

## Region I

East Texas Regional Water Planning Group



REGIONAL WATER PLANNING
GROUP MEETING
August 5, 2020



Agenda Item 6

Report from State Agencies – TWDB

#### TWDB Report

RWP rulemaking update: Revisions to Chapter 357 adopted 6/4 by TWDB Board and effective 6/28. TWDB will update electronic rules pamphlet this summer. Rules are updated on the Secretary of State web site.

 IPP comments issued. TWDB comments and region response must be included in final plan.

 Final plan process (plans and prioritization list due 10/14; approve at regular meeting; need to consider all comments received; finalize implementation and IFR survey).

• Interregional Planning Council status (virtual meetings held 4/29, 5/28, 6/10, 6/22, 6/29, 7/20 with TWDB and facilitator; report due before 2022 SWP adoption).

Flood Planning update: Planning boundaries have been established and rules adopted. Open solicitations for planning group membership and interest from potential political subdivision sponsors, deadline extended to 7/17 for membership and 8/21 for sponsors. See TWDB website for more details and submission forms.

• After submittal of the final regional water plans from all regions work on the state water plan commences. There will be a TWDB Board item later this year on a draft 2021 State Water Plan and at that point there will be opportunity for public comments.

1st Request for Applications (RFA) for sixth cycle of RWP to be issued next spring (March). More information to be provided later this year. Planning groups will need to take action to select Political Subdivision and authorize them to submit an application prior to RFA deadline. After this application is submitted and a contract initiated the political subdivision will need to go through their procurement process to obtain a consultant for the RWPG.

#### Budget Status

Description	Score
Contract Amount	\$1,127,625
Currently Work Completed	\$973,838
Remaining Budget	\$128,787

Task	Original Budget	Proposed Budget
3 – Water Supply Analysis	\$122,853	\$125,300
4a – Identification of Water Needs	\$22,694	\$22,830
10 – Public Participation	\$236,954	\$234,371



## Region I

East Texas Regional Water Planning Group



**Agenda Item 8** 

Report from Consultant Team



## Consultant Team Report Agenda

Planning Schedule

IPP Comments Received

IFR Survey

Draft Prioritization of Strategies

#### Consultant Team Report Item 8a Planning Schedule

#### TWDB Preliminary Working Schedule

Working Schedule: Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Planning (October 2018) A **ENTITY** Release list of new municipal WUGs under utility houndary **TWDB** process DATA Draft population and mining, and municipal demand TWDB 2A. 2B projections prepared and made available by the TWDB RELEASED OPTIONAL Identify any ontional sub-WIIGs for RWPA so the TWDB can RWPG incorporate these entities into the DB22 data structure SUB-WUGS DUE: 9/1/17 Draft livestock, irrigation, manufacturing, and steam-electric TWDB power demand projections made available by the TWDB REVIEW & FINALIZE DRAFT Review draft projections and finalize adjustments and WUG **PROJECTIONS AND WUG LIST RWPG** list with TWDR staff **DUE: 1/12/18** August 2020 TWDB TWDB Board adopts all projections TWDB/RWPG DB22 prepared and released for data entry<sup>B,C</sup> **DB22 DATA MIGRATION AND PREPARATION** 8 TWDB/RWPG DB22 consultant training RELEASED **EVALUATE WATER SOURCE AVAILABILITY RWPG** Evaluate water availability and existing water supplies & EXISTING SUPPLIES **IDENTIFY** RWPG Identify water needs **WATER NEEDS** "As of" date for needs in DB22 to be utilized for the **TWDB** socioeconomic impact analysis **IDENTIFY POTENTIALLY FEASIBLE WMSs** 12 **RWPG** Identify potentially feasible WMSs New modeled available groundwater (MAG) volumes issued **NEW MAGS ISSUED** TWDB by the TWDB based on updated desired future conditions **RULE REVISIONS RULE REVISIONS** 14 **TWDB** TWDB planning rule revisions Next RFA for regional water planning grant (public notice, 2ND RFA 15 TWDB/RWPG remaining SOW, total study cost) Amend to 16 TWDB/RWPG Amend Contracts with additional funding (WMS evaluation funding to remain as notice-to-proceed) FY16-17 **REVIEW AND NEGOTIATE SOWS FOR ALL WMS** Review and negotiate SOW submittals for WMS evaluations TWDB and issue notice-to-proceeds<sup>D</sup> **EVALUATIONS (UPON SUBMITTAL BY RWPG) TECH MEMO** RWPG Prepare and submit Technical Memorandums DUE: 9/10/18 TWDB Socioeconomic impact reports distributed to RWPGs IPP DUE MARCH 3, 2020 -----ALL RWPG Complete the 2021 regional water plans SUBMITTAL TO TWDB OF FINAL ADOPTED PLAN BY October 14, 2020 Stakeholder committee meet to consider uniform standards SHC for 2021 project prioritizations Prepare and submit project prioritizations from 2021 RWPG

regional water plans



#### 2020 Project Schedule

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	ОСТ	NOV	DEC
IPP Su	VPG bmitted /26				TWDB ommenor ceived 6						
			Fir	RWF al Plan [		1					
							Prior	WPG itization e 10/14			

#### 2019-2020 RWPG Meeting Schedule

		Agenda Items		
Year	Quarter	Chapter	County-Other	RWPG Mtg. Date
	Q2	1, 2 (Needs must be finalized May 2020)	4 Counties	April 17, 2019
2019	Q3	6, 8	6 Counties	July 17, 2019
	Q4 a	3, 4, 10	5 Counties	October 15, 2019
	Q4 b	5A, 5B, 5C	5 Counties	November 20, 2019
	Q1 a	ES, 5B, 7, 9, 11		January 15, 2020
	Q1 b	Initially Prepared Plan Approval (IPP due 03/03/20)		February 19, 2020
	Q2	Public Notices/Hearings		May, 2020
2020	Q3 a	Review Public Comments, TWDB Comments Prioritization		August 5, 2020
	Q3 b	Review Public Comments, TWDB Comments, Final Plan Approval (Final Plan due 10/14/20)		September 16, 2020

## Consultant Team Report Item 8b IPP Comments Received

#### Entities Submitting Comments

Texas Water Development Board

RWPG Comments

Other State Agencies

Public Comments

#### Texas Water Development Board

- Level 1 Comments Must be addressed to meet regulatory requirements
  - 33 Comments

- Level 2 Comments Suggestions that may improve the readability of the plan
  - 22 Comments

#### TWDB - Level 1 Comments

 Most Level 1 comments can be resolved with the addition of clarifying text or additional information in the Plan.

- The most significant comment is regarding projects with an online decade of 2020.
  - Projects with an online decade of 2020 must be producing water by January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

#### TWDB – Level 1 Comments (cont.)

- The consultant team's proposed approach is to push any project having a capital cost and an online decade of 2020 to 2030.
  - Approximately 20 projects will be shifted

This will result in unmet needs being shown in the 2020 decade.

## Planning Group Member Comments

Many comments were received throughout the planning process

Primarily grammatical comments

Technical committee input during Prioritization

## Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board

One comment received:

 Include TSSWCD on the list of Non-Voting Planning Group Members

#### (Virtual) Public Hearing – May 14<sup>th</sup> 2020

 21 total attendees including consultants and planning group members.

 Two comments received. Neither comment requested a change to the plan or required a specific response.

# Consultant Team Report Item 8c IFR Survey

## Infrastructure Financing Report Survey

- 76 Water User Groups were contacted late Feb/early March
  - 62 via email
  - 14 via postal mail

 Responses were received from three Water User Groups

## Infrastructure Financing Report Survey

#### Example for Rusk livestock, mining, and SEP

New Wells (Carrizo-Wilcox) - Livestock		Total Capital Costs :	\$ 275,000	
Pre-Construction Funding (Planning, Design, Permitting, Acquisition, etc.) (1)	\$81,000	Year Needed <sup>(2)</sup> :	2040	
Construction Funding (1)	\$194,000	Year Needed <sup>(2)</sup> :	2040	
Percent State	Participation in Ownir	ng Excess Capacity (3):	76%	
Purchase from ANRA (Run of River, Angelina) - Mining	Total Capital Costs : \$ 14,4			
Pre-Construction Funding (Planning, Design, Permitting, Acquisition, etc.) (1)	\$5,985,000	Year Needed <sup>(2)</sup> :	2030	
Construction Funding (1)	\$8,427,000	Year Needed <sup>(2)</sup> :	2030	
Percent State Participation in Owning Excess Capacity (3):				
Purchase from SRA (Toledo Bend) - SEP	To	otal Capital Costs: \$ 29	9,204,500	
Pre-Construction Funding (Planning, Design, Permitting, Acquisition, etc.) (1)	\$10,895,000	Year Needed <sup>(2)</sup> :	2020	
Construction Funding (1)	\$18,309,500	Year Needed <sup>(2)</sup> :	2020	
Percent State Participation in Owning Excess Capacity (3):				



## Infrastructure Financing Report Survey

- The IFR Survey helps the TWDB anticipate future funding needs
- Responses to the IFR surveys affect project prioritization
- If you represent a WUG, please review the letter sent in late Feb/early March for changes.
   Contact dmay@plummer.com if you need the letter resent.

# Consultant Team Report Item 8d Draft Prioritization of Strategies

#### Prioritization

 Process of prioritizing recommended Water Management Strategies

 57 recommended WMS in the 2021 Region I Water Plan

 The prioritization score of a project is considered when applying for SWIFT funding

#### Prioritization Criteria

- Thirteen criteria across five categories
  - Decade of Need (40%)
  - Project Feasibility (10%)
  - Project Viability (25%)
  - Project Sustainability (15%)
  - Project Cost Effectiveness (10%)

#### Prioritization Criteria (1/5)

• What decade does the project come online?

Decade	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Score	10	8	6	4	2	0

In what decade is initial funding needed?

Decade	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Score	10	8	6	4	2	0

#### Prioritization Criteria (2/5)

- What supporting data is available to show that the quantity of water needed is available?
- Does the sponsor hold necessary legal rights, water rights and/or contracts?
- What level of engineering and/or planning has been accomplished for this project?
- Has the project sponsor requested in writing that the project be included in the Regional Water Plan?

#### Prioritization Criteria (3/5)

- What is the % of the WUG's needs satisfied by this project in its first decade?
- What is the % of the WUG's needs satisfied by this project in the final decade?
- Is this project the only economically feasible source of new supply for the WUG, other than conservation?
- Does this project serve multiple WUGs?

#### Prioritization Criteria (4/5)

 Over what period of time is this project expected to provide water?

Description	Score
Less than or equal to 20 years	5
Greater than 20 years	10

 Does the volume of water supplied by the project change over the regional water planning

period?

Description	Score
Decrease	0
Stay the Same	3
Increase	5

#### Prioritization Criteria (5/5)

• How does the project's unit cost compare to median unit cost?

Description	Score
200% or greater	0
150% to 199%	1
101% to 149%	2
100%	3
51% to 99%	4
0% to 50%	5

#### Draft Prioritization Results

[Display Prioritization Results]

#### Draft Prioritization Results

 Please review the draft prioritization scores and results. Provide comments to <u>dmay@plummer.com</u> by September 2nd.

 Action will be taken at the September planning meeting to approve the Prioritization scores.

#### Questions?

Dexter May (817) 806-1777 dmay@plummer.com Plummer Associates, Inc.