ 399	+ 455
Nacogdoches County Total	2006 RWP	12,024	13,375	14,670	15,974	18,589	21,098
	Requested 2011	12,024	13,375	14,670	15,974	18,589	21,098
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0

