

## East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Task 4C Technical Memorandum

**Project No:** 1600-003-01

**Date:** August 15, 2018

**Prepared For:** East Texas Regional Water Planning Group

**Prepared By:** Cynthia A. Syvarth, PE, Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.  
Spandana Tummuri, PhD, PE, ENV SP, Freese and Nichols, Inc.  
Jennifer Herrera, WSP USA  
Rex H. Hunt, PE, Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) with the Technical Memorandum developed during preparation of the East Texas Regional Water Planning Area (ETRWPA or Region I) 2021 Regional Water Plan (2021 Plan). This memorandum details regional planning activities to date including preliminary analyses of water demand projections, water supply availability, existing water supplies, water needs, and the East Texas Regional Water Planning Group's (ETRWPG) declaration of intent to forego simplified planning.

### 1. Water User Group Population Projections

A copy of the Population Projections data from the TWDB Data Web Interface (DB22) is included as Attachment 1 of this memorandum. The Water User Group (WUG) summary is divided by County, Basin, and Name.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(1) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code and Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### 2. Water User Group Water Demand Projections

A copy of the Water Demand Projections data from the DB22 is included as Attachment 2 of this memorandum. The WUG summary is divided by County, Basin, and Name.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(1) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code and Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

## **East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

### **3. Water User Group Category Summary**

A copy of the WUG Category Summary from the DB22 is included as Attachment 3 of this memorandum. The summary includes the Population (if applicable), Demand, Existing Supplies, and Needs for each water use category in the 2021 Plan: Municipal, County-Other, Manufacturing, Mining, Steam Electric Power, Livestock, and Irrigation.

This information is provided in accordance with Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **4. Source Water Availability**

A copy of the Water Availability data from the DB22 is included as Attachment 4 of this memorandum. The source summary is divided by Type, Name, County, Basin, and Salinity.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(2) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code and Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **5. Water User Group Existing Water Supplies**

A copy of the Existing Water Supplies data from the DB22 is included as Attachment 5 of this memorandum. The WUG summary is divided by County, Basin, Name, Source Region, and Source Description.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(3) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code and Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **6. Water User Group Identified Water Needs/Surpluses**

A copy of the Water Needs/Surpluses data from the DB22 is included as Attachment 6 of this memorandum. The WUG summary is a balance of projected demands (Attachment 2) minus existing water supplies (Attachment 5) and is divided by County, Basin, and Name.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(4) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code and Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

## **East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

### **7. Source Water Balance**

A copy of the Water Balance data from the DB22 is included as Attachment 7 of this memorandum. The Source summary is a balance of Availability (Attachment 4) minus Existing Water Supplies (Attachment 5) and is divided by Type, Name, County, Basin, and Salinity.

This information is provided in accordance with Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **8. Water User Group Data Comparison to 2016 Plan**

A copy of the WUG comparison to the 2016 Plan data from the DB22 is included as attachment 8 of this memorandum. The WUG Category comparison includes the 2021 Plan Existing Supply, Projected Demand, and Needs balance from Attachment 3 and compares the data to the 2016 Plan. The table is divided by County and Category.

This information is provided in accordance with Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **9. Source Data Comparison to 2016 Plan**

A copy of the Water Availability comparison to the 2016 Plan data from the DB22 is included as attachment 9 of this memorandum. The Source comparison includes the Availability from Attachment 4 and compares the data to the 2016 Plan. The table is divided by County and Type.

This information is provided in accordance with Section 13.1.1 and Table 13-1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **10. Modifications to Draft Available Water Supplies**

Region I is not requesting the reallocation of annual Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) volumes or the use of MAG Peak Factors. However, Region I is requesting modifications to the firm yield of major reservoirs in the Neches, Trinity, and Sabine River Basins. A summary of the model modification assumptions and the original unmodified firm yield are included as Attachments 10a and 10b, respectively, of this memorandum. The alternative availability utilized as the basis for regional water planning is included as Attachment 4 of this memorandum, Source Water Availability.

## East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Task 4C Technical Memorandum

---

This information is provided in accordance with Section 13.1.1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **11. Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies**

The process used to identify potentially feasible Water Management Strategies (WMS) was approved by the ETRWPG at a public meeting held to receive input on the process dated December 11, 2017. The documented process is included as Attachment 11 of this memorandum.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(5) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code and Section 13.1.1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **12. Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies to Date**

A single tabular list of all potentially feasible WMSs identified by the ETRWPG to date is included as Attachment 12 of this memorandum.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(6) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code and Section 13.1.1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **13. Water Availability Models and Runs**

Water availability modeling was used to analyze available supplies from run-of-river sources, reservoirs, and reservoir systems in the Neches, Sabine, and Trinity River Basins and the Neches-Trinity Coastal Basin. A summary of the method used to determine available supplies from the Neches River for the City of Beaumont for regional water planning is included in the hydrologic variance request letter submitted to the TWDB on July 3, 2018. The hydrologic variance request letter is included as Attachment 13a of this memorandum.

A summary of the versions and dates of all Water Availability Models (WAM) and Water Availability runs used to date is included as Attachment 13b of this memorandum.

The electronic model input/output files submitted to the TWDB are not required to be made public or made available in PDF format. Therefore, these documents will be provided directly to the TWDB via electronic submittal in their original text file format so they can be directly verified by a TWDB modeler in accordance with the TWDB Exhibit D, Guidelines for Regional Water Planning Data Deliverables dated March 2018.

## East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Task 4C Technical Memorandum

---

This information is provided in accordance with Section 13.1.1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **14. Groundwater Availability Determination Methodology**

A table summarizing the groundwater availability determination methodology is included as Attachment 14 of this memorandum. The Water Source summary is divided by Name, County, and Basin.

The various methodologies utilized in the order each methodology was applied include:

- Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) – Groundwater Availability Model (GAM) Runs (Run number provided in table)
- Non-Relevant TWDB Modeled
- Maximum 8-Year Historical Annual Use

This information is provided in accordance with Section 13.1.1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **15. Simplified Planning**

The ETRWPG discussed and decided to forgo the option to pursue the simplified planning offered by the TWDB for the fifth cycle of regional water planning at its general meeting held August 15, 2018. The agenda for this meeting is included as Attachment 15 to this memorandum.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(8) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code and Section 13.1.1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **16. Water and Groundwater Availability Model Summaries**

A summary of all WAM models used to determine surface water availability is included as Attachment 13b of this memorandum. The summary includes each model name, model modifications, the date modifications were approved by the TWDB Executive Administrator\*, the firm that performed each model run, and the date of each model run.

\*The ETRWPA hydrologic variance request was submitted to the TWDB Executive Administrator on July 3, 2018 and is pending approval. The request letter is included as Attachment 13a of this memorandum.

The only GAM models utilized by Region I to determine groundwater availabilities were TWDB provided GAMs; therefore, a GAM model summary is not included as an attachment.

## **East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

This information is provided in accordance with Section 13.1.1 of the Texas Water Development Board's Exhibit C: Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development, April 2018.

### **17. Public Comments**

A notice of meeting to consider approving submittal of this Task 4C Technical Memorandum was issued August 1, 2018. The ETRWPG began to accept written and oral comments at the public meeting. Comments were accepted until August 30, 2018 for inclusion in this technical memorandum. A copy of the notice and a summary of comments received are included as Attachments 17a and 17b, respectively, of this memorandum.

This information is provided in accordance with §357.12(c)(7) of Title 31 of the Texas Administrative Code.

### **18. Submittal**

Submittal of this memorandum includes two double-sided bound copies and two electronic copies (PDF and WORD) of this memorandum and its attachments. In addition, the electronic submittals shall include the model input/output files per paragraph 13 of this memorandum.

This information is provided in accordance with Paragraph D in Article III of the Contract between the City of Nacogdoches and the TWDB initiated and approved by the TWDB on April 10, 2015.

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 1**

**TWDB DB22 Report #1. WUG Population Projections**

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	2,118	2,187	2,213	2,213	2,213	2,213
FRANKSTON	1,263	1,305	1,320	1,320	1,320	1,320
FRANKSTON RURAL WSC	1,295	1,338	1,354	1,354	1,354	1,354
NECHES WSC	1,515	1,564	1,582	1,582	1,582	1,582
NORWOOD WSC	814	820	829	829	829	829
PALESTINE	9,726	10,045	10,162	10,162	10,162	10,162
SLOCUM WSC	2,187	2,258	2,284	2,284	2,284	2,284
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	2,581	2,666	2,698	2,698	2,698	2,698
COUNTY-OTHER	615	643	653	653	653	653
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>22,114</b>	<b>22,826</b>	<b>23,095</b>	<b>23,095</b>	<b>23,095</b>	<b>23,095</b>
ANDERSON COUNTY CEDAR CREEK WSC	1,015	1,049	1,060	1,060	1,060	1,060
B B S WSC	1,345	1,388	1,405	1,405	1,405	1,405
B C Y WSC	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	1,243	1,283	1,298	1,298	1,298	1,298
ELKHART	1,431	1,478	1,496	1,496	1,496	1,496
FOUR PINES WSC	3,596	3,713	3,756	3,756	3,756	3,756
NORWOOD WSC	60	60	61	61	61	61
PALESTINE	9,228	9,531	9,641	9,641	9,641	9,641
PLEASANT SPRINGS WSC	974	1,007	1,018	1,018	1,018	1,018
SLOCUM WSC	230	238	240	240	240	240
TDCJ BETO GURNEY & POWLEDGE UNITS	3,598	3,716	3,759	3,759	3,759	3,759
TDCJ COFFIELD MICHAEL	5,132	5,300	5,361	5,361	5,361	5,361
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	1,140	1,178	1,191	1,191	1,191	1,191
TUCKER WSC	1,160	1,198	1,211	1,211	1,211	1,211
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	1,030	1,064	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076
COUNTY-OTHER	5,819	6,087	6,177	6,177	6,177	6,177
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>38,902</b>	<b>40,191</b>	<b>40,651</b>	<b>40,651</b>	<b>40,651</b>	<b>40,651</b>
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>61,016</b>	<b>63,017</b>	<b>63,746</b>	<b>63,746</b>	<b>63,746</b>	<b>63,746</b>
ANGELINA WSC	3,000	3,210	3,386	3,547	3,690	3,818
CENTRAL WCID OF ANGELINA COUNTY	7,323	7,835	8,265	8,658	9,009	9,320
DIBOLL	5,646	6,041	6,372	6,675	6,946	7,186
FOUR WAY SUD	5,596	5,987	6,316	6,616	6,885	7,122
HUDSON WSC	9,588	10,259	10,823	11,337	11,797	12,204
HUNTINGTON	2,504	2,680	2,826	2,961	3,081	3,188
LUFKIN	43,626	46,679	49,241	51,580	53,673	55,526
M & M WSC	3,325	3,558	3,753	3,932	4,091	4,232
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	1,658	1,778	1,880	1,977	2,066	2,148
REDLAND WSC	2,624	2,808	2,961	3,102	3,228	3,340
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	91	92	93	93	93	93
WOODLAWN WSC	1,828	1,956	2,064	2,162	2,249	2,327
ZAVALLA	835	893	943	987	1,028	1,063



### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
COUNTY-OTHER	5,672	6,072	6,406	6,705	6,972	7,205
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>93,316</b>	<b>99,848</b>	<b>105,329</b>	<b>110,332</b>	<b>114,808</b>	<b>118,772</b>
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>93,316</b>	<b>99,848</b>	<b>105,329</b>	<b>110,332</b>	<b>114,808</b>	<b>118,772</b>
AFTON GROVE WSC	1,237	1,357	1,474	1,614	1,761	1,919
ALTO	1,275	1,398	1,519	1,663	1,814	1,977
ALTO RURAL WSC	3,272	3,588	3,898	4,267	4,655	5,074
BLACKJACK WSC	778	853	927	1,014	1,107	1,206
BULLARD	58	63	69	76	82	89
CRAFT TURNEY WSC	5,215	5,717	6,211	6,800	7,417	8,086
GUM CREEK WSC	1,311	1,437	1,561	1,709	1,865	2,033
JACKSONVILLE	18,083	19,830	21,543	23,585	25,726	28,041
NEW SUMMERFIELD	1,238	1,358	1,475	1,614	1,761	1,919
NORTH CHEROKEE WSC	4,900	5,375	5,839	6,391	6,973	7,599
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	144	154	163	171	179	186
RUSK	6,204	6,804	7,391	8,091	8,826	9,620
RUSK RURAL WSC	2,969	3,255	3,537	3,872	4,223	4,603
SOUTH RUSK COUNTY WSC	63	70	77	85	92	100
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	4,165	4,497	4,847	5,240	5,670	6,148
TROUP	77	85	92	101	109	119
WELLS	879	963	1,046	1,146	1,249	1,362
WEST JACKSONVILLE WSC	1,126	1,234	1,341	1,468	1,601	1,745
WRIGHT CITY WSC	601	659	716	784	855	932
COUNTY-OTHER	2,039	2,308	2,551	2,869	3,183	3,511
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>55,634</b>	<b>61,005</b>	<b>66,277</b>	<b>72,560</b>	<b>79,148</b>	<b>86,269</b>
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>55,634</b>	<b>61,005</b>	<b>66,277</b>	<b>72,560</b>	<b>79,148</b>	<b>86,269</b>
HARDIN COUNTY WCID 1	1,421	1,528	1,605	1,661	1,706	1,739
KOUNTZE	2,135	2,141	2,145	2,148	2,151	2,153
LUMBERTON MUD	28,586	31,985	34,397	36,192	37,592	38,619
NORTH HARDIN WSC	7,821	8,344	8,716	8,991	9,206	9,367
SILSBEE	7,162	7,320	7,434	7,517	7,583	7,633
SOUR LAKE	1,920	2,021	2,093	2,147	2,189	2,219
WEST HARDIN WSC	3,491	3,510	3,523	3,531	3,539	3,545
WILDWOOD POA	806	843	869	887	902	913
COUNTY-OTHER	5,900	6,044	6,148	6,207	6,248	6,301
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>59,242</b>	<b>63,736</b>	<b>66,930</b>	<b>69,281</b>	<b>71,116</b>	<b>72,489</b>
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	100	112	125	138	152	166
WEST HARDIN WSC	46	46	46	47	47	47
COUNTY-OTHER	89	92	93	94	95	96
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>309</b>
<b>HARDIN COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>59,477</b>	<b>63,986</b>	<b>67,194</b>	<b>69,560</b>	<b>71,410</b>	<b>72,798</b>

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
ATHENS	274	294	311	333	352	371
BERRYVILLE	1,097	1,201	1,287	1,401	1,500	1,596
BETHEL ASH WSC	3,154	3,565	3,908	4,362	4,753	5,133
BROWNSBORO	1,368	1,665	1,915	2,243	2,527	2,803
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	917	985	1,041	1,116	1,181	1,243
CHANDLER	3,704	4,510	5,181	6,067	6,833	7,574
EDOM WSC	204	223	238	254	274	296
FRANKSTON	44	67	86	111	133	154
LEAGUEVILLE WSC	2,023	2,159	2,330	2,533	3,184	4,044
MOORE STATION WSC	1,430	1,526	1,647	1,789	2,250	2,858
MURCHISON	603	604	606	608	611	612
R P M WSC	630	752	854	988	1,104	1,216
VIRGINIA HILL WSC	1,722	1,976	2,190	2,470	2,711	2,946
COUNTY-OTHER	7,634	7,117	6,583	5,924	4,535	2,798
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>24,804</b>	<b>26,644</b>	<b>28,177</b>	<b>30,199</b>	<b>31,948</b>	<b>33,644</b>
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>24,804</b>	<b>26,644</b>	<b>28,177</b>	<b>30,199</b>	<b>31,948</b>	<b>33,644</b>
GRAPELAND	597	600	601	601	601	601
PENNINGTON WSC	310	311	311	311	311	311
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	2,865	2,885	2,886	2,886	2,886	2,886
COUNTY-OTHER	723	706	705	705	705	705
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>4,495</b>	<b>4,502</b>	<b>4,503</b>	<b>4,503</b>	<b>4,503</b>	<b>4,503</b>
CROCKETT	7,073	7,105	7,105	7,105	7,105	7,105
GRAPELAND	922	927	927	927	927	927
LOVELADY	684	693	693	693	693	693
PENNINGTON WSC	558	561	561	561	561	561
TDCJ EASTHAM UNIT	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,460
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	7,818	7,874	7,874	7,874	7,874	7,874
COUNTY-OTHER	141	138	137	137	137	137
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>19,656</b>	<b>19,758</b>	<b>19,757</b>	<b>19,757</b>	<b>19,757</b>	<b>19,757</b>
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>24,151</b>	<b>24,260</b>	<b>24,260</b>	<b>24,260</b>	<b>24,260</b>	<b>24,260</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	335	337	338	338	338	338
JASPER	9,059	9,259	9,297	9,297	9,297	9,297
RAYBURN COUNTRY MUD	1,703	1,741	1,748	1,748	1,748	1,748
RURAL WSC	1,029	1,052	1,056	1,056	1,056	1,056
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	412	421	423	423	423	423
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	1,209	1,240	1,249	1,252	1,256	1,258
COUNTY-OTHER	8,318	8,502	8,535	8,533	8,530	8,528
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>22,065</b>	<b>22,552</b>	<b>22,646</b>	<b>22,647</b>	<b>22,648</b>	<b>22,648</b>
JASPER COUNTY WCID 1	2,730	2,791	2,802	2,802	2,802	2,802

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
KIRBYVILLE	2,218	2,267	2,276	2,276	2,276	2,276
MAURICEVILLE SUD	429	439	440	440	440	440
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	1,179	1,205	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,210
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	464	476	479	480	482	483
COUNTY-OTHER	7,793	7,965	7,996	7,994	7,991	7,990
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>14,813</b>	<b>15,143</b>	<b>15,203</b>	<b>15,202</b>	<b>15,201</b>	<b>15,201</b>
<b>JASPER COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>36,878</b>	<b>37,695</b>	<b>37,849</b>	<b>37,849</b>	<b>37,849</b>	<b>37,849</b>
BEAUMONT	42,437	45,174	48,050	51,392	55,079	59,207
BEVIL OAKS	1,345	1,431	1,522	1,628	1,745	1,875
CHINA	22	23	25	27	29	31
GROVES	496	496	496	496	496	496
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	945	1,006	1,070	1,144	1,226	1,319
MEEKER MWD	836	890	947	1,012	1,085	1,166
NEDERLAND	679	723	769	822	881	947
PORT ARTHUR	166	168	168	168	168	168
PORT NECHES	7,202	7,667	8,155	8,722	9,347	10,048
COUNTY-OTHER	1,022	1,392	1,838	2,357	2,928	3,569
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>55,150</b>	<b>58,970</b>	<b>63,040</b>	<b>67,768</b>	<b>72,984</b>	<b>78,826</b>
BEAUMONT	87,587	93,235	99,171	106,070	113,679	122,199
CHINA	1,208	1,286	1,368	1,462	1,567	1,685
GROVES	15,511	15,511	15,511	15,511	15,511	15,511
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	4,709	5,012	5,332	5,703	6,112	6,570
MEEKER MWD	2,497	2,658	2,827	3,024	3,240	3,484
NEDERLAND	18,176	19,348	20,579	22,011	23,590	25,359
PORT ARTHUR	55,227	55,922	55,922	55,922	55,922	55,922
PORT NECHES	6,656	7,085	7,536	8,060	8,639	9,287
WEST JEFFERSON COUNTY MWD	8,554	9,105	9,685	10,359	11,102	11,934
COUNTY-OTHER	12,104	16,488	21,773	27,912	34,684	42,264
<b>NECHES-TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>212,229</b>	<b>225,650</b>	<b>239,704</b>	<b>256,034</b>	<b>274,046</b>	<b>294,215</b>
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>267,379</b>	<b>284,620</b>	<b>302,744</b>	<b>323,802</b>	<b>347,030</b>	<b>373,041</b>
APPLEBY WSC	3,656	4,108	4,553	5,026	5,527	6,050
CARO WSC	2,593	2,913	3,228	3,564	3,919	4,290
CUSHING	924	1,037	1,150	1,270	1,396	1,528
D & M WSC	6,238	7,009	7,767	8,574	9,430	10,322
ETOILE WSC	2,238	2,514	2,786	3,075	3,382	3,702
GARRISON	1,124	1,263	1,399	1,545	1,698	1,859
LILLY GROVE SUD	2,649	2,975	3,298	3,641	4,004	4,383
MELROSE WSC	2,828	3,178	3,521	3,887	4,275	4,680
NACOGDOCHES	37,580	42,218	46,790	51,655	56,802	62,183
SWIFT WSC	2,773	3,116	3,453	3,812	4,192	4,589

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
WODEN WSC	2,783	3,127	3,466	3,825	4,206	4,605
COUNTY-OTHER	6,750	7,582	8,404	9,281	10,204	11,173
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>72,136</b>	<b>81,040</b>	<b>89,815</b>	<b>99,155</b>	<b>109,035</b>	<b>119,364</b>
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>72,136</b>	<b>81,040</b>	<b>89,815</b>	<b>99,155</b>	<b>109,035</b>	<b>119,364</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	896	901	902	902	902	902
MAURICEVILLE SUD	390	390	390	390	390	390
NEWTON	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478	2,478
SOUTH NEWTON WSC	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485
COUNTY-OTHER	8,196	8,191	8,190	8,190	8,190	8,190
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>
<b>NEWTON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>	<b>14,445</b>
BRIDGE CITY	1,350	1,411	1,454	1,483	1,505	1,522
KELLY G BREWER	268	280	289	294	299	302
MAURICEVILLE SUD	701	733	755	770	782	790
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 1	12,541	13,108	13,507	13,778	13,985	14,134
ORANGEFIELD WSC	1,897	1,982	2,043	2,084	2,115	2,138
PORT ARTHUR	5	5	5	5	5	5
COUNTY-OTHER	10,665	11,150	11,489	11,719	11,894	12,021
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>27,427</b>	<b>28,669</b>	<b>29,542</b>	<b>30,133</b>	<b>30,585</b>	<b>30,912</b>
BRIDGE CITY	900	941	969	989	1,004	1,014
COUNTY-OTHER	98	102	106	108	109	110
<b>NECHES-TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>1,043</b>	<b>1,075</b>	<b>1,097</b>	<b>1,113</b>	<b>1,124</b>
BRIDGE CITY	6,741	7,045	7,260	7,405	7,517	7,598
KELLY G BREWER	231	241	249	254	258	260
MAURICEVILLE SUD	8,407	8,787	9,056	9,237	9,375	9,476
ORANGE	19,667	20,556	21,183	21,608	21,931	22,166
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 2	3,632	3,797	3,912	3,991	4,051	4,094
ORANGEFIELD WSC	2,968	3,102	3,197	3,261	3,310	3,344
PINEHURST	2,226	2,326	2,397	2,445	2,481	2,509
SOUTH NEWTON WSC	1,398	1,461	1,506	1,536	1,559	1,576
COUNTY-OTHER	12,632	13,206	13,607	13,881	14,089	14,239
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>57,902</b>	<b>60,521</b>	<b>62,367</b>	<b>63,618</b>	<b>64,571</b>	<b>65,262</b>
<b>ORANGE COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>86,327</b>	<b>90,233</b>	<b>92,984</b>	<b>94,848</b>	<b>96,269</b>	<b>97,298</b>
COUNTY-OTHER	55	58	60	62	63	64
<b>CYPRESS BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>
BECKVILLE	994	1,113	1,186	1,254	1,305	1,345
CARTHAGE	6,925	7,066	7,152	7,232	7,292	7,339
GILL WSC	817	841	857	871	882	891
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	58	65	71	78	85	93
PANOLA-BETHANY WSC	92	111	134	169	192	211

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TATUM	324	387	425	460	487	507
COUNTY-OTHER	15,846	16,737	17,269	17,747	18,106	18,382
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>25,056</b>	<b>26,320</b>	<b>27,094</b>	<b>27,811</b>	<b>28,349</b>	<b>28,768</b>
<b>PANOLA COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>25,111</b>	<b>26,378</b>	<b>27,154</b>	<b>27,873</b>	<b>28,412</b>	<b>28,832</b>
CHESTER WSC	224	230	235	239	242	245
CORRIGAN	1,871	2,091	2,263	2,410	2,530	2,627
DAMASCUS-STRYKER WSC	1,557	1,739	1,883	2,005	2,105	2,185
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	1,000	1,124	1,246	1,378	1,515	1,660
MOSCOW WSC	356	398	430	459	482	500
SODA WSC	131	146	159	169	178	184
COUNTY-OTHER	3,820	4,280	4,618	4,877	5,060	5,173
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>8,959</b>	<b>10,008</b>	<b>10,834</b>	<b>11,537</b>	<b>12,112</b>	<b>12,574</b>
<b>POLK COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>8,959</b>	<b>10,008</b>	<b>10,834</b>	<b>11,537</b>	<b>12,112</b>	<b>12,574</b>
EBENEZER WSC	838	934	1,027	1,127	1,231	1,339
GASTON WSC	1,661	1,851	2,036	2,235	2,442	2,656
GOODSPRINGS WSC	2,869	3,198	3,518	3,861	4,218	4,588
HENDERSON	12,718	14,177	15,592	17,115	18,697	20,337
JACOBS WSC	82	91	101	110	121	131
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	1,027	1,145	1,260	1,382	1,510	1,643
MT ENTERPRISE WSC	1,864	2,078	2,285	2,508	2,740	2,981
NEW LONDON	1,380	1,537	1,690	1,855	2,027	2,205
OVERTON	282	314	346	379	414	451
SOUTH RUSK COUNTY WSC	1,888	2,104	2,314	2,541	2,775	3,019
WRIGHT CITY WSC	497	554	610	669	731	795
COUNTY-OTHER	4,914	5,498	6,054	6,646	7,251	7,868
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>30,020</b>	<b>33,481</b>	<b>36,833</b>	<b>40,428</b>	<b>44,157</b>	<b>48,013</b>
CHALK HILL SUD	3,807	4,243	4,668	5,123	5,597	6,088
CROSS ROADS SUD	3,134	3,494	3,844	4,218	4,609	5,013
CRYSTAL FARMS WSC	1,043	1,163	1,279	1,404	1,534	1,668
ELDERVILLE WSC	1,902	2,094	2,301	2,534	2,790	3,073
HENDERSON	2,210	2,463	2,710	2,974	3,249	3,534
JACOBS WSC	2,265	2,525	2,777	3,049	3,330	3,623
KILGORE	3,323	3,705	4,075	4,472	4,887	5,314
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	461	514	565	620	678	737
NEW LONDON	1,111	1,238	1,361	1,494	1,632	1,775
NEW PROSPECT WSC	1,156	1,289	1,418	1,557	1,700	1,850
OVERTON	2,329	2,596	2,854	3,134	3,423	3,723
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	419	452	487	527	570	618
TATUM	1,212	1,351	1,486	1,630	1,781	1,937
WEST GREGG SUD	188	210	231	253	277	301

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
COUNTY-OTHER	4,692	5,249	5,780	6,346	6,924	7,513
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>29,252</b>	<b>32,586</b>	<b>35,836</b>	<b>39,335</b>	<b>42,981</b>	<b>46,767</b>
<b>RUSK COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>59,272</b>	<b>66,067</b>	<b>72,669</b>	<b>79,763</b>	<b>87,138</b>	<b>94,780</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	570	574	575	575	575	575
G M WSC	800	801	801	801	801	801
PINELAND	968	970	970	970	970	970
COUNTY-OTHER	64	64	64	64	64	64
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>2,402</b>	<b>2,409</b>	<b>2,410</b>	<b>2,410</b>	<b>2,410</b>	<b>2,410</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	81	82	82	82	82	82
G M WSC	5,950	5,954	5,955	5,955	5,955	5,955
HEMPHILL	1,294	1,304	1,304	1,304	1,304	1,304
COUNTY-OTHER	1,490	1,500	1,498	1,498	1,498	1,498
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>8,815</b>	<b>8,840</b>	<b>8,839</b>	<b>8,839</b>	<b>8,839</b>	<b>8,839</b>
<b>SABINE COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>11,217</b>	<b>11,249</b>	<b>11,249</b>	<b>11,249</b>	<b>11,249</b>	<b>11,249</b>
SAN AUGUSTINE	2,121	2,121	2,121	2,121	2,121	2,121
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	1,196	1,196	1,196	1,196	1,196	1,196
COUNTY-OTHER	4,824	4,824	4,824	4,824	4,824	4,824
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>8,141</b>	<b>8,141</b>	<b>8,141</b>	<b>8,141</b>	<b>8,141</b>	<b>8,141</b>
G M WSC	563	563	563	563	563	563
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	69	69	69	69	69	69
COUNTY-OTHER	144	144	144	144	144	144
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>776</b>
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>8,917</b>	<b>8,917</b>	<b>8,917</b>	<b>8,917</b>	<b>8,917</b>	<b>8,917</b>
CHOICE WSC	292	314	333	352	369	385
SAND HILLS WSC	869	934	992	1,047	1,098	1,145
TIMPSON	44	47	50	53	56	58
COUNTY-OTHER	1,703	1,832	1,945	2,053	2,153	2,248
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>2,908</b>	<b>3,127</b>	<b>3,320</b>	<b>3,505</b>	<b>3,676</b>	<b>3,836</b>
CENTER	5,589	6,011	6,383	6,736	7,066	7,370
CHOICE WSC	851	914	972	1,025	1,075	1,121
EAST LAMAR WSC	853	918	975	1,029	1,079	1,125
FIVE WAY WSC	1,512	1,627	1,727	1,822	1,912	1,994
FLAT FORK WSC	1,161	1,248	1,326	1,399	1,467	1,530
HUXLEY	2,210	2,376	2,522	2,662	2,793	2,912
JOAQUIN	1,176	1,264	1,343	1,416	1,487	1,550
McCLELLAND WSC	1,383	1,487	1,579	1,666	1,747	1,823
SAND HILLS WSC	856	921	978	1,032	1,082	1,128
TENAHA	1,252	1,347	1,430	1,509	1,583	1,651
TIMPSON	1,201	1,292	1,372	1,447	1,517	1,583

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
COUNTY-OTHER	6,509	7,000	7,435	7,847	8,231	8,590
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>24,553</b>	<b>26,405</b>	<b>28,042</b>	<b>29,590</b>	<b>31,039</b>	<b>32,377</b>
<b>SHELBY COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>27,461</b>	<b>29,532</b>	<b>31,362</b>	<b>33,095</b>	<b>34,715</b>	<b>36,213</b>
ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF TEXAS	859	954	1,052	1,161	1,276	1,400
ARP	1,084	1,136	1,189	1,245	1,303	1,362
BEN WHEELER WSC	17	19	20	21	22	23
BULLARD	3,674	4,714	5,757	6,881	8,024	9,197
CARROLL WSC	855	950	1,048	1,156	1,270	1,394
CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	1,317	1,657	2,000	2,372	2,758	3,166
DEAN WSC	4,725	4,905	5,087	5,281	5,480	5,683
EMERALD BAY MUD	1,133	1,133	1,133	1,133	1,133	1,133
JACKSON WSC	2,322	2,561	2,802	3,062	3,325	3,595
LINDALE	2,099	2,704	3,311	3,964	4,629	5,311
LINDALE RURAL WSC	3,815	4,149	4,484	4,846	5,212	5,591
OVERTON	149	189	229	271	315	359
R P M WSC	262	297	332	369	408	447
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	35,552	37,774	39,984	42,376	44,796	47,271
TROUP	2,101	2,317	2,536	2,770	3,009	3,254
TYLER	104,698	113,960	123,250	133,249	143,427	153,872
WALNUT GROVE WSC	8,728	10,281	11,839	13,516	15,222	16,973
WHITEHOUSE	9,215	10,854	12,499	14,270	16,071	17,920
WRIGHT CITY WSC	2,381	2,669	2,958	3,269	3,585	3,910
COUNTY-OTHER	4,034	5,356	6,686	8,100	9,538	10,998
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>189,020</b>	<b>208,579</b>	<b>228,196</b>	<b>249,312</b>	<b>270,803</b>	<b>292,859</b>
<b>SMITH COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>189,020</b>	<b>208,579</b>	<b>228,196</b>	<b>249,312</b>	<b>270,803</b>	<b>292,859</b>
CENTERVILLE WSC	855	925	932	905	937	981
GROVETON	518	561	565	550	569	596
PENNINGTON WSC	549	594	599	581	602	629
COUNTY-OTHER	1,826	1,974	1,988	1,933	2,045	2,140
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>3,748</b>	<b>4,054</b>	<b>4,084</b>	<b>3,969</b>	<b>4,153</b>	<b>4,346</b>
<b>TRINITY COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>3,748</b>	<b>4,054</b>	<b>4,084</b>	<b>3,969</b>	<b>4,153</b>	<b>4,346</b>
CHESTER WSC	872	899	917	932	944	954
COLMESNEIL	1,045	1,045	1,045	1,045	1,045	1,045
CYPRESS CREEK WSC	592	595	595	595	595	595
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	29	33	36	40	44	49
MOSCOW WSC	15	16	18	19	20	21
TYLER COUNTY WSC	5,684	5,711	5,711	5,711	5,711	5,711
WARREN WSC	1,371	1,377	1,377	1,377	1,377	1,377
WILDWOOD POA	598	626	645	658	669	678
WOODVILLE	5,809	5,825	5,825	5,825	5,825	5,825

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG POPULATION					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
COUNTY-OTHER	6,273	6,269	6,227	6,194	6,166	6,141
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>22,288</b>	<b>22,396</b>	<b>22,396</b>	<b>22,396</b>	<b>22,396</b>	<b>22,396</b>
<b>TYLER COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>22,288</b>	<b>22,396</b>	<b>22,396</b>	<b>22,396</b>	<b>22,396</b>	<b>22,396</b>
<b>REGION I TOTAL POPULATION</b>	<b>1,151,556</b>	<b>1,233,973</b>	<b>1,309,681</b>	<b>1,388,867</b>	<b>1,469,843</b>	<b>1,553,652</b>



**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 2**

**TWDB DB22 Report #2. WUG Water Demand Projections**

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	181	177	171	167	166	166
FRANKSTON	238	240	238	235	235	235
FRANKSTON RURAL WSC	171	171	168	166	166	166
NECHES WSC	199	199	196	193	192	192
NORWOOD WSC	129	126	124	123	123	123
PALESTINE	2,512	2,548	2,542	2,522	2,519	2,519
SLOCUM WSC	258	257	252	249	248	248
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	263	260	255	250	249	249
COUNTY-OTHER	87	88	87	86	86	86
MINING	64	81	85	67	48	34
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408
LIVESTOCK	474	474	474	474	474	474
IRRIGATION	288	288	288	288	288	288
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>6,272</b>	<b>6,317</b>	<b>6,288</b>	<b>6,228</b>	<b>6,202</b>	<b>6,188</b>
ANDERSON COUNTY CEDAR CREEK WSC	101	100	98	96	96	96
B B S WSC	131	130	127	124	124	124
B C Y WSC	220	212	206	202	202	202
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	107	104	101	98	98	98
ELKHART	249	251	249	246	246	246
FOUR PINES WSC	336	335	331	326	325	325
NORWOOD WSC	9	9	9	9	9	9
PALESTINE	2,384	2,418	2,411	2,393	2,390	2,390
PLEASANT SPRINGS WSC	169	171	169	167	167	167
SLOCUM WSC	27	27	27	26	26	26
TDCJ BETO GURNEY & POWLEDGE UNITS	1,129	1,150	1,152	1,145	1,144	1,144
TDCJ COFFIELD MICHAEL	3,116	3,195	3,214	3,205	3,203	3,203
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	129	129	126	124	124	123
TUCKER WSC	127	126	124	122	121	121
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	105	104	102	100	100	100
COUNTY-OTHER	820	832	825	814	811	811
MINING	76	96	100	80	57	41
LIVESTOCK	552	552	552	552	552	552
IRRIGATION	369	369	369	369	369	369
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>10,156</b>	<b>10,310</b>	<b>10,292</b>	<b>10,198</b>	<b>10,164</b>	<b>10,147</b>
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>16,428</b>	<b>16,627</b>	<b>16,580</b>	<b>16,426</b>	<b>16,366</b>	<b>16,335</b>
ANGELINA WSC	251	251	254	265	274	284
CENTRAL WCID OF ANGELINA COUNTY	510	527	555	582	605	626
DIBOLL	738	758	776	811	841	870
FOUR WAY SUD	484	502	520	538	558	577
HUDSON WSC	644	689	727	762	793	820
HUNTINGTON	254	259	264	271	281	291
LUFKIN	7,253	7,545	7,792	8,073	8,382	8,668
M & M WSC	283	286	290	300	310	321
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	162	166	170	176	184	191
REDLAND WSC	203	201	210	219	227	235
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	11	11	10	10	10	10
WOODLAWN WSC	163	165	168	173	180	186

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
ZAVALLA	85	87	89	91	95	98
COUNTY-OTHER	641	653	668	697	722	746
MANUFACTURING	3,658	3,878	3,878	3,878	3,878	3,878
MINING	486	585	410	312	237	180
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	3,520	3,520	3,520	3,520	3,520	3,520
LIVESTOCK	1,028	1,028	1,028	1,028	1,028	1,028
IRRIGATION	779	779	779	779	779	779
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>21,153</b>	<b>21,890</b>	<b>22,108</b>	<b>22,485</b>	<b>22,904</b>	<b>23,308</b>
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>21,153</b>	<b>21,890</b>	<b>22,108</b>	<b>22,485</b>	<b>22,904</b>	<b>23,308</b>
AFTON GROVE WSC	189	202	215	234	254	277
ALTO	236	253	270	293	319	347
ALTO RURAL WSC	637	677	734	801	873	951
BLACKJACK WSC	138	147	158	171	186	203
BULLARD	11	12	13	15	16	17
CRAFT TURNEY WSC	485	503	524	562	610	665
GUM CREEK WSC	129	134	142	153	167	181
JACKSONVILLE	3,045	3,247	3,457	3,745	4,076	4,440
NEW SUMMERFIELD	158	169	180	195	212	231
NORTH CHEROKEE WSC	601	640	680	736	801	872
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	14	14	15	15	16	17
RUSK	1,041	1,112	1,186	1,286	1,400	1,525
RUSK RURAL WSC	301	316	332	358	388	423
SOUTH RUSK COUNTY WSC	6	7	7	8	8	9
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	712	749	791	847	914	991
TROUP	15	16	17	19	20	22
WELLS	141	150	159	172	187	204
WEST JACKSONVILLE WSC	165	175	187	203	221	241
WRIGHT CITY WSC	69	73	77	83	91	99
COUNTY-OTHER	238	260	281	311	344	380
MANUFACTURING	115	129	129	129	129	129
MINING	295	304	267	204	141	97
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	3,211	3,211	3,211	3,211	3,211	3,211
LIVESTOCK	1,874	1,874	1,874	1,874	1,874	1,874
IRRIGATION	451	451	451	451	451	451
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>14,277</b>	<b>14,825</b>	<b>15,357</b>	<b>16,076</b>	<b>16,909</b>	<b>17,857</b>
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>14,277</b>	<b>14,825</b>	<b>15,357</b>	<b>16,076</b>	<b>16,909</b>	<b>17,857</b>
HARDIN COUNTY WCID 1	131	134	136	138	141	143
KOUNTZE	255	246	238	234	234	234
LUMBERTON MUD	2,610	2,805	2,929	3,032	3,137	3,222
NORTH HARDIN WSC	543	561	586	604	619	630
SILSBEE	944	931	918	913	919	925
SOUR LAKE	279	285	288	292	297	301
WEST HARDIN WSC	235	236	237	237	238	238
WILDWOOD POA	156	160	162	164	166	168
COUNTY-OTHER	699	686	674	678	681	687
MANUFACTURING	40	45	45	45	45	45

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
MINING	12	12	12	12	12	12
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	1	1	1	1	1	1
LIVESTOCK	196	196	196	196	196	196
IRRIGATION	989	989	989	989	989	989
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>7,090</b>	<b>7,287</b>	<b>7,411</b>	<b>7,535</b>	<b>7,675</b>	<b>7,791</b>
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	7	8	8	9	10	11
WEST HARDIN WSC	3	3	3	3	3	3
COUNTY-OTHER	11	10	10	10	10	10
LIVESTOCK	2	2	2	2	2	2
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>HARDIN COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>7,113</b>	<b>7,310</b>	<b>7,434</b>	<b>7,559</b>	<b>7,700</b>	<b>7,817</b>
ATHENS	56	59	61	65	68	72
BERRYVILLE	118	124	129	138	147	157
BETHEL ASH WSC	321	350	376	414	450	486
BROWNSBORO	218	259	295	343	386	428
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	79	80	81	84	89	93
CHANDLER	627	746	846	984	1,107	1,226
EDOM WSC	22	23	24	26	27	30
FRANKSTON	8	12	16	20	24	27
LEAGUEVILLE WSC	215	221	233	250	313	397
MOORE STATION WSC	183	189	200	215	269	342
MURCHISON	94	91	89	88	88	89
R P M WSC	69	79	88	101	112	123
VIRGINIA HILL WSC	166	182	195	217	237	257
COUNTY-OTHER	700	613	538	482	367	226
MINING	77	86	77	59	40	28
LIVESTOCK	1,006	1,006	1,006	1,006	1,006	1,006
IRRIGATION	303	303	303	303	303	303
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>4,262</b>	<b>4,423</b>	<b>4,557</b>	<b>4,795</b>	<b>5,033</b>	<b>5,290</b>
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>4,262</b>	<b>4,423</b>	<b>4,557</b>	<b>4,795</b>	<b>5,033</b>	<b>5,290</b>
GRAPELAND	83	81	79	77	77	77
PENNINGTON WSC	29	28	28	27	27	27
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	325	315	305	300	299	299
COUNTY-OTHER	126	120	118	118	118	118
MANUFACTURING	7	10	10	10	10	10
MINING	113	89	66	42	18	8
LIVESTOCK	441	482	525	572	623	688
IRRIGATION	387	387	387	387	387	387
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>1,511</b>	<b>1,512</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>1,533</b>	<b>1,559</b>	<b>1,614</b>
CROCKETT	1,280	1,253	1,225	1,211	1,208	1,208
GRAPELAND	128	124	121	120	119	119
LOVELADY	132	130	128	127	126	126
PENNINGTON WSC	53	51	49	49	48	48
TDCJ EASTHAM UNIT	1,098	1,088	1,079	1,075	1,074	1,074
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	885	859	834	820	817	817
COUNTY-OTHER	25	24	23	23	23	23
MANUFACTURING	162	222	222	222	222	222

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
MINING	209	165	121	77	33	14
LIVESTOCK	1,123	1,225	1,335	1,455	1,585	1,751
IRRIGATION	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>6,845</b>	<b>6,891</b>	<b>6,887</b>	<b>6,929</b>	<b>7,005</b>	<b>7,152</b>
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>8,356</b>	<b>8,403</b>	<b>8,405</b>	<b>8,462</b>	<b>8,564</b>	<b>8,766</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	39	38	37	36	36	36
JASPER	1,963	1,963	1,937	1,918	1,915	1,915
RAYBURN COUNTRY MUD	178	174	170	167	167	167
RURAL WSC	107	105	102	101	100	100
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	31	30	28	28	28	28
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	145	143	140	139	139	139
COUNTY-OTHER	877	861	836	821	817	817
MANUFACTURING	45,841	57,200	57,200	57,200	57,200	57,200
MINING	70	56	42	27	13	7
LIVESTOCK	6,354	6,354	6,354	6,354	6,354	6,354
IRRIGATION	94	94	94	94	94	94
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>55,699</b>	<b>67,018</b>	<b>66,940</b>	<b>66,885</b>	<b>66,863</b>	<b>66,857</b>
JASPER COUNTY WCID 1	204	192	188	188	188	188
KIRBYVILLE	402	401	395	391	390	390
MAURICEVILLE SUD	30	30	30	30	30	30
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	88	84	82	82	82	82
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	55	55	54	53	53	53
COUNTY-OTHER	821	806	784	769	766	766
MANUFACTURING	132	164	164	164	164	164
MINING	78	62	46	31	15	7
LIVESTOCK	3,646	3,646	3,646	3,646	3,646	3,646
IRRIGATION	57	57	57	57	57	57
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>5,513</b>	<b>5,497</b>	<b>5,446</b>	<b>5,411</b>	<b>5,391</b>	<b>5,383</b>
<b>JASPER COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>61,212</b>	<b>72,515</b>	<b>72,386</b>	<b>72,296</b>	<b>72,254</b>	<b>72,240</b>
BEAUMONT	10,049	10,480	10,974	11,642	12,457	13,385
BEVIL OAKS	134	135	138	146	156	167
CHINA	3	3	3	3	3	3
GROVES	69	66	64	64	63	63
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	82	83	85	89	95	102
MEEKER MWD	108	111	116	122	131	140
NEDERLAND	88	90	93	98	105	112
PORT ARTHUR	58	58	57	57	57	57
PORT NECHES	744	754	771	809	864	928
COUNTY-OTHER	162	213	276	351	435	530
MANUFACTURING	109,387	126,100	126,100	126,100	126,100	126,100
MINING	128	143	161	194	217	243
LIVESTOCK	67	67	67	67	67	67
IRRIGATION	6,198	6,198	6,198	6,198	6,198	6,198
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>127,277</b>	<b>144,501</b>	<b>145,103</b>	<b>145,940</b>	<b>146,948</b>	<b>148,095</b>
BEAUMONT	20,739	21,630	22,649	24,029	25,711	27,627
CHINA	139	142	147	154	165	177

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GROVES	2,149	2,075	2,012	1,987	1,982	1,982
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	411	416	425	445	475	510
MEEKER MWD	323	333	346	366	390	420
NEDERLAND	2,348	2,408	2,487	2,620	2,799	3,007
PORT ARTHUR	19,176	19,147	18,927	18,882	18,863	18,862
PORT NECHES	687	696	713	748	798	857
WEST JEFFERSON COUNTY MWD	741	752	771	809	863	926
COUNTY-OTHER	1,914	2,520	3,265	4,152	5,151	6,272
MANUFACTURING	93,515	107,802	107,802	107,802	107,802	107,802
MINING	66	73	83	100	112	125
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	3,291	3,291	3,291	3,291	3,291	3,291
LIVESTOCK	770	770	770	770	770	770
IRRIGATION	82,338	82,338	82,338	82,338	82,338	82,338
<b>NECHES-TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>228,607</b>	<b>244,393</b>	<b>246,026</b>	<b>248,493</b>	<b>251,510</b>	<b>254,966</b>
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>355,884</b>	<b>388,894</b>	<b>391,129</b>	<b>394,433</b>	<b>398,458</b>	<b>403,061</b>
APPLEBY WSC	658	722	787	862	946	1,035
CARO WSC	254	272	292	317	347	380
CUSHING	166	181	197	216	237	259
D & M WSC	904	993	1,086	1,189	1,305	1,428
ETOILE WSC	255	275	297	323	354	387
GARRISON	252	277	302	331	363	397
LILLY GROVE SUD	369	404	440	481	528	577
MELROSE WSC	410	447	485	529	581	635
NACOGDOCHES	6,868	7,514	8,177	8,945	9,818	10,742
SWIFT WSC	424	461	499	545	598	654
WODEN WSC	340	368	396	432	473	518
COUNTY-OTHER	686	749	827	909	996	1,090
MANUFACTURING	2,508	2,529	2,529	2,529	2,529	2,529
MINING	7,000	4,500	1,643	1,299	958	707
LIVESTOCK	9,693	10,122	10,619	11,195	11,854	12,836
IRRIGATION	266	266	266	266	266	266
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>31,053</b>	<b>30,080</b>	<b>28,842</b>	<b>30,368</b>	<b>32,153</b>	<b>34,440</b>
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>31,053</b>	<b>30,080</b>	<b>28,842</b>	<b>30,368</b>	<b>32,153</b>	<b>34,440</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	104	101	99	97	97	97
MAURICEVILLE SUD	27	26	26	26	26	26
NEWTON	443	433	425	421	420	420
SOUTH NEWTON WSC	167	167	167	167	167	167
COUNTY-OTHER	886	846	811	803	800	800
MANUFACTURING	52	56	56	56	56	56
MINING	429	373	279	209	146	107
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	5,778	5,778	5,778	5,778	5,778	5,778
LIVESTOCK	168	168	168	168	168	168
IRRIGATION	101	101	101	101	101	101
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>8,155</b>	<b>8,049</b>	<b>7,910</b>	<b>7,826</b>	<b>7,759</b>	<b>7,720</b>
<b>NEWTON COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>8,155</b>	<b>8,049</b>	<b>7,910</b>	<b>7,826</b>	<b>7,759</b>	<b>7,720</b>
BRIDGE CITY	120	118	116	117	118	119

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
KELLY G BREWER	41	42	42	43	44	44
MAURICEVILLE SUD	49	49	51	52	53	53
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 1	1,553	1,569	1,576	1,595	1,614	1,631
ORANGEFIELD WSC	175	179	182	184	186	188
PORT ARTHUR	2	2	2	2	2	2
COUNTY-OTHER	1,231	1,220	1,252	1,274	1,289	1,302
MANUFACTURING	542	589	589	589	589	589
MINING	139	141	141	141	143	147
LIVESTOCK	83	83	83	83	83	83
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>3,935</b>	<b>3,992</b>	<b>4,034</b>	<b>4,080</b>	<b>4,121</b>	<b>4,158</b>
BRIDGE CITY	80	78	77	78	79	80
COUNTY-OTHER	11	11	12	12	12	12
<b>NECHES-TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>92</b>
BRIDGE CITY	596	588	577	583	589	596
KELLY G BREWER	36	36	37	37	37	38
MAURICEVILLE SUD	588	591	608	621	630	637
ORANGE	2,626	2,644	2,645	2,663	2,696	2,724
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 2	494	500	504	510	517	522
ORANGEFIELD WSC	274	280	284	287	291	294
PINEHURST	284	284	285	290	293	296
SOUTH NEWTON WSC	94	98	101	103	105	106
COUNTY-OTHER	1,458	1,445	1,483	1,508	1,526	1,542
MANUFACTURING	43,793	47,604	47,604	47,604	47,604	47,604
MINING	170	173	172	173	176	180
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	4,298	4,298	4,298	4,298	4,298	4,298
LIVESTOCK	172	172	172	172	172	172
IRRIGATION	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>56,707</b>	<b>60,537</b>	<b>60,594</b>	<b>60,673</b>	<b>60,758</b>	<b>60,833</b>
<b>ORANGE COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>60,733</b>	<b>64,618</b>	<b>64,717</b>	<b>64,843</b>	<b>64,970</b>	<b>65,083</b>
COUNTY-OTHER	6	6	6	6	6	6
MINING	6	6	5	4	4	4
LIVESTOCK	27	27	27	27	27	27
<b>CYPRESS BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>
BECKVILLE	136	147	153	160	166	171
CARTHAGE	1,650	1,651	1,644	1,648	1,659	1,669
GILL WSC	94	93	91	92	93	94
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	4	4	5	5	6	6
PANOLA-BETHANY WSC	18	21	25	32	36	40
TATUM	63	73	79	85	89	93
COUNTY-OTHER	1,589	1,602	1,594	1,607	1,633	1,658
MANUFACTURING	852	1,272	1,272	1,272	1,272	1,272
MINING	5,910	5,853	5,044	4,264	3,616	3,934
LIVESTOCK	2,625	2,625	2,625	2,625	2,625	2,625
IRRIGATION	574	574	574	574	574	574
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>13,515</b>	<b>13,915</b>	<b>13,106</b>	<b>12,364</b>	<b>11,769</b>	<b>12,136</b>
<b>PANOLA COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>13,554</b>	<b>13,954</b>	<b>13,144</b>	<b>12,401</b>	<b>11,806</b>	<b>12,173</b>
CHESTER WSC	39	39	39	39	39	40





### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
MINING	1,435	1,923	1,857	1,787	1,728	1,724
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	40,811	40,811	40,811	40,811	40,811	40,811
LIVESTOCK	732	742	755	769	783	783
IRRIGATION	121	121	121	121	121	121
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>47,303</b>	<b>48,142</b>	<b>48,439</b>	<b>48,807</b>	<b>49,242</b>	<b>49,741</b>
<b>RUSK COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>59,937</b>	<b>61,800</b>	<b>62,533</b>	<b>63,411</b>	<b>64,433</b>	<b>65,593</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	67	65	63	62	62	62
G M WSC	54	54	54	54	54	54
PINELAND	90	86	82	81	81	81
COUNTY-OTHER	6	5	5	5	5	5
MANUFACTURING	246	265	265	265	265	265
MINING	240	218	192	167	142	124
LIVESTOCK	20	28	36	46	57	57
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>648</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	9	9	9	9	9	9
G M WSC	400	400	400	400	400	400
HEMPHILL	305	302	297	295	294	294
COUNTY-OTHER	128	122	116	115	115	115
MINING	1,260	1,147	1,011	879	746	652
LIVESTOCK	109	148	195	248	306	306
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>2,211</b>	<b>2,128</b>	<b>2,028</b>	<b>1,946</b>	<b>1,870</b>	<b>1,776</b>
<b>SABINE COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>2,934</b>	<b>2,849</b>	<b>2,725</b>	<b>2,626</b>	<b>2,536</b>	<b>2,424</b>
SAN AUGUSTINE	519	508	499	498	498	498
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	113	108	104	102	102	102
COUNTY-OTHER	467	448	432	423	421	421
MANUFACTURING	6	6	6	6	6	6
MINING	3,800	2,850	1,405	1,121	840	629
LIVESTOCK	1,811	2,005	2,228	2,486	2,771	2,771
IRRIGATION	4	4	4	4	4	4
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>6,720</b>	<b>5,929</b>	<b>4,678</b>	<b>4,640</b>	<b>4,642</b>	<b>4,431</b>
G M WSC	38	38	38	38	38	38
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	7	6	6	6	6	6
COUNTY-OTHER	14	13	13	13	13	13
MINING	200	150	74	59	44	33
LIVESTOCK	193	214	237	265	295	295
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>385</b>
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>7,172</b>	<b>6,350</b>	<b>5,046</b>	<b>5,021</b>	<b>5,038</b>	<b>4,816</b>
CHOICE WSC	32	33	34	36	37	39
SAND HILLS WSC	150	156	163	170	178	186
TIMPSON	6	7	7	7	7	8
COUNTY-OTHER	186	192	198	206	215	224
MINING	919	822	699	554	411	304
LIVESTOCK	2,266	2,699	3,227	3,872	4,657	4,657
IRRIGATION	3	3	3	3	3	3
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>3,562</b>	<b>3,912</b>	<b>4,331</b>	<b>4,848</b>	<b>5,508</b>	<b>5,421</b>
CENTER	1,842	1,952	2,050	2,152	2,255	2,351

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
CHOICE WSC	95	98	100	104	109	113
EAST LAMAR WSC	109	113	117	122	127	133
FIVE WAY WSC	163	168	172	179	187	195
FLAT FORK WSC	129	133	136	142	149	155
HUXLEY	285	295	304	318	333	347
JOAQUIN	180	187	194	203	213	222
MCCLELLAND WSC	216	225	234	244	256	267
SAND HILLS WSC	147	154	160	168	176	183
TENAHA	227	237	247	258	271	282
TIMPSON	172	178	185	193	202	210
COUNTY-OTHER	712	735	758	787	823	858
MANUFACTURING	1,696	1,696	1,696	1,696	1,696	1,696
MINING	2,364	2,116	1,797	1,426	1,056	783
LIVESTOCK	9,592	11,429	13,664	16,391	19,716	19,716
IRRIGATION	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>17,936</b>	<b>19,723</b>	<b>21,821</b>	<b>24,390</b>	<b>27,576</b>	<b>27,518</b>
<b>SHELBY COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>21,498</b>	<b>23,635</b>	<b>26,152</b>	<b>29,238</b>	<b>33,084</b>	<b>32,939</b>
ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF TEXAS	58	64	71	78	86	94
ARP	175	178	182	189	197	206
BEN WHEELER WSC	1	2	2	2	2	2
BULLARD	728	920	1,115	1,329	1,547	1,773
CARROLL WSC	99	106	115	125	137	150
CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	411	512	616	730	848	973
DEAN WSC	763	772	784	805	833	864
EMERALD BAY MUD	175	170	167	166	165	165
JACKSON WSC	212	222	234	252	272	294
LINDALE	476	604	733	875	1,020	1,170
LINDALE RURAL WSC	298	308	321	341	365	391
OVERTON	32	39	47	55	64	73
R P M WSC	29	31	34	38	41	45
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	6,079	6,289	6,527	6,848	7,223	7,617
TROUP	416	447	481	520	564	610
TYLER	20,032	21,313	22,676	24,310	26,118	28,007
WALNUT GROVE WSC	1,082	1,231	1,388	1,569	1,763	1,964
WHITEHOUSE	1,166	1,331	1,503	1,700	1,910	2,128
WRIGHT CITY WSC	272	295	319	348	380	415
COUNTY-OTHER	475	610	745	894	1,049	1,209
MANUFACTURING	2,956	3,348	3,348	3,348	3,348	3,348
MINING	134	139	140	109	80	58
LIVESTOCK	580	580	580	580	580	580
IRRIGATION	448	448	448	448	448	448
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>37,097</b>	<b>39,959</b>	<b>42,576</b>	<b>45,659</b>	<b>49,040</b>	<b>52,584</b>
<b>SMITH COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>37,097</b>	<b>39,959</b>	<b>42,576</b>	<b>45,659</b>	<b>49,040</b>	<b>52,584</b>
CENTERVILLE WSC	106	111	109	105	109	114
GROVETON	55	57	55	53	55	57
PENNINGTON WSC	52	54	53	50	52	54

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG DEMAND (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
COUNTY-OTHER	131	133	134	130	137	144
MINING	5	5	5	5	5	5
LIVESTOCK	202	202	202	202	202	202
IRRIGATION	278	278	278	278	278	278
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>829</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>854</b>
<b>TRINITY COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>829</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>854</b>
CHESTER WSC	151	151	151	152	154	155
COLMESNEIL	252	247	243	241	241	241
CYPRESS CREEK WSC	117	115	113	112	112	112
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	2	2	2	3	3	3
MOSCOW WSC	2	2	3	3	3	3
TYLER COUNTY WSC	660	638	617	606	604	604
WARREN WSC	185	180	175	173	172	172
WILDWOOD POA	116	119	120	122	123	125
WOODVILLE	1,241	1,218	1,196	1,184	1,182	1,182
COUNTY-OTHER	793	764	736	719	714	711
MINING	160	198	150	103	55	29
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	200	200	200	200	200	200
LIVESTOCK	249	249	249	249	249	249
IRRIGATION	354	354	354	354	354	354
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>	<b>4,482</b>	<b>4,437</b>	<b>4,309</b>	<b>4,221</b>	<b>4,166</b>	<b>4,140</b>
<b>TYLER COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>4,482</b>	<b>4,437</b>	<b>4,309</b>	<b>4,221</b>	<b>4,166</b>	<b>4,140</b>
<b>REGION I TOTAL DEMAND</b>	<b>738,081</b>	<b>793,495</b>	<b>798,814</b>	<b>811,072</b>	<b>826,138</b>	<b>839,601</b>

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 3**

**TWDB DB22 Report #3. WUG Category Summary**

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Category Summary\*

<b>MUNICIPAL</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
POPULATION	999,152	1,069,403	1,133,698	1,201,086	1,270,452	1,342,338
DEMAND (acre-feet per year)	174,710	181,744	188,684	197,797	208,510	220,028
EXISTING SUPPLIES (acre-feet per year)	208,064	213,003	216,671	220,874	226,926	233,684
NEEDS (acre-feet per year)	4,164	4,843	6,539	9,790	12,728	16,019

<b>COUNTY-OTHER</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
POPULATION	152,404	164,570	175,983	187,781	199,391	211,314
DEMAND (acre-feet per year)	17,339	18,126	19,138	20,469	21,958	23,583
EXISTING SUPPLIES (acre-feet per year)	29,845	30,848	31,911	32,670	33,038	33,442
NEEDS (acre-feet per year)	160	73	0	253	1,434	2,739

<b>MANUFACTURING</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
DEMAND (acre-feet per year)	305,973	353,415	353,415	353,415	353,415	353,415
EXISTING SUPPLIES (acre-feet per year)	419,090	519,463	534,573	549,546	564,689	580,428
NEEDS (acre-feet per year)	0	0	0	0	0	0

<b>MINING</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
DEMAND (acre-feet per year)	27,523	24,547	18,169	15,488	12,986	12,093
EXISTING SUPPLIES (acre-feet per year)	22,082	21,988	21,437	20,904	20,432	20,608
NEEDS (acre-feet per year)	9,663	7,246	2,872	2,397	2,088	1,944

<b>STEAM ELECTRIC POWER</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
DEMAND (acre-feet per year)	67,011	67,011	67,011	67,011	67,011	67,011
EXISTING SUPPLIES (acre-feet per year)	88,574	88,574	88,574	88,574	88,574	88,574
NEEDS (acre-feet per year)	3,494	3,494	3,494	3,494	3,494	3,494

<b>LIVESTOCK</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
DEMAND (acre-feet per year)	47,157	50,284	54,029	58,524	63,890	65,103
EXISTING SUPPLIES (acre-feet per year)	26,647	26,755	26,773	26,766	26,102	25,759
NEEDS (acre-feet per year)	26,715	29,622	33,121	37,358	42,450	43,432

<b>IRRIGATION</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
DEMAND (acre-feet per year)	98,368	98,368	98,368	98,368	98,368	98,368
EXISTING SUPPLIES (acre-feet per year)	218,387	218,404	218,417	218,430	218,410	218,421
NEEDS (acre-feet per year)	577	587	602	618	670	700

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG’s region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Category Summary report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split’s projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 4**

**TWDB DB22 Report #4. Source Water Availability**

### Region I Source Availability

GROUNDWATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE AVAILABILITY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY *	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	23,335	23,335	23,335	23,335	23,335	23,335
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	5,753	5,753	5,753	5,753	5,753	5,753
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	27,591	27,591	27,591	27,591	27,591	27,591
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	20,933	20,933	20,933	20,933	20,933	20,470
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	HENDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	6,036	6,036	6,036	6,036	6,036	6,036
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	22,488	22,488	22,488	22,488	22,488	22,488
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	3,806	3,806	3,806	3,806	3,806	3,806
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	24,181	24,181	24,181	24,181	24,181	24,181
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	PANOLA	CYPRESS	FRESH	6	6	6	6	6	6
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	PANOLA	SABINE	FRESH	8,370	8,212	8,212	8,212	8,062	8,062
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	11,769	11,769	11,769	11,750	11,750	11,750
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	9,068	9,068	9,068	9,068	9,068	9,068
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	356	356	356	356	356	356
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	3,249	3,249	3,249	3,249	3,249	3,249
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	1,149	1,149	1,149	1,149	1,149	1,149
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	SABINE	FRESH	290	290	290	290	290	290
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SHELBY	NECHES	FRESH	2,577	2,288	2,151	2,018	2,018	2,018
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SHELBY	SABINE	FRESH	8,317	8,154	8,154	7,705	7,269	7,081
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	22,705	22,705	22,705	22,705	22,705	22,693
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	269	269	269	269	269	269
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	HARDIN	NECHES	FRESH	34,789	34,789	34,789	34,789	34,789	34,789
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	HARDIN	TRINITY	FRESH	138	138	138	138	138	138
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	JASPER	NECHES	FRESH	37,630	37,630	37,630	37,630	37,630	37,630
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	JASPER	SABINE	FRESH	29,854	29,854	29,854	29,854	29,854	29,854
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	JEFFERSON	NECHES	FRESH	803	803	803	803	803	803
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	1,722	1,722	1,722	1,722	1,722	1,722
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	NEWTON	NECHES	FRESH	176	176	176	176	176	176
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	NEWTON	SABINE	FRESH	34,043	34,043	34,043	34,043	34,043	34,043
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	ORANGE	NECHES	FRESH	3,287	3,287	3,287	3,287	3,287	3,287
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	ORANGE	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	256	256	256	256	256	256
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	15,821	15,821	15,821	15,821	15,821	15,821
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	14,897	14,897	14,897	14,897	14,897	14,897
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	38,211	38,211	38,211	38,211	38,211	38,211
OTHER AQUIFER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	298	298	298	298	298	298
OTHER AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	812	812	812	812	812	812
OTHER AQUIFER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	268	268	268	268	268	268
OTHER AQUIFER	HENDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	5	5	5	5	5	5
OTHER AQUIFER	HENDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	680	680	680	680	680	680
OTHER AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	378	378	378	378	378	378
OTHER AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	888	888	888	888	888	888
OTHER AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	1,131	1,131	1,131	1,131	1,131	1,131
OTHER AQUIFER	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270
OTHER AQUIFER	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	270	270	270	270	270	270

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.



### Region I Source Availability

GROUNDWATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE AVAILABILITY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY *	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
OTHER AQUIFER	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	469	469	469	469	469	469
OTHER AQUIFER	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	336	336	336	336	336	336
OTHER AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	1,395	1,395	1,395	1,395	1,395	1,395
OTHER AQUIFER	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	922	922	922	922	922	922
OTHER AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	700	700	700	700	700	700
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	11,828	11,828	11,828	11,828	11,828	11,828
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	7,274	7,274	7,274	7,274	7,274	7,274
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	1,093	1,093	1,093	1,093	1,093	1,093
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	23,211	23,211	23,211	23,211	23,039	22,866
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	HENDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	12,067	12,067	12,067	12,067	12,067	12,067
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	2,043	2,043	2,043	2,043	2,043	2,043
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	258	258	258	258	258	258
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	2,985	2,985	2,985	2,985	2,985	2,985
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	40	40	40	40	40	40
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	18	18	18	18	18	18
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	30,692	30,692	30,692	30,692	30,692	30,692
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPARTA AQUIFER	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	344	344	344	344	344	344
SPARTA AQUIFER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	272	272	272	272	272	272
SPARTA AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	371	371	371	371	371	371
SPARTA AQUIFER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	359	359	359	359	359	359
SPARTA AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	477	477	477	477	477	477
SPARTA AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	977	977	977	977	977	977
SPARTA AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	365	365	365	365	365	365
SPARTA AQUIFER	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	37	37	37	37	37	37
SPARTA AQUIFER	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	160	160	160	160	160	160
SPARTA AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	163	163	163	163	163	163
SPARTA AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	SABINE	FRESH	3	3	3	3	3	3
SPARTA AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	154	154	154	154	154	154
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	16,890	16,890	16,890	16,890	16,507	16,507
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	4,061	4,061	4,061	4,061	4,061	4,061
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	235	235	235	235	235	235
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	360	360	360	360	360	360
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	3,724	3,724	3,724	3,724	3,724	3,724
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	575	575	575	575	575	575
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	SABINE	FRESH	9	9	9	9	9	9
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	700	700	700	700	700	700
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>GROUNDWATER TOTAL SOURCE AVAILABILITY</b>				<b>548,868</b>	<b>548,258</b>	<b>548,121</b>	<b>547,520</b>	<b>546,379</b>	<b>545,543</b>

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

### Region I Source Availability

REUSE SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE AVAILABILITY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY *	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
DIRECT REUSE	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	15	15	15	15	15	15
DIRECT REUSE	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	20	20	20	20	20	20
DIRECT REUSE	SHELBY	SABINE	FRESH	233	246	259	270	284	299
INDIRECT REUSE	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	13,687	13,687	13,687	13,687	13,687	13,687
<b>REUSE TOTAL SOURCE AVAILABILITY</b>				<b>13,955</b>	<b>13,968</b>	<b>13,981</b>	<b>13,992</b>	<b>14,006</b>	<b>14,021</b>

SURFACE WATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE AVAILABILITY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY *	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
ATHENS LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	5,950	5,864	5,778	5,692	5,606	5,520
BELLWOOD LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	996	996	996	996	996	996
CENTER LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	1,460	1,460	1,460	1,460	1,460	1,460
CHEROKEE LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	31,456	31,309	31,162	31,015	30,867	30,720
CYPRESS LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	PANOLA	CYPRESS	FRESH	30	30	30	30	30	30
HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	TRINITY	FRESH	6,250	6,145	6,040	5,935	5,830	5,725
JACKSONVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200
KURTH LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500
LAKE NACONICHE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500
MARTIN LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
MURVAUL LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	21,367	20,686	20,006	19,325	18,644	17,963
NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	16,200	15,800	15,400	15,000	14,600	14,200
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	333	333	333	333	333	333
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	661	661	661	661	661	661
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	1,555	1,555	1,555	1,555	1,555	1,555
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	HARDIN	NECHES	FRESH	155	155	155	155	155	155
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	HENDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	770	770	770	770	770	770
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	1,007	1,007	1,007	1,007	1,007	1,007
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	JASPER	NECHES	FRESH	332	332	332	332	332	332
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	2,386	2,386	2,386	2,386	2,386	2,386
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ORANGE	NECHES	FRESH	56	56	56	56	56	56
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	396	396	396	396	396	396
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	808	808	808	808	808	808
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	71	71	71	71	71	71
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	465	465	465	465	465	465
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SHELBY	NECHES	FRESH	334	334	334	334	334	334
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	605	605	605	605	605	605
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	449	449	449	449	449	449
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	239	239	239	239	239	239
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	19	19	19	19	19	19
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	JEFFERSON	NECHES	FRESH	110	110	110	110	110	110
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	494	494	494	494	494	494
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	20	20	20	20	20	20
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	8	8	8	8	8	8
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	162	162	162	162	162	162
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	14	14	14	14	14	14

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

### Region I Source Availability

SURFACE WATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE AVAILABILITY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY *	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	108	108	108	108	108	108
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	HARDIN	NECHES	FRESH	57	57	57	57	57	57
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	208	208	208	208	208	208
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	JASPER	NECHES	FRESH	382,430	382,430	382,430	382,430	382,430	382,430
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	JEFFERSON	NECHES	BRACKISH	752,152	752,152	752,152	752,152	752,152	752,152
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	JEFFERSON	NECHES	FRESH	15,933	16,732	17,670	18,877	20,307	21,588
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	69	69	69	69	69	69
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	ORANGE	NECHES	BRACKISH	17,310	17,310	17,310	17,310	17,310	17,310
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	82	82	82	82	82	82
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	178	178	178	178	178	178
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	SHELBY	NECHES	FRESH	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	50	50	50	50	50	50
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	3	3	3	3	3	3
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	88	88	88	88	88	88
NECHES-TRINITY LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	800	800	800	800	800	800
NECHES-TRINITY OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
NECHES-TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	51,274	51,274	51,274	51,274	51,274	51,274
PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	197,710	196,110	194,610	193,010	191,310	189,010
PINKSTON LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
RUSK CITY LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	40	40	40	40	40	40
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	JASPER	SABINE	FRESH	215	215	215	215	215	215
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	NEWTON	SABINE	FRESH	155	155	155	155	155	155
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	42	42	42	42	42	42
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	PANOLA	SABINE	FRESH	1,224	1,224	1,224	1,224	1,224	1,224
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	308	308	308	308	308	308
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	634	634	634	634	634	634
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SAN AUGUSTINE	SABINE	FRESH	71	71	71	71	71	71
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SHELBY	SABINE	FRESH	2,998	2,998	2,998	2,998	2,998	2,998
SABINE OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	NEWTON	SABINE	FRESH	158	158	158	158	158	158
SABINE OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	178	178	178	178	178	178
SABINE OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	NEWTON	SABINE	FRESH	133,128	133,128	133,128	133,128	133,128	133,128
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	ORANGE	SABINE	BRACKISH	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	28	28	28	28	28	28
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	PANOLA	SABINE	FRESH	574	574	574	574	574	574
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	137	137	137	137	137	137
SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	848,000	848,000	848,000	848,000	848,000	848,000
SAN AUGUSTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285
STRIKER LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	20,340	19,635	18,890	18,150	16,715	14,690
TIMPSON LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	350	350	350	350	350	350
TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE-LOUISIANA	FRESH	336	336	336	336	336	336
TRINITY LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	684	684	684	684	684	684

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

### Region I Source Availability

SURFACE WATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE AVAILABILITY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY *	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TRINITY LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	783	783	783	783	783	783
TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290
TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	2,522	2,522	2,522	2,522	2,522	2,522
TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	34,830	34,666	34,502	34,338	34,174	34,010
<b>SURFACE WATER TOTAL SOURCE AVAILABILITY</b>				<b>3,642,150</b>	<b>3,639,061</b>	<b>3,636,172</b>	<b>3,633,456</b>	<b>3,630,167</b>	<b>3,625,540</b>
<b>REGION I TOTAL SOURCE AVAILABILITY</b>				<b>4,204,973</b>	<b>4,201,287</b>	<b>4,198,274</b>	<b>4,194,968</b>	<b>4,190,552</b>	<b>4,185,104</b>

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 5**

**TWDB DB22 Report #5. WUG Existing Water Supplies**

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	181	177	171	167	166	166
FRANKSTON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	388	382	378	372	366	360
FRANKSTON RURAL WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	172	172	168	166	166	166
NECHES WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	200	200	196	194	192	192
NORWOOD WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	602	601	600	600	600	600
PALESTINE	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	366	404	397	377	373	373
PALESTINE	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,222	2,222	2,223	2,223	2,223	2,223
SLOCUM WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	258	258	252	250	248	248
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	299	299	299	299	299	299
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	25	25	25	25	25	25
COUNTY-OTHER	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	5	4	4	4	5	5
COUNTY-OTHER	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	38	38	38	38	38	38
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	28	28	28	28	28	28
MINING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	64	81	85	68	48	35
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	14	14	14	14	14	14
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	333	333	333	333	333	333
LIVESTOCK	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	301	301	301	301	301	301
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	124	124	124	124	124	124
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	162	162	162	162	162	162
IRRIGATION	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	149	149	149	149	149	149
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>7,340</b>	<b>7,383</b>	<b>7,356</b>	<b>7,303</b>	<b>7,269</b>	<b>7,250</b>
ANDERSON COUNTY CEDAR CREEK WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	101	100	98	96	96	96
B B S WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	131	130	127	124	124	124
B C Y WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	220	212	206	202	202	202
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	107	104	101	98	98	98
ELKHART	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	428	428	428	428	428	428
FOUR PINES WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	549	549	549	549	549	549
NORWOOD WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	42	43	44	44	44	44
PALESTINE	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	348	383	376	357	354	354
PALESTINE	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,109	2,109	2,108	2,108	2,108	2,108
PLEASANT SPRINGS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	417	416	413	411	411	411
SLOCUM WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	28	28	28	26	26	26
TDCJ BETO GURNEY & POWLEDGE UNITS	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	1,130	1,150	1,152	1,146	1,144	1,144
TDCJ COFFIELD MICHAEL	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	3,116	3,196	3,214	3,206	3,204	3,204
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	254	254	254	254	254	254
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	5	4	3	3	2	2
TUCKER WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	128	126	124	122	122	122
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	117	116	113	111	111	111
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	235	235	235	235	235	235
COUNTY-OTHER	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	42	43	43	43	42	42
COUNTY-OTHER	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	362	362	362	362	362	362
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	263	263	263	263	263	263
MINING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	100	100	100	100	100	100
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	29	29	29	29	29	29

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	18	18	18	18	18	18
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	684	684	684	684	684	684
LIVESTOCK	I	OTHER AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	9	9	9	9	9	9
LIVESTOCK	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	64	64	64	64	64	64
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	161	161	161	161	161	161
IRRIGATION	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	138	138	138	138	138	138
IRRIGATION	I	TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	1,060	1,060	1,060	1,060	1,060	1,060
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>12,395</b>	<b>12,514</b>	<b>12,504</b>	<b>12,451</b>	<b>12,442</b>	<b>12,442</b>
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>19,735</b>	<b>19,897</b>	<b>19,860</b>	<b>19,754</b>	<b>19,711</b>	<b>19,692</b>
ANGELINA WSC	I	OTHER AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	523	523	523	523	523	523
CENTRAL WCID OF ANGELINA COUNTY	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	877	877	877	877	877	877
DIBOLL	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	1,806	1,806	1,806	1,806	1,806	1,806
DIBOLL	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	908	908	908	908	908	908
FOUR WAY SUD	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,216
HUDSON WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	1,157	1,157	1,157	1,157	1,157	1,157
HUNTINGTON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	448	448	448	448	448	448
HUNTINGTON	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	609	609	609	609	609	609
LUFKIN	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	4,352	4,527	4,675	4,844	5,029	4,186
LUFKIN	I	KURTH LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,901	3,018	3,117	3,229	3,353	4,482
M & M WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	283	286	290	300	310	321
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	162	166	170	176	184	191
REDLAND WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	778	778	778	778	778	778
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	11	11	10	10	10	10
WOODLAWN WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	163	165	168	173	180	186
ZAVALLA	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	85	87	89	91	95	98
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	1,733	1,733	1,733	1,733	1,733	1,733
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	175	175	175	175	175	175
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	175	175	175	175	175	175
COUNTY-OTHER	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	275	275	275	275	275	275
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	1,964	2,157	2,352	2,526	2,711	2,911
MANUFACTURING	I	KURTH LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,220	1,349	1,479	1,595	1,719	1,851
MANUFACTURING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	101	101	101	101	101	101
MANUFACTURING	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,242
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	13	13	13	13	13	13
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	10,081	10,081	10,081	10,081	10,081	10,081
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	KURTH LAKE/RESERVOIR	6,721	6,721	6,721	6,721	6,721	6,721
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	308	308	308	308	308	308
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	661	661	661	661	661	661
LIVESTOCK	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	13	13	13	13	13	13
LIVESTOCK	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	50	50	50	50	50	50
IRRIGATION	I	KURTH LAKE/RESERVOIR	481	481	481	481	481	481
IRRIGATION	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   ANGELINA COUNTY	331	331	331	331	331	331
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>41,823</b>	<b>42,448</b>	<b>43,032</b>	<b>43,626</b>	<b>44,273</b>	<b>44,918</b>
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>41,823</b>	<b>42,448</b>	<b>43,032</b>	<b>43,626</b>	<b>44,273</b>	<b>44,918</b>
AFTON GROVE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	189	202	215	234	254	277
ALTO	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	508	508	508	508	508	508

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
ALTO RURAL WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	736	736	736	736	736	736
BLACKJACK WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	138	147	158	171	186	203
BULLARD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	16	16	16	16	16	16
BULLARD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	10	9	8	7	6	6
CRAFT TURNEY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	146	151	157	169	183	200
CRAFT TURNEY WSC	I	JACKSONVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR	339	352	367	393	427	465
GUM CREEK WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	129	134	142	153	167	181
JACKSONVILLE	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	914	974	1,037	1,124	1,223	1,332
JACKSONVILLE	I	JACKSONVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,131	2,273	2,420	2,621	2,853	3,108
NEW SUMMERFIELD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	253	253	253	253	253	253
NORTH CHEROKEE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	185	196	208	225	244	266
NORTH CHEROKEE WSC	I	JACKSONVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR	417	444	473	512	557	607
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	14	14	15	15	16	17
RUSK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	1,362	1,362	1,362	1,362	1,362	1,485
RUSK	I	RUSK CITY LAKE/RESERVOIR	40	40	40	40	40	40
RUSK RURAL WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	557	557	557	557	557	557
SOUTH RUSK COUNTY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	6	7	7	8	8	9
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	436	466	496	538	585	637
TROUP	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	15	16	17	19	20	22
WELLS	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	382	382	382	382	382	382
WEST JACKSONVILLE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	165	175	187	203	221	241
WRIGHT CITY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	102	102	102	102	102	99
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	587	591	597	605	614	623
COUNTY-OTHER	I	JACKSONVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR	199	211	223	241	262	286
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	196	196	196	196	196	196
COUNTY-OTHER	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	676	676	676	676	676	676
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	156	156	156	156	156	156
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	134	143	151	158	169	181
MANUFACTURING	I	JACKSONVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR	289	309	328	344	371	400
MANUFACTURING	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	19	19	19	19	19	19
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	38	38	38	38	38	38
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	STRIKER LAKE/RESERVOIR	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	119	119	119	119	119	119
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	1,555	1,555	1,555	1,555	1,555	1,555
LIVESTOCK	I	OTHER AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	33	33	33	33	33	33
LIVESTOCK	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	176	176	176	176	176	176
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	115	115	115	115	115	115
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	108	108	108	108	108	108
IRRIGATION	I	OTHER AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
IRRIGATION	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	41	36	32	28	25	25
IRRIGATION	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	206	206	206	206	206	206
IRRIGATION	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>18,840</b>	<b>19,206</b>	<b>19,594</b>	<b>20,124</b>	<b>20,747</b>	<b>21,562</b>
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>18,840</b>	<b>19,206</b>	<b>19,594</b>	<b>20,124</b>	<b>20,747</b>	<b>21,562</b>
HARDIN COUNTY WCID 1	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041
KOUNTZE	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041	1,041



### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
LUMBERTON MUD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	2,610	2,805	2,929	3,032	3,137	3,222
NORTH HARDIN WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	1,906	1,906	1,906	1,906	1,906	1,906
SILSBEE	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	1,617	1,617	1,617	1,617	1,617	1,617
SOUR LAKE	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	934	934	934	934	934	934
WEST HARDIN WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	771	768	766	763	761	758
WILDWOOD POA	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	156	160	162	164	166	168
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	703	689	677	681	684	690
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	46	51	51	51	51	51
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	12	12	12	12	12	12
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	69	69	69	69	69	69
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	155	155	155	155	155	155
IRRIGATION	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	932	932	932	932	932	932
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	57	57	57	57	57	57
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>12,051</b>	<b>12,238</b>	<b>12,350</b>	<b>12,456</b>	<b>12,564</b>	<b>12,654</b>
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	10	11	12	12	13	13
WEST HARDIN WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	4	4	4	4	4	4
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	18	18	18	18	18	18
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	2	2	2	2	2	2
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>34</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>HARDIN COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>12,085</b>	<b>12,273</b>	<b>12,386</b>	<b>12,492</b>	<b>12,601</b>	<b>12,691</b>
ATHENS	I	ATHENS LAKE/RESERVOIR	33	37	38	40	34	29
ATHENS	C	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	23	23	21	21	13	10
BERRYVILLE	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	118	124	128	137	147	156
BETHEL ASH WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	659	637	625	620	616	616
BROWNSBORO	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	218	260	295	343	386	428
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	79	80	81	84	89	93
CHANDLER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	877	877	877	877	877	877
EDOM WSC	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   VAN ZANDT COUNTY	20	20	20	21	20	21
FRANKSTON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   ANDERSON COUNTY	15	21	25	31	37	43
LEAGUEVILLE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	215	221	233	250	313	397
MOORE STATION WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	183	189	200	215	269	342
MURCHISON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	94	91	89	88	88	89
R P M WSC	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   VAN ZANDT COUNTY	38	37	37	38	38	39
R P M WSC	D	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   VAN ZANDT COUNTY	36	35	35	36	36	36
VIRGINIA HILL WSC	C	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	156	156	156	156	155	152
VIRGINIA HILL WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	108	108	108	108	107	105
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HENDERSON COUNTY	539	539	539	539	539	539
MINING		NO WATER SUPPLY ASSOCIATED WITH WUG	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK	I	ATHENS LAKE/RESERVOIR	3,023	3,007	2,890	2,735	1,912	1,396
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	770	770	770	770	770	770
IRRIGATION	I	ATHENS LAKE/RESERVOIR	170	169	163	154	108	78
IRRIGATION	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	82	73	64	57	51	51
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>7,457</b>	<b>7,475</b>	<b>7,395</b>	<b>7,321</b>	<b>6,606</b>	<b>6,268</b>
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>7,457</b>	<b>7,475</b>	<b>7,395</b>	<b>7,321</b>	<b>6,606</b>	<b>6,268</b>
GRAPELAND	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	240	239	241	241	242	242

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GRAPELAND	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	5	4	4	4	4	4
PENNINGTON WSC	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	13	13	13	13	13	13
PENNINGTON WSC	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	71	71	73	71	72	72
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	755	755	755	755	755	755
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	14	9	8	7	5	4
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	86	86	87	87	87	87
COUNTY-OTHER	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	4	3	3	3	3	3
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	87	87	88	88	88	88
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	25	25	25	25	25	25
COUNTY-OTHER	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	42	42	42	42	42	42
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	24	24	24	24	24	24
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	113	89	65	42	18	8
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	4	4	4	4	4	4
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	1,007	1,007	1,007	1,007	1,007	1,007
LIVESTOCK	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	14	14	14	14	14	14
LIVESTOCK	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	14	14	14	14	14	14
LIVESTOCK	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	29	29	29	29	29	29
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	7	7	7	7	7	7
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	38	38	38	38	38	38
IRRIGATION	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	10	10	10	10	10	10
IRRIGATION	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	9	9	9	9	9	9
IRRIGATION	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	5	5	5	5	5	5
IRRIGATION	I	TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	457	457	457	457	457	457
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>3,073</b>	<b>3,041</b>	<b>3,022</b>	<b>2,996</b>	<b>2,972</b>	<b>2,961</b>
CROCKETT	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	155	126	126	126	126	126
CROCKETT	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	209	209	209	209	209	209
GRAPELAND	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	369	370	368	368	367	367
GRAPELAND	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	7	6	6	6	6	6
LOVELADY	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	3	2	2	2	2	2
LOVELADY	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	201	201	201	201	201	201
PENNINGTON WSC	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	24	24	24	24	24	24
PENNINGTON WSC	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	130	130	128	130	129	129
TDCJ EASTHAM UNIT	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	37	37	37	37	37	37
TDCJ EASTHAM UNIT	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	201	201	201	201	201	201
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	1,329	1,329	1,329	1,329	1,329	1,329
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	36	25	22	19	14	11
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	18	18	17	17	17	17
COUNTY-OTHER	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	1	1	1	1	1	1
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	18	18	17	17	17	17
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	5	5	5	5	5	5
COUNTY-OTHER	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	8	8	8	8	8	8
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	18	18	18	18	18	18
MANUFACTURING	I	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	301	331	360	385	417	451
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	209	165	122	77	33	14
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	244	351	466	591	726	899
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	783	783	783	783	783	783
LIVESTOCK	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	55	55	55	55	55	55

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
LIVESTOCK	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	13	13	13	13	13	13
LIVESTOCK	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	75	75	75	75	75	75
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	31	31	31	31	31	31
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	170	170	170	170	170	170
IRRIGATION	I	OTHER AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	46	46	46	46	46	46
IRRIGATION	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	41	41	41	41	41	41
IRRIGATION	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   HOUSTON COUNTY	20	20	20	20	20	20
IRRIGATION	I	TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065
<b>TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>6,822</b>	<b>6,874</b>	<b>6,966</b>	<b>7,070</b>	<b>7,186</b>	<b>7,371</b>
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>9,895</b>	<b>9,915</b>	<b>9,988</b>	<b>10,066</b>	<b>10,158</b>	<b>10,332</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	39	38	37	36	36	36
JASPER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	4,790	4,790	4,790	4,790	4,790	4,790
RAYBURN COUNTRY MUD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	178	174	170	167	167	167
RURAL WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	107	105	102	101	100	100
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	31	30	28	28	28	28
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	145	143	140	139	139	139
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	1,385	1,333	1,242	1,190	1,178	1,178
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	31,230	31,231	31,231	31,231	31,231	31,231
MANUFACTURING	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	546	546	546	546	546	546
MANUFACTURING	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	59,828	59,828	59,828	59,828	59,828	59,828
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	70	56	42	27	13	8
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	115	115	115	115	115	115
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	332	332	332	332	332	332
IRRIGATION	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	94	94	94	94	94	94
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>98,890</b>	<b>98,815</b>	<b>98,697</b>	<b>98,624</b>	<b>98,597</b>	<b>98,592</b>
JASPER COUNTY WCID 1	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	1,073	1,073	1,073	1,073	1,073	1,073
KIRBYVILLE	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	584	584	584	584	584	584
MAURICEVILLE SUD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	73	73	71	70	68	68
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	88	84	82	82	82	82
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	55	55	54	53	53	53
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	1,159	1,183	1,233	1,259	1,265	1,265
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	90	89	89	89	89	89
MANUFACTURING	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	2	2	2	2	2	2
MANUFACTURING	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	172	172	172	172	172	172
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	78	62	46	31	15	8
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	134	134	134	134	134	134
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	215	215	215	215	215	215
IRRIGATION	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	57	57	57	57	57	57
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>3,780</b>	<b>3,783</b>	<b>3,812</b>	<b>3,821</b>	<b>3,809</b>	<b>3,802</b>
<b>JASPER COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>102,670</b>	<b>102,598</b>	<b>102,509</b>	<b>102,445</b>	<b>102,406</b>	<b>102,394</b>
BEAUMONT	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	3,211	3,211	3,211	3,211	3,211	3,211
BEAUMONT	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	4,363	4,405	4,479	4,772	5,291	5,763
BEAUMONT	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2,585	2,975	3,035	2,669	2,229	1,835
BEVIL OAKS	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	135	137	139	147	157	169
CHINA	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	4	4	4	4	4	4
GROVES	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	70	67	65	64	64	64

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	82	83	85	89	95	102
MEEKER MWD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	127	128	128	128	133	139
MEEKER MWD	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	1	1	1	1	1	2
NEDERLAND	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	88	90	93	98	105	112
PORT ARTHUR	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	60	60	59	59	59	59
PORT NECHES	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	744	754	771	809	864	928
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	2	2	2	2	1	1
COUNTY-OTHER	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	159	209	262	283	266	250
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	22	26	32	39	47	56
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	10	10	10	10	10	10
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	80	80	80	80	80	80
MANUFACTURING	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	121,326	126,064	126,079	126,100	126,123	126,146
MANUFACTURING	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	582	582	582	582	582	582
MANUFACTURING	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	4,324	51,094	58,470	65,828	73,187	80,841
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	18	33	51	84	107	133
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	110	110	110	110	110	110
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	16	16	16	16	16	16
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	64	64	64	64	64	64
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	9,800	9,800	9,800	9,800	9,800	9,800
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES-TRINITY INDIRECT REUSE	958	958	958	958	958	958
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES-TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	3,546	3,546	3,546	3,546	3,546	3,546
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>152,487</b>	<b>204,509</b>	<b>212,132</b>	<b>219,553</b>	<b>227,110</b>	<b>234,981</b>
BEAUMONT	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	6,289	6,289	6,289	6,289	6,289	6,289
BEAUMONT	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	9,005	9,091	9,244	9,849	10,920	11,896
BEAUMONT	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	5,335	6,139	6,263	5,509	4,601	3,788
CHINA	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	140	143	147	155	164	177
GROVES	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2,168	2,093	2,029	2,005	1,999	1,999
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	411	416	425	445	475	510
MEEKER MWD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	381	380	380	380	395	415
MEEKER MWD	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	3	3	4	4	4	4
NEDERLAND	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2,348	2,408	2,487	2,620	2,799	3,007
PORT ARTHUR	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	19,745	19,715	19,489	19,442	19,423	19,422
PORT NECHES	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	687	696	713	748	798	857
WEST JEFFERSON COUNTY MWD	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	741	752	772	809	863	927
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	48	48	48	48	49	49
COUNTY-OTHER	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	1,875	2,469	3,097	3,345	3,155	2,961
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	308	369	444	533	634	746
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   HARDIN COUNTY	10	10	10	10	10	10
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
MANUFACTURING	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	111,992	116,365	116,380	116,399	116,423	116,442
MANUFACTURING	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	538	538	538	538	538	538
MANUFACTURING	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	3,934	47,104	53,915	60,707	67,499	74,564
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	32	39	49	66	78	91
MINING	I	NECHES-TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	34	34	34	34	34	34
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	900	900	900	900	900	900
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JEFFERSON COUNTY	190	190	190	190	190	190
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	736	736	736	736	736	736

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	130,200	130,200	130,200	130,200	130,200	130,200
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES-TRINITY INDIRECT REUSE	12,729	12,729	12,729	12,729	12,729	12,729
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES-TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	47,108	47,108	47,108	47,108	47,108	47,108
<b>NECHES-TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>357,888</b>	<b>406,965</b>	<b>414,621</b>	<b>421,799</b>	<b>429,014</b>	<b>436,590</b>
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>510,375</b>	<b>611,474</b>	<b>626,753</b>	<b>641,352</b>	<b>656,124</b>	<b>671,571</b>
APPLEBY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	873	873	874	874	881	971
APPLEBY WSC	I	NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	67	67	66	66	65	65
CARO WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	254	272	292	317	347	380
CUSHING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	229	229	229	229	229	229
D & M WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	1,008	1,009	1,011	1,012	1,013	1,015
D & M WSC	I	NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	186	185	183	182	181	179
ETOILE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	255	275	297	323	354	387
GARRISON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	565	565	565	565	565	565
LILLY GROVE SUD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	761	761	761	761	761	761
MELROSE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	781	782	782	782	782	782
MELROSE WSC	I	NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	27	26	26	26	26	26
NACOGDOCHES	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	1,965	2,188	2,425	2,702	3,022	3,370
NACOGDOCHES	I	NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	4,903	5,326	5,752	6,243	6,796	7,372
SWIFT WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	666	666	666	666	666	666
WODEN WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	770	770	770	770	770	770
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	655	764	897	1,040	1,190	1,351
COUNTY-OTHER	I	NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	48	48	48	48	48	48
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	79	79	79	79	79	79
COUNTY-OTHER	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	221	221	221	221	221	221
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	156	156	156	156	156	156
COUNTY-OTHER	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	26	26	26	26	26	26
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	1,254	1,265	1,265	1,265	1,265	1,265
MANUFACTURING	I	NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,254	1,265	1,265	1,265	1,265	1,265
MANUFACTURING	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	494	494	494	494	494	494
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	1,031	1,031	1,031	1,031	1,031	1,031
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	229	229	229	229	229	229
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	2,386	2,386	2,386	2,386	2,386	2,386
LIVESTOCK	I	OTHER AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	21	21	21	21	21	21
LIVESTOCK	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	84	84	84	84	84	84
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	373	373	373	373	373	373
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	67	67	67	67	67	67
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>31,688</b>	<b>32,503</b>	<b>33,341</b>	<b>34,303</b>	<b>35,393</b>	<b>36,634</b>
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>31,688</b>	<b>32,503</b>	<b>33,341</b>	<b>34,303</b>	<b>35,393</b>	<b>36,634</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   NEWTON COUNTY	68	65	64	62	62	61
MAURICEVILLE SUD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	68	65	64	62	62	61
NEWTON	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   NEWTON COUNTY	483	483	483	483	483	483
SOUTH NEWTON WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   NEWTON COUNTY	321	321	321	321	321	321
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   NEWTON COUNTY	1,425	1,425	1,425	1,425	1,425	1,425
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   NEWTON COUNTY	433	509	586	656	723	796
MANUFACTURING	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	135	135	135	135	135	135
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   NEWTON COUNTY	156	156	156	156	156	156

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	158	158	158	158	158	158
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   NEWTON COUNTY	104	104	104	104	104	104
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	155	155	155	155	155	155
IRRIGATION	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   NEWTON COUNTY	330	330	330	330	330	330
IRRIGATION	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	50	50	50	50	50	50
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>17,328</b>	<b>17,398</b>	<b>17,473</b>	<b>17,539</b>	<b>17,606</b>	<b>17,677</b>
<b>NEWTON COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>17,328</b>	<b>17,398</b>	<b>17,473</b>	<b>17,539</b>	<b>17,606</b>	<b>17,677</b>
BRIDGE CITY	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	126	126	126	126	126	125
KELLY G BREWER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	41	42	42	43	44	44
MAURICEVILLE SUD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	121	121	120	120	121	122
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 1	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	1,553	1,569	1,576	1,595	1,614	1,631
ORANGEFIELD WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	188	192	195	197	199	201
PORT ARTHUR	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2	2	2	2	2	2
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	1,305	1,305	1,305	1,305	1,305	1,305
MANUFACTURING	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	684	684	684	684	684	684
MANUFACTURING	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	0
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	149	149	149	149	149	147
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	74	74	74	74	74	74
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	32	32	32	32	32	32
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>4,275</b>	<b>4,296</b>	<b>4,305</b>	<b>4,327</b>	<b>4,350</b>	<b>4,367</b>
BRIDGE CITY	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	84	84	84	84	84	84
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	12	12	13	12	12	12
<b>NECHES-TRINITY BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
BRIDGE CITY	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	626	628	627	627	627	627
KELLY G BREWER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	36	36	37	37	37	38
MAURICEVILLE SUD	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	1,425	1,428	1,432	1,436	1,436	1,436
ORANGE	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	2,626	2,644	2,645	2,663	2,696	2,724
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 2	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	494	500	504	510	517	522
ORANGEFIELD WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	293	299	304	308	311	315
PINEHURST	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	284	284	285	290	293	296
SOUTH NEWTON WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	100	104	107	109	111	112
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	1,545	1,545	1,545	1,544	1,545	1,545
MANUFACTURING	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	55,276	55,276	55,276	55,276	55,276	55,276
MANUFACTURING	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	31	31	31	31	31	31
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	0	0	0	0	0	2
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	178	178	178	178	178	178
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	1,310	1,310	1,310	1,310	1,310	1,310
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	4,481	4,481	4,481	4,481	4,481	4,481
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   ORANGE COUNTY	154	154	154	154	154	154
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	66	66	66	66	66	66
IRRIGATION	I	DIRECT REUSE	15	15	15	15	15	15
IRRIGATION	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,283
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>70,223</b>	<b>70,262</b>	<b>70,280</b>	<b>70,318</b>	<b>70,367</b>	<b>70,411</b>
<b>ORANGE COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>74,594</b>	<b>74,654</b>	<b>74,682</b>	<b>74,741</b>	<b>74,813</b>	<b>74,874</b>
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	6	6	6	6	6	6
MINING	I	MURVAUL LAKE/RESERVOIR	4	4	3	2	2	2

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
MINING	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	4	4	4	4	6	6
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	27	27	27	27	27	27
<b>CYPRESS BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>
BECKVILLE	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	581	581	581	581	581	581
CARTHAGE	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	49	49	49	49	49	49
CARTHAGE	I	MURVAUL LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,601	1,602	1,595	1,599	1,610	1,621
GILL WSC	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   HARRISON COUNTY	126	126	126	126	126	126
GILL WSC	D	O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR	33	33	33	33	33	33
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	4	4	5	5	6	6
PANOLA-BETHANY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	19	19	19	19	19	19
TATUM	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	65	75	81	87	92	96
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	1,503	1,503	1,503	1,503	1,503	1,503
COUNTY-OTHER	I	MURVAUL LAKE/RESERVOIR	291	291	291	291	291	291
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	266	267	268	269	271	273
MANUFACTURING	I	MURVAUL LAKE/RESERVOIR	879	917	955	987	1,052	1,081
MANUFACTURING	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	114	114	114	114	114	114
MINING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	1,489	1,489	1,489	1,489	1,489	1,489
MINING	I	MURVAUL LAKE/RESERVOIR	3,546	3,511	3,026	2,559	2,170	2,361
MINING	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	168	168	168	168	168	168
MINING	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	3,896	4,196	4,496	4,496	5,494	5,494
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	416	416	416	416	416	416
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	1,227	1,227	1,227	1,227	1,227	1,227
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   PANOLA COUNTY	450	450	450	450	450	450
IRRIGATION	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	152	152	152	152	152	152
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>16,875</b>	<b>17,190</b>	<b>17,044</b>	<b>16,620</b>	<b>17,313</b>	<b>17,550</b>
<b>PANOLA COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>16,916</b>	<b>17,231</b>	<b>17,084</b>	<b>16,659</b>	<b>17,354</b>	<b>17,591</b>
CHESTER WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	39	39	39	39	39	40
CORRIGAN	I	OTHER AQUIFER   POLK COUNTY	231	248	260	276	288	299
DAMASCUS-STRYKER WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	194	210	222	234	245	254
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	68	76	84	93	102	112
MOSCOW WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	71	71	71	71	71	71
SODA WSC	H	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	11	12	12	13	13	14
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	583	637	680	722	763	797
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   POLK COUNTY	160	160	160	160	160	160
MANUFACTURING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	166	249	336	416	486	562
MANUFACTURING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   POLK COUNTY	447	447	447	447	447	447
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	83	83	83	83	83	83
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	20	20	20	20	20	20
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   POLK COUNTY	83	83	83	83	83	83
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	231	231	231	231	231	231
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	396	396	396	396	396	396
LIVESTOCK	I	OTHER AQUIFER   POLK COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
LIVESTOCK	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   POLK COUNTY	6	6	6	6	6	6
IRRIGATION	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   POLK COUNTY	769	769	769	769	769	769
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>3,559</b>	<b>3,738</b>	<b>3,900</b>	<b>4,060</b>	<b>4,203</b>	<b>4,345</b>
<b>POLK COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>3,559</b>	<b>3,738</b>	<b>3,900</b>	<b>4,060</b>	<b>4,203</b>	<b>4,345</b>
EBENEZER WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	130	141	152	165	180	196

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	REGION		2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GASTON WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	192	205	220	238	259	282
GOODSPRINGS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	260	275	292	315	343	372
HENDERSON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	2,466	2,466	2,466	2,466	2,466	2,466
HENDERSON	D	FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	3,470	3,469	3,470	3,470	3,470	3,470
HENDERSON	I	STRIKER LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	0
JACOBS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	10	11	11	12	13	15
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	70	78	86	94	102	110
MT ENTERPRISE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	306	330	356	388	422	460
NEW LONDON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	482	530	576	630	688	748
OVERTON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	74	73	74	73	73	73
SOUTH RUSK COUNTY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	188	200	213	230	250	272
WRIGHT CITY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	84	84	84	84	84	85
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	2,446	2,446	2,446	2,446	2,446	2,446
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	4	4	4	4	4	4
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	333	357	377	395	422	450
MANUFACTURING	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	1	1	1	1	1	1
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	210	0	0	0	0	0
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	270	270	270	270	270	270
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	127	127	127	127	127	127
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	MARTIN LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,479	2,479	2,479	2,479	2,479	2,479
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,777	1,777	1,777	1,777	1,777	1,777
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	156	156	156	156	156	156
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	808	808	808	808	808	808
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	215	215	215	215	215	215
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	80	80	80	80	80	80
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>16,638</b>	<b>16,582</b>	<b>16,740</b>	<b>16,923</b>	<b>17,135</b>	<b>17,362</b>
CHALK HILL SUD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043
CROSS ROADS SUD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	397	398	399	399	398	397
CROSS ROADS SUD	D	FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	248	248	249	249	248	248
CRYSTAL FARMS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	104	111	118	127	139	151
ELDERVILLE WSC	I	CHEROKEE LAKE/RESERVOIR	95	96	96	96	95	94
ELDERVILLE WSC	D	FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	97	97	97	97	97	96
HENDERSON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	400	400	400	400	400	400
HENDERSON	D	FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	603	604	603	603	603	603
HENDERSON	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	10	10	10	10	10	10
HENDERSON	I	STRIKER LAKE/RESERVOIR	0	0	0	0	0	0
JACOBS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	273	292	314	340	370	402
KILGORE	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   GREGG COUNTY	365	370	370	369	366	361
KILGORE	D	FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	506	841	841	839	832	821
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	32	34	38	42	46	50
NEW LONDON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	388	426	464	508	554	602
NEW PROSPECT WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	92	96	102	110	118	130
OVERTON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	604	605	604	605	605	605
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	44	47	50	54	59	64
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	72	77	82	80	60	46
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	53	54	56	59	71	83
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2	2	2	2	2	2



### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	I	TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	2	2	2	2	2	2
TATUM	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	358	348	342	336	336	367
WEST GREGG SUD	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   GREGG COUNTY	27	28	28	27	27	27
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	81	81	81	81	81	81
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	13	14	15	15	16	18
MANUFACTURING	D	FORK LAKE/RESERVOIR	1	1	1	1	1	1
MINING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	201	201	201	201	201	201
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	1,020	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	214	214	214	214	214	214
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	1,152	1,152	1,152	1,152	1,152	1,152
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	MARTIN LAKE/RESERVOIR	22,521	22,521	22,521	22,521	22,521	22,521
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	16,145	16,145	16,145	16,145	16,145	16,145
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	224	232	241	252	262	262
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	308	308	308	308	308	308
IRRIGATION	I	OTHER AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	170	170	170	170	170	170
IRRIGATION	I	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	127	127	127	127	127	127
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>49,792</b>	<b>50,425</b>	<b>50,516</b>	<b>50,614</b>	<b>50,709</b>	<b>50,834</b>
<b>RUSK COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>66,430</b>	<b>67,007</b>	<b>67,256</b>	<b>67,537</b>	<b>67,844</b>	<b>68,196</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	67	65	63	62	62	62
G M WSC	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	57	57	57	57	57	57
PINELAND	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	90	86	82	81	81	81
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   RUSK COUNTY	85	85	85	85	85	85
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	10	10	10	10	10	10
COUNTY-OTHER	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	29	28	29	29	29	29
COUNTY-OTHER	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	59	59	59	59	59	59
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	45	45	45	45	45	45
MANUFACTURING	I	DIRECT REUSE	20	20	20	20	20	20
MANUFACTURING	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	178	178	178	178	178	178
MANUFACTURING	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	600	600	600	600	600	600
MINING	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	320	319	319	319	320	320
MINING	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	44	44	44	44	44	44
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	8	8	8	8	8	8
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	71	71	71	71	71	71
LIVESTOCK	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	3	3	3	3	3	3
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>1,686</b>	<b>1,678</b>	<b>1,673</b>	<b>1,671</b>	<b>1,672</b>	<b>1,672</b>
BROOKELAND FWSD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	9	9	9	9	9	9
G M WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	270	270	270	270	270	270
G M WSC	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	420	420	420	420	420	420
HEMPHILL	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	743	743	743	743	743	743
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	85	85	85	85	85	85
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	3	3	3	3	3	3
COUNTY-OTHER	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	450	451	450	450	450	450
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	234	234	234	234	234	234
MINING	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,680	1,681	1,681	1,681	1,680	1,680
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	3	3	3	3	3	3
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	634	634	634	634	634	634

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
LIVESTOCK	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	3	3	3	3	3	3
LIVESTOCK	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	10	10	10	10	10	10
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>4,544</b>	<b>4,546</b>	<b>4,545</b>	<b>4,545</b>	<b>4,544</b>	<b>4,544</b>
<b>SABINE COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>6,230</b>	<b>6,224</b>	<b>6,218</b>	<b>6,216</b>	<b>6,216</b>	<b>6,216</b>
SAN AUGUSTINE	I	SAN AUGUSTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	519	517	517	517	517	517
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	113	108	104	102	102	102
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   NACOGDOCHES COUNTY	1	1	1	1	1	1
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	428	428	428	428	428	428
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   JASPER COUNTY	2	2	2	2	2	2
COUNTY-OTHER	I	OTHER AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	156	156	156	156	156	156
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SAN AUGUSTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	98	100	100	100	100	100
COUNTY-OTHER	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	79	79	79	79	79	79
COUNTY-OTHER	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   SABINE COUNTY	4	4	4	4	4	4
COUNTY-OTHER	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	231	231	231	231	231	231
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	17	17	17	17	17	17
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230
MINING	I	SAN AUGUSTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	468	518	594	609	624	635
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	26	26	26	26	26	26
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	465	465	465	465	465	465
LIVESTOCK	I	SPARTA AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	12	12	12	12	12	12
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	62	62	62	62	62	62
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>3,911</b>	<b>3,956</b>	<b>4,028</b>	<b>4,041</b>	<b>4,056</b>	<b>4,067</b>
G M WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	26	26	26	26	26	26
G M WSC	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	40	40	40	40	40	40
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	7	6	6	6	6	6
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	88	88	88	88	88	88
MINING	I	SAN AUGUSTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	200	150	74	59	44	33
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	16	25	36	48	62	62
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	71	71	71	71	71	71
LIVESTOCK	I	OTHER AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	9	9	9	9	9	9
LIVESTOCK	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY	9	9	9	9	9	9
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>466</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>344</b>
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>4,377</b>	<b>4,380</b>	<b>4,387</b>	<b>4,397</b>	<b>4,411</b>	<b>4,411</b>
CHOICE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	32	33	34	36	37	39
SAND HILLS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	150	156	163	170	178	186
TIMPSON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	7	7	7	8	8	8
COUNTY-OTHER	I	PINKSTON LAKE/RESERVOIR	152	157	161	168	175	183
COUNTY-OTHER	I	TIMPSON LAKE/RESERVOIR	350	350	350	350	350	350
MINING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	483	483	483	483	483	482
MINING	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	448	364	280	280	0	0
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	108	108	108	108	108	108
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	334	334	334	334	334	334
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	16	16	16	16	16	16
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>2,080</b>	<b>2,008</b>	<b>1,936</b>	<b>1,953</b>	<b>1,689</b>	<b>1,706</b>
CENTER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	8	8	8	8	8	178
CENTER	I	CENTER LAKE/RESERVOIR	511	509	508	507	506	505
CENTER	I	PINKSTON LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,609	1,324	1,322	1,320	1,317	1,315

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	REGION		2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
CHOICE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	95	98	100	104	109	113
EAST LAMAR WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	109	113	117	122	127	133
FIVE WAY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	163	168	172	179	187	195
FLAT FORK WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	129	133	136	142	149	155
HUXLEY	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	285	295	304	318	333	347
JOAQUIN	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	183	188	193	201	208	215
MCCLELLAND WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	216	225	234	244	256	267
SAND HILLS WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	147	154	160	168	176	183
TENAHA	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	442	442	442	442	442	442
TIMPSON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	558	558	558	558	558	558
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	718	742	765	794	830	866
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CENTER LAKE/RESERVOIR	30	31	32	33	35	36
COUNTY-OTHER	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	180	175	170	162	155	148
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	175	175	175	175	175	175
MANUFACTURING	I	CENTER LAKE/RESERVOIR	820	929	929	929	929	929
MANUFACTURING	I	DIRECT REUSE	151	164	177	188	202	217
MANUFACTURING	I	PINKSTON LAKE/RESERVOIR	2,136	2,419	2,419	2,419	2,419	2,419
MINING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,242	1,243
MINING	I	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,152	936	720	720	0	0
LIVESTOCK	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SHELBY COUNTY	458	458	458	458	458	458
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	2,998	2,998	2,998	2,998	2,998	2,998
IRRIGATION	I	DIRECT REUSE	82	82	82	82	82	82
<b>SABINE BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>14,597</b>	<b>14,566</b>	<b>14,421</b>	<b>14,513</b>	<b>13,901</b>	<b>14,177</b>
<b>SHELBY COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>16,677</b>	<b>16,574</b>	<b>16,357</b>	<b>16,466</b>	<b>15,590</b>	<b>15,883</b>
ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF TEXAS	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   WOOD COUNTY	202	201	202	202	202	202
ARP	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	175	178	182	189	197	206
BEN WHEELER WSC	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   VAN ZANDT COUNTY	2	4	4	3	3	3
BULLARD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   CHEROKEE COUNTY	16	16	16	16	16	16
BULLARD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	587	588	589	590	591	591
CARROLL WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	99	106	115	125	137	150
CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	165	158	138	105	50	0
CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	83	67	46	20	0	0
DEAN WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	765	774	786	808	836	867
EMERALD BAY MUD	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	175	170	167	166	165	165
JACKSON WSC	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	212	222	234	252	272	294
LINDALE	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	424	424	424	424	424	424
LINDALE RURAL WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	221	229	239	253	271	290
OVERTON	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	33	40	48	56	65	74
R P M WSC	D	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   VAN ZANDT COUNTY	16	15	15	14	14	14
R P M WSC	D	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   VAN ZANDT COUNTY	15	14	14	13	14	14
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	4,471	4,539	4,609	4,794	5,570	6,263
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	128	132	136	143	150	158
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	I	TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	145	150	155	162	170	179
TROUP	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	416	447	481	520	564	610
TYLER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	2,228	2,370	2,522	2,703	2,905	3,115
TYLER	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	8,353	8,888	9,456	10,138	10,892	11,679
TYLER	I	TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	9,468	10,073	10,718	11,490	12,344	13,237

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE REGION	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
			2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
WALNUT GROVE WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	593	593	593	593	593	593
WALNUT GROVE WSC	I	JACKSONVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR	13	13	13	13	13	13
WALNUT GROVE WSC	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	623	623	623	623	623	623
WALNUT GROVE WSC	I	TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	706	706	706	706	706	706
WHITEHOUSE	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	502	667	839	1,036	1,246	1,464
WHITEHOUSE	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	311	311	311	311	311	311
WHITEHOUSE	I	TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	353	353	353	353	353	353
WRIGHT CITY WSC	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	403	403	403	403	403	415
COUNTY-OTHER	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	26	26	26	26	26	26
COUNTY-OTHER	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	100	100	100	100	100	100
COUNTY-OTHER	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	584	761	941	1,143	1,356	1,577
COUNTY-OTHER	I	TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	113	113	113	113	113	113
MANUFACTURING	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	616	648	678	704	740	779
MANUFACTURING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	209	209	209	209	209	209
MANUFACTURING	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,380	1,499	1,614	1,711	1,844	1,988
MANUFACTURING	I	TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	1,451	1,586	1,716	1,826	1,977	2,140
MINING	I	OTHER AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	26	26	26	26	26	26
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	605	605	605	605	605	605
LIVESTOCK	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	510	510	510	510	510	510
IRRIGATION	I	BELLWOOD LAKE/RESERVOIR	400	400	400	400	400	400
IRRIGATION	I	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	225	225	225	225	225	0
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	50	50	50	50	50	50
IRRIGATION	I	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	487	478	469	462	456	456
IRRIGATION	I	QUEEN CITY AQUIFER   SMITH COUNTY	324	365	406	446	487	753
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>39,009</b>	<b>41,075</b>	<b>43,225</b>	<b>45,780</b>	<b>49,224</b>	<b>52,761</b>
<b>SMITH COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>39,009</b>	<b>41,075</b>	<b>43,225</b>	<b>45,780</b>	<b>49,224</b>	<b>52,761</b>
CENTERVILLE WSC	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   TRINITY COUNTY	106	111	109	105	109	114
GROVETON	H	LIVINGSTON-WALLISVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	282	283	282	283	284	283
GROVETON	H	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   TRINITY COUNTY	27	28	27	26	27	28
PENNINGTON WSC	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   TRINITY COUNTY	52	54	53	50	52	54
COUNTY-OTHER	H	LIVINGSTON-WALLISVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	250	250	250	250	250	250
COUNTY-OTHER	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   TRINITY COUNTY	10	10	10	10	10	10
MINING	H	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   TRINITY COUNTY	5	5	5	5	5	5
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	449	449	449	449	449	449
LIVESTOCK	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   TRINITY COUNTY	29	29	29	29	29	29
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	3	3	3	3	3	3
IRRIGATION	I	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER   TRINITY COUNTY	300	300	300	300	300	300
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>1,513</b>	<b>1,522</b>	<b>1,517</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>1,525</b>
<b>TRINITY COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>1,513</b>	<b>1,522</b>	<b>1,517</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>1,525</b>
CHESTER WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	355	355	355	355	355	355
COLMESNEIL	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	355	355	355	355	355	355
CYPRESS CREEK WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	117	115	113	112	112	112
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	5	5	5	5	5	5
MOSCOW WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	2	2	3	3	3	3
TYLER COUNTY WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	448	448	448	448	448	448
WARREN WSC	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	448	448	448	448	448	448
WILDWOOD POA	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	116	119	120	122	123	125

### Region I Water User Group (WUG) Existing Water Supply

WUG NAME	SOURCE	SOURCE DESCRIPTION	EXISTING SUPPLY (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	REGION		2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
WOODVILLE	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	1,159	1,159	1,159	1,159	1,159	1,159
WOODVILLE	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	4,762	4,762	4,762	4,762	4,762	4,762
COUNTY-OTHER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	1,494	1,448	1,404	1,380	1,376	1,376
MINING	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	229	229	229	229	229	229
MINING	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	8	8	8	8	8	8
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	191	191	191	191	191	191
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	I	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	838	838	838	838	838	838
LIVESTOCK	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	75	75	75	75	75	75
LIVESTOCK	I	LOCAL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY	239	239	239	239	239	239
IRRIGATION	I	GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM   TYLER COUNTY	559	559	559	559	559	559
IRRIGATION	I	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	88	88	88	88	88	88
<b>NECHES BASIN TOTAL</b>			<b>11,488</b>	<b>11,443</b>	<b>11,399</b>	<b>11,376</b>	<b>11,373</b>	<b>11,375</b>
<b>TYLER COUNTY TOTAL</b>			<b>11,488</b>	<b>11,443</b>	<b>11,399</b>	<b>11,376</b>	<b>11,373</b>	<b>11,375</b>
<b>REGION I TOTAL EXISTING WATER SUPPLY</b>			<b>1,012,689</b>	<b>1,119,035</b>	<b>1,138,356</b>	<b>1,157,764</b>	<b>1,178,171</b>	<b>1,200,916</b>

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 6**

**TWDB DB22 Report #6. WUG Identified Water Needs/Surpluses**

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

	(NEEDS)/SURPLUS (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
FRANKSTON	150	142	140	137	131	125
FRANKSTON RURAL WSC	1	1	0	0	0	0
NECHES WSC	1	1	0	1	0	0
NORWOOD WSC	473	475	476	477	477	477
PALESTINE	76	78	78	78	77	77
SLOCUM WSC	0	1	0	1	0	0
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	36	39	44	49	50	50
COUNTY-OTHER	10	8	9	10	11	11
MINING	0	0	0	1	0	1
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK	174	174	174	174	174	174
IRRIGATION	147	147	147	147	147	147
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY - TRINITY BASIN</b>						
ANDERSON COUNTY CEDAR CREEK WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
B B S WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
B C Y WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
ELKHART	179	177	179	182	182	182
FOUR PINES WSC	213	214	218	223	224	224
NORWOOD WSC	33	34	35	35	35	35
PALESTINE	73	74	73	72	72	72
PLEASANT SPRINGS WSC	248	245	244	244	244	244
SLOCUM WSC	1	1	1	0	0	0
TDCJ BETO GURNEY & POWLEDGE UNITS	1	0	0	1	0	0
TDCJ COFFIELD MICHAEL	0	1	0	1	1	1
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	130	129	131	133	132	133
TUCKER WSC	1	0	0	0	1	1
WALSTON SPRINGS WSC	12	12	11	11	11	11
COUNTY-OTHER	82	71	78	89	91	91
MINING	53	33	29	49	72	88
LIVESTOCK	223	223	223	223	223	223
IRRIGATION	990	990	990	990	990	990
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
ANGELINA WSC	272	272	269	258	249	239
CENTRAL WCID OF ANGELINA COUNTY	367	350	322	295	272	251
DIBOLL	1,976	1,956	1,938	1,903	1,873	1,844
FOUR WAY SUD	732	714	696	678	658	639
HUDSON WSC	513	468	430	395	364	337
HUNTINGTON	803	798	793	786	776	766
LUFKIN	0	0	0	0	0	0
M & M WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
REDLAND WSC	575	577	568	559	551	543

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.



**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	0	0	0	0	0	0
WOODLAWN WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
ZAVALLA	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	1,717	1,705	1,690	1,661	1,636	1,612
MANUFACTURING	869	971	1,296	1,586	1,895	2,227
MINING	(473)	(572)	(397)	(299)	(224)	(167)
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	13,282	13,282	13,282	13,282	13,282	13,282
LIVESTOCK	4	4	4	4	4	4
IRRIGATION	33	33	33	33	33	33
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
AFTON GROVE WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALTO	272	255	238	215	189	161
ALTO RURAL WSC	99	59	2	(65)	(137)	(215)
BLACKJACK WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
BULLARD	15	13	11	8	6	5
CRAFT TURNEY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
GUM CREEK WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
JACKSONVILLE	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEW SUMMERFIELD	95	84	73	58	41	22
NORTH CHEROKEE WSC	1	0	1	1	0	1
POLLOK-REDTOWN WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
RUSK	361	290	216	116	2	0
RUSK RURAL WSC	256	241	225	199	169	134
SOUTH RUSK COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	(276)	(283)	(295)	(309)	(329)	(354)
TROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0
WELLS	241	232	223	210	195	178
WEST JACKSONVILLE WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
WRIGHT CITY WSC	33	29	25	19	11	0
COUNTY-OTHER	1,576	1,570	1,567	1,563	1,560	1,557
MANUFACTURING	309	324	351	374	412	453
MINING	(238)	(247)	(210)	(147)	(84)	(40)
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	1,789	1,789	1,789	1,789	1,789	1,789
LIVESTOCK	9	9	9	9	9	9
IRRIGATION	21	16	12	8	5	5
<b>HARDIN COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
HARDIN COUNTY WCID 1	910	907	905	903	900	898
KOUNTZE	786	795	803	807	807	807
LUMBERTON MUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
NORTH HARDIN WSC	1,363	1,345	1,320	1,302	1,287	1,276
SILSBEE	673	686	699	704	698	692
SOUR LAKE	655	649	646	642	637	633
WEST HARDIN WSC	536	532	529	526	523	520
WILDWOOD POA	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	4	3	3	3	3	3
MANUFACTURING	6	6	6	6	6	6
MINING	0	0	0	0	0	0

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK	28	28	28	28	28	28
IRRIGATION	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>HARDIN COUNTY - TRINITY BASIN</b>						
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	3	3	4	3	3	2
WEST HARDIN WSC	1	1	1	1	1	1
COUNTY-OTHER	7	8	8	8	8	8
LIVESTOCK	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
ATHENS	0	1	(2)	(4)	(21)	(33)
BERRYVILLE	0	0	(1)	(1)	0	(1)
BETHEL ASH WSC	338	287	249	206	166	130
BROWNSBORO	0	1	0	0	0	0
BRUSHY CREEK WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
CHANDLER	250	131	31	(107)	(230)	(349)
EDOM WSC	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(9)
FRANKSTON	7	9	9	11	13	16
LEAGUEVILLE WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
MOORE STATION WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
MURCHISON	0	0	0	0	0	0
R P M WSC	5	(7)	(16)	(27)	(38)	(48)
VIRGINIA HILL WSC	98	82	69	47	25	0
COUNTY-OTHER	(160)	(73)	2	58	173	314
MINING	(77)	(86)	(77)	(59)	(40)	(28)
LIVESTOCK	2,787	2,771	2,654	2,499	1,676	1,160
IRRIGATION	(51)	(61)	(76)	(92)	(144)	(174)
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
GRAPELAND	162	162	166	168	169	169
PENNINGTON WSC	55	56	58	57	58	58
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	444	449	458	462	461	460
COUNTY-OTHER	118	123	127	127	127	127
MANUFACTURING	17	14	14	14	14	14
MINING	0	0	(1)	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK	627	586	543	496	445	380
IRRIGATION	139	139	139	139	139	139
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY - TRINITY BASIN</b>						
CROCKETT	(916)	(918)	(890)	(876)	(873)	(873)
GRAPELAND	248	252	253	254	254	254
LOVELADY	72	73	75	76	77	77
PENNINGTON WSC	101	103	103	105	105	105
TDCJ EASTHAM UNIT	(860)	(850)	(841)	(837)	(836)	(836)
THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	480	495	517	528	526	523
COUNTY-OTHER	25	26	25	25	25	25
MANUFACTURING	157	127	156	181	213	247
MINING	0	0	1	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK	47	52	57	62	67	74
IRRIGATION	623	623	623	623	623	623

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

<b>JASPER COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
BROOKELAND FWSD	0	0	0	0	0	0
JASPER	2,827	2,827	2,853	2,872	2,875	2,875
RAYBURN COUNTRY MUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
RURAL WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	508	472	406	369	361	361
MANUFACTURING	45,763	34,405	34,405	34,405	34,405	34,405
MINING	0	0	0	0	0	1
LIVESTOCK	(5,907)	(5,907)	(5,907)	(5,907)	(5,907)	(5,907)
IRRIGATION	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>JASPER COUNTY - SABINE BASIN</b>						
JASPER COUNTY WCID 1	869	881	885	885	885	885
KIRBYVILLE	182	183	189	193	194	194
MAURICEVILLE SUD	43	43	41	40	38	38
SOUTH JASPER COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
UPPER JASPER COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	338	377	449	490	499	499
MANUFACTURING	132	99	99	99	99	99
MINING	0	0	0	0	0	1
LIVESTOCK	(3,297)	(3,297)	(3,297)	(3,297)	(3,297)	(3,297)
IRRIGATION	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
BEAUMONT	110	111	(249)	(990)	(1,726)	(2,576)
BEVIL OAKS	1	2	1	1	1	2
CHINA	1	1	1	1	1	1
GROVES	1	1	1	0	1	1
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEEKER MWD	20	18	13	7	3	1
NEDERLAND	0	0	0	0	0	0
PORT ARTHUR	2	2	2	2	2	2
PORT NECHES	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	21	24	20	(27)	(121)	(223)
MANUFACTURING	16,935	51,730	59,121	66,500	73,882	81,559
MINING	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK	13	13	13	13	13	13
IRRIGATION	8,106	8,106	8,106	8,106	8,106	8,106
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY - NECHES-TRINITY BASIN</b>						
BEAUMONT	(110)	(111)	(853)	(2,382)	(3,901)	(5,654)
CHINA	1	1	0	1	(1)	0
GROVES	19	18	17	18	17	17
JEFFERSON COUNTY WCID 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEEKER MWD	61	50	38	18	9	(1)
NEDERLAND	0	0	0	0	0	0
PORT ARTHUR	569	568	562	560	560	560
PORT NECHES	0	0	0	0	0	0

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG’s region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split’s projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

WEST JEFFERSON COUNTY MWD	0	0	1	0	0	1
COUNTY-OTHER	317	366	324	(226)	(1,313)	(2,516)
MANUFACTURING	22,960	56,216	63,042	69,853	76,669	83,753
MINING	0	0	0	0	0	0
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	(2,391)	(2,391)	(2,391)	(2,391)	(2,391)	(2,391)
LIVESTOCK	156	156	156	156	156	156
IRRIGATION	107,699	107,699	107,699	107,699	107,699	107,699
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
APPLEBY WSC	282	218	153	78	0	1
CARO WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
CUSHING	63	48	32	13	(8)	(30)
D & M WSC	290	201	108	5	(111)	(234)
ETOILE WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
GARRISON	313	288	263	234	202	168
LILLY GROVE SUD	392	357	321	280	233	184
MELROSE WSC	398	361	323	279	227	173
NACOGDOCHES	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWIFT WSC	242	205	167	121	68	12
WODEN WSC	430	402	374	338	297	252
COUNTY-OTHER	499	545	600	661	724	791
MANUFACTURING	10,000	10,001	10,001	10,001	10,001	10,001
MINING	(5,475)	(2,975)	(118)	226	567	818
LIVESTOCK	(6,973)	(7,402)	(7,899)	(8,475)	(9,134)	(10,116)
IRRIGATION	174	174	174	174	174	174
<b>NEWTON COUNTY - SABINE BASIN</b>						
BROOKELAND FWSD	(36)	(36)	(35)	(35)	(35)	(36)
MAURICEVILLE SUD	41	39	38	36	36	35
NEWTON	40	50	58	62	63	63
SOUTH NEWTON WSC	154	154	154	154	154	154
COUNTY-OTHER	539	579	614	622	625	625
MANUFACTURING	516	588	665	735	802	875
MINING	(115)	(59)	35	105	168	207
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	7,664	7,664	7,664	7,664	7,664	7,664
LIVESTOCK	91	91	91	91	91	91
IRRIGATION	279	279	279	279	279	279
<b>ORANGE COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
BRIDGE CITY	6	8	10	9	8	6
KELLY G BREWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
MAURICEVILLE SUD	72	72	69	68	68	69
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
ORANGEFIELD WSC	13	13	13	13	13	13
PORT ARTHUR	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	74	85	53	31	16	3
MANUFACTURING	142	95	95	95	95	95
MINING	10	8	8	8	6	0
LIVESTOCK	23	23	23	23	23	23

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

<b>ORANGE COUNTY - NECHES-TRINITY BASIN</b>						
BRIDGE CITY	4	6	7	6	5	4
COUNTY-OTHER	1	1	1	0	0	0
<b>ORANGE COUNTY - SABINE BASIN</b>						
BRIDGE CITY	30	40	50	44	38	31
KELLY G BREWER	0	0	0	0	0	0
MAURICEVILLE SUD	837	837	824	815	806	799
ORANGE	0	0	0	0	0	0
ORANGE COUNTY WCID 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
ORANGEFIELD WSC	19	19	20	21	20	21
PINEHURST	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH NEWTON WSC	6	6	6	6	6	6
COUNTY-OTHER	87	100	62	36	19	3
MANUFACTURING	11,514	7,703	7,703	7,703	7,703	7,703
MINING	8	5	6	5	2	0
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	1,493	1,493	1,493	1,493	1,493	1,493
LIVESTOCK	48	48	48	48	48	48
IRRIGATION	(526)	(526)	(526)	(526)	(526)	(526)
<b>PANOLA COUNTY - CYPRESS BASIN</b>						
COUNTY-OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0
MINING	2	2	2	2	4	4
LIVESTOCK	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>PANOLA COUNTY - SABINE BASIN</b>						
BECKVILLE	445	434	428	421	415	410
CARTHAGE	0	0	0	0	0	1
GILL WSC	65	66	68	67	66	65
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
PANOLA-BETHANY WSC	1	(2)	(6)	(13)	(17)	(21)
TATUM	2	2	2	2	3	3
COUNTY-OTHER	205	192	200	187	161	136
MANUFACTURING	407	26	65	98	165	196
MINING	3,189	3,511	4,135	4,448	5,705	5,578
LIVESTOCK	(982)	(982)	(982)	(982)	(982)	(982)
IRRIGATION	28	28	28	28	28	28
<b>POLK COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
CHESTER WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
CORRIGAN	0	0	0	0	0	0
DAMASCUS-STRYKER WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
MOSCOW WSC	19	14	11	7	4	2
SODA WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	346	369	391	414	440	463
MANUFACTURING	180	230	317	397	467	543
MINING	63	89	114	140	166	177
LIVESTOCK	460	460	460	460	460	460
IRRIGATION	539	539	539	539	539	539

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

<b>RUSK COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
EBENEZER WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
GASTON WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
GOODSPRINGS WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
HENDERSON	2,749	2,444	2,141	1,796	1,420	1,025
JACOBS WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	1	1	1	1	1	0
MT ENTERPRISE WSC	1	0	0	1	0	1
NEW LONDON	0	1	0	1	1	1
OVERTON	14	8	3	(4)	(11)	(18)
SOUTH RUSK COUNTY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
WRIGHT CITY WSC	27	23	18	13	6	1
COUNTY-OTHER	1,917	1,882	1,845	1,796	1,739	1,679
MANUFACTURING	304	326	346	364	391	419
MINING	(1,075)	(1,814)	(1,743)	(1,667)	(1,603)	(1,598)
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	(110)	(110)	(110)	(110)	(110)	(110)
LIVESTOCK	36	23	5	(12)	(30)	(30)
IRRIGATION	140	140	140	140	140	140
<b>RUSK COUNTY - SABINE BASIN</b>						
CHALK HILL SUD	711	691	668	639	603	565
CROSS ROADS SUD	386	373	360	338	309	279
CRYSTAL FARMS WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
ELDERVILLE WSC	64	52	38	23	4	(17)
HENDERSON	459	407	354	294	228	160
JACOBS WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
KILGORE	154	428	363	284	190	87
MINDEN BRACHFIELD WSC	1	0	0	0	0	0
NEW LONDON	0	0	0	1	1	1
NEW PROSPECT WSC	1	0	1	1	0	1
OVERTON	110	66	21	(31)	(88)	(149)
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	101	107	112	112	102	97
TATUM	124	94	67	36	9	12
WEST GREGG SUD	11	11	10	7	5	4
COUNTY-OTHER	1,372	1,338	1,304	1,257	1,202	1,145
MANUFACTURING	12	13	14	14	15	17
MINING	0	(278)	(212)	(142)	(83)	(79)
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	(993)	(993)	(993)	(993)	(993)	(993)
LIVESTOCK	(200)	(202)	(206)	(209)	(213)	(213)
IRRIGATION	176	176	176	176	176	176
<b>SABINE COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
BROOKELAND FWSD	0	0	0	0	0	0
G M WSC	3	3	3	3	3	3
PINELAND	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	177	177	178	178	178	178
MANUFACTURING	597	578	578	578	578	578
MINING	124	145	171	196	222	240
LIVESTOCK	62	54	46	36	25	25

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

<b>SABINE COUNTY - SABINE BASIN</b>						
BROOKELAND FWSD	0	0	0	0	0	0
G M WSC	290	290	290	290	290	290
HEMPHILL	438	441	446	448	449	449
COUNTY-OTHER	410	417	422	423	423	423
MINING	654	768	904	1,036	1,168	1,262
LIVESTOCK	541	502	455	402	344	344
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
SAN AUGUSTINE	0	9	18	19	19	19
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	532	553	569	578	580	580
MANUFACTURING	11	11	11	11	11	11
MINING	(2,102)	(1,102)	419	718	1,014	1,236
LIVESTOCK	(1,308)	(1,502)	(1,725)	(1,983)	(2,268)	(2,268)
IRRIGATION	58	58	58	58	58	58
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY - SABINE BASIN</b>						
G M WSC	28	28	28	28	28	28
SAN AUGUSTINE RURAL WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	74	75	75	75	75	75
MINING	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK	(88)	(100)	(112)	(128)	(144)	(144)
<b>SHELBY COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
CHOICE WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAND HILLS WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
TIMPSON	1	0	0	1	1	0
COUNTY-OTHER	316	315	313	312	310	309
MINING	12	25	64	209	72	178
LIVESTOCK	(1,824)	(2,257)	(2,785)	(3,430)	(4,215)	(4,215)
IRRIGATION	13	13	13	13	13	13
<b>SHELBY COUNTY - SABINE BASIN</b>						
CENTER	286	(111)	(212)	(317)	(424)	(353)
CHOICE WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
EAST LAMAR WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
FIVE WAY WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
FLAT FORK WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
HUXLEY	0	0	0	0	0	0
JOAQUIN	3	1	(1)	(2)	(5)	(7)
MCCLELLAND WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAND HILLS WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
TENAHA	215	205	195	184	171	160
TIMPSON	386	380	373	365	356	348
COUNTY-OTHER	216	213	209	202	197	192
MANUFACTURING	1,586	1,991	2,004	2,015	2,029	2,044
MINING	30	62	165	536	186	460
LIVESTOCK	(6,136)	(7,973)	(10,208)	(12,935)	(16,260)	(16,260)
IRRIGATION	75	75	75	75	75	75

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

<b>SMITH COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
ALGONQUIN WATER RESOURCES OF TEXAS	144	137	131	124	116	108
ARP	0	0	0	0	0	0
BEN WHEELER WSC	1	2	2	1	1	1
BULLARD	(125)	(316)	(510)	(723)	(940)	(1,166)
CARROLL WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	(163)	(287)	(432)	(605)	(798)	(973)
DEAN WSC	2	2	2	3	3	3
EMERALD BAY MUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
JACKSON WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
LINDALE	(52)	(180)	(309)	(451)	(596)	(746)
LINDALE RURAL WSC	(77)	(79)	(82)	(88)	(94)	(101)
OVERTON	1	1	1	1	1	1
R P M WSC	2	(2)	(5)	(11)	(13)	(17)
SOUTHERN UTILITIES	(1,335)	(1,468)	(1,627)	(1,749)	(1,333)	(1,017)
TROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYLER	17	18	20	21	23	24
WALNUT GROVE WSC	853	704	547	366	172	(29)
WHITEHOUSE	0	0	0	0	0	0
WRIGHT CITY WSC	131	108	84	55	23	0
COUNTY-OTHER	348	390	435	488	546	607
MANUFACTURING	700	594	869	1,102	1,422	1,768
MINING	(108)	(113)	(114)	(83)	(54)	(32)
LIVESTOCK	535	535	535	535	535	535
IRRIGATION	1,038	1,070	1,102	1,135	1,170	1,211
<b>TRINITY COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
CENTERVILLE WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
GROVETON	254	254	254	256	256	254
PENNINGTON WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
COUNTY-OTHER	129	127	126	130	123	116
MINING	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIVESTOCK	276	276	276	276	276	276
IRRIGATION	25	25	25	25	25	25
<b>TYLER COUNTY - NECHES BASIN</b>						
CHESTER WSC	204	204	204	203	201	200
COLMESNEIL	103	108	112	114	114	114
CYPRESS CREEK WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAKE LIVINGSTON WSC	3	3	3	2	2	2
MOSCOW WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYLER COUNTY WSC	(212)	(190)	(169)	(158)	(156)	(156)
WARREN WSC	263	268	273	275	276	276
WILDWOOD POA	0	0	0	0	0	0
WOODVILLE	4,680	4,703	4,725	4,737	4,739	4,739
COUNTY-OTHER	701	684	668	661	662	665
MINING	77	39	87	134	182	208
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	829	829	829	829	829	829
LIVESTOCK	65	65	65	65	65	65

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.



**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs/Surplus\***

IRRIGATION	293	293	293	293	293	293
------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Needs/Surplus report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Surplus volumes are shown as positive values, and needs are shown as negative values in parentheses.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 7**

**TWDB DB22 Report #9. Source Water Balance**

**Region I Source Water Balance (Availability - WUG Supply)**

GROUNDWATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE WATER BALANCE (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY*	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	17,861	17,774	17,795	17,860	17,889	17,902
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	1,145	1,063	1,074	1,109	1,116	1,116
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	2,494	2,485	2,475	2,454	2,429	2,405
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	12,902	12,830	12,751	12,643	12,522	11,804
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	HENDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	2,984	3,013	3,026	2,935	2,760	2,547
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	21,086	21,086	21,086	21,086	21,086	21,086
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	2,083	1,976	1,861	1,736	1,601	1,428
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	10,396	10,249	10,074	9,880	9,663	9,346
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	PANOLA	CYPRESS	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	PANOLA	SABINE	FRESH	2,976	2,818	2,817	2,817	2,666	2,666
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	4,513	4,381	4,247	4,072	3,890	3,696
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	2,213	2,090	1,958	1,799	1,617	1,401
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	338	338	338	338	338	338
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	2,680	2,684	2,686	2,687	2,687	2,687
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	481	487	491	493	493	493
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	SABINE	FRESH	175	166	155	143	129	129
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SHELBY	NECHES	FRESH	718	429	292	158	158	158
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SHELBY	SABINE	FRESH	3,026	2,738	2,620	2,012	1,391	1,021
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	7,057	6,652	6,196	5,443	3,812	2,407
CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	269	269	269	269	269	269
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	HARDIN	NECHES	FRESH	13,406	13,216	13,102	12,993	12,883	12,790
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	HARDIN	TRINITY	FRESH	104	103	102	102	101	101
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	JASPER	NECHES	FRESH	144	188	244	285	305	310
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	JASPER	SABINE	FRESH	25,834	25,862	25,893	25,915	25,932	25,939
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	JEFFERSON	NECHES	FRESH	241	224	204	163	130	92
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	210	200	186	161	120	68
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	NEWTON	NECHES	FRESH	176	176	176	176	176	176
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	NEWTON	SABINE	FRESH	30,723	30,650	30,574	30,506	30,439	30,367
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	ORANGE	NECHES	FRESH	2,136	2,131	2,127	2,124	2,121	2,118
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	ORANGE	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	4	3	4	4	4	4
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	4,536	4,486	4,464	4,410	4,344	4,286
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	12,664	12,503	12,353	12,210	12,079	11,949
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
GULF COAST AQUIFER SYSTEM	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	32,658	32,703	32,747	32,770	32,773	32,771
OTHER AQUIFER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER AQUIFER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER AQUIFER	HENDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	5	5	5	5	5	5
OTHER AQUIFER	HENDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	141	141	141	141	141	141
OTHER AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	196	220	244	267	291	301
OTHER AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	518	562	605	650	694	713
OTHER AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER AQUIFER	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	348	331	319	303	291	280
OTHER AQUIFER	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER AQUIFER	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

**Region I Source Water Balance (Availability - WUG Supply)**

GROUNDWATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE WATER BALANCE (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY*	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
OTHER AQUIFER	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	99	99	99	99	99	99
OTHER AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER AQUIFER	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	687	687	687	687	687	687
OTHER AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	700	700	700	700	700	700
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	10,474	10,474	10,474	10,474	10,474	10,474
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	6,168	6,168	6,168	6,168	6,168	6,168
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	1,093	1,093	1,093	1,093	1,093	1,093
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	22,152	22,152	22,152	22,152	21,980	21,807
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	HENDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	12,067	12,067	12,067	12,067	12,067	12,067
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	2,029	2,029	2,029	2,029	2,029	2,029
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	195	195	195	195	195	195
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,680
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	40	40	40	40	40	40
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	18	18	18	18	18	18
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	29,274	29,056	28,835	28,593	28,339	27,852
QUEEN CITY AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPARTA AQUIFER	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	181	181	181	181	181	181
SPARTA AQUIFER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	144	144	144	144	144	144
SPARTA AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	183	183	183	183	183	183
SPARTA AQUIFER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	202	202	202	202	202	202
SPARTA AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	418	418	418	418	418	418
SPARTA AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	877	877	877	877	877	877
SPARTA AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	209	209	209	209	209	209
SPARTA AQUIFER	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	34	34	34	34	34	34
SPARTA AQUIFER	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	157	157	157	157	157	157
SPARTA AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	72	72	72	72	72	72
SPARTA AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	SABINE	FRESH	3	3	3	3	3	3
SPARTA AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	154	154	154	154	154	154
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	12,174	12,172	12,170	12,168	11,781	11,778
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	3,199	3,199	3,199	3,199	3,199	3,199
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	209	209	209	209	209	209
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	354	354	354	354	354	354
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	3,017	3,017	3,017	3,017	3,017	3,017
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	565	565	565	565	565	565
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	1,871	1,871	1,871	1,871	1,871	1,871
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	SAN AUGUSTINE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	203	196	199	206	200	193
YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>GROUNDWATER TOTAL SOURCE WATER BALANCE</b>				<b>332,667</b>	<b>330,231</b>	<b>328,480</b>	<b>325,661</b>	<b>321,068</b>	<b>316,363</b>

REUSE SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE WATER BALANCE (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY*	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
DIRECT REUSE	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
DIRECT REUSE	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

**Region I Source Water Balance (Availability - WUG Supply)**

REUSE SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE WATER BALANCE (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY*	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
DIRECT REUSE	SHELBY	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
INDIRECT REUSE	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>REUSE TOTAL SOURCE WATER BALANCE</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

SURFACE WATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE WATER BALANCE (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY*	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
ATHENS LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
BELLWOOD LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	596	596	596	596	596	596
CENTER LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
CHEROKEE LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
CYPRESS LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	PANOLA	CYPRESS	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	TRINITY	FRESH	2,676	2,571	2,466	2,361	2,256	2,151
JACKSONVILLE LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	1,027	1,027	1,027	1,027	1,027	1,027
KURTH LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAKE NACONICHE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500
MARTIN LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
MURVAUL LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	HARDIN	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	HENDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	JASPER	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ORANGE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SAN AUGUSTINE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SHELBY	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	JEFFERSON	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	POLK	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	ANDERSON	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	ANGELINA	NECHES	FRESH	14	14	14	14	14	14
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	CHEROKEE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	HARDIN	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	HOUSTON	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

**Region I Source Water Balance (Availability - WUG Supply)**

SURFACE WATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE WATER BALANCE (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY*	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	JASPER	NECHES	FRESH	6	6	6	6	6	6
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	JEFFERSON	NECHES	BRACKISH	752,152	752,152	752,152	752,152	752,152	752,152
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	JEFFERSON	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	NACOGDOCHES	NECHES	FRESH	2	2	2	2	2	2
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	ORANGE	NECHES	BRACKISH	17,310	17,310	17,310	17,310	17,310	17,310
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	RUSK	NECHES	FRESH	1	1	1	1	1	1
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	SABINE	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	SHELBY	NECHES	FRESH	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	SMITH	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	TRINITY	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	TYLER	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES-TRINITY LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
NECHES-TRINITY OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
NECHES-TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	JEFFERSON	NECHES-TRINITY	FRESH	586	586	586	586	586	586
PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
PINKSTON LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
RUSK CITY LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	JASPER	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	NEWTON	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	PANOLA	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SABINE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SAN AUGUSTINE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	SHELBY	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	NEWTON	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	NEWTON	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	ORANGE	SABINE	BRACKISH	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	ORANGE	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	PANOLA	SABINE	FRESH	140	140	140	140	140	140
SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	RUSK	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	28,000	56,000	56,000	56,000	56,000	56,000
SAN AUGUSTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
STRIKER LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	1,435	665	0
TIMPSON LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	SABINE-LOUISIANA	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRINITY LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRINITY LIVESTOCK LOCAL SUPPLY	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	ANDERSON	TRINITY	FRESH	230	230	230	230	230	230
TRINITY RUN-OF-RIVER	HOUSTON	TRINITY	FRESH	0	0	0	0	0	0

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.

**Region I Source Water Balance (Availability - WUG Supply)**

SURFACE WATER SOURCE TYPE				SOURCE WATER BALANCE (ACRE-FEET PER YEAR)					
SOURCE NAME	COUNTY	BASIN	SALINITY*	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
TYLER LAKE/RESERVOIR	RESERVOIR	NECHES	FRESH	15,773	15,609	15,445	15,281	15,117	14,953
<b>SURFACE WATER TOTAL SOURCE WATER BALANCE</b>				<b>1,092,013</b>	<b>1,119,744</b>	<b>1,119,475</b>	<b>1,120,641</b>	<b>1,119,602</b>	<b>1,118,668</b>
<b>REGION I TOTAL SOURCE WATER BALANCE</b>				<b>1,424,680</b>	<b>1,449,975</b>	<b>1,447,955</b>	<b>1,446,302</b>	<b>1,440,670</b>	<b>1,435,031</b>

\*Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered 'fresh' (less than 1,000 mg/L), 'brackish' (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), 'saline' (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or 'seawater' (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as 'fresh/brackish' or 'brackish/saline', if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.



**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 8**

**TWDB DB22 Report #10a. WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP**

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	4,080	999	-75.5%	3,979	999	-74.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	3,772	907	-76.0%	3,671	897	-75.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,829	1,794	-1.9%	1,829	1,794	-1.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	462	657	42.2%	462	657	42.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,423	1,423	0.0%	1,423	1,423	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,402	1,026	-26.8%	1,402	1,026	-26.8%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	30	0	-100.0%	48	0	-100.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	30	0	-100.0%	48	0	-100.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	193	193	0.0%	164	164	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	140	140	0.0%	75	75	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	7,860	13,918	77.1%	7,835	13,904	77.5%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	6,704	12,290	83.3%	6,652	12,272	84.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	0	1,408	100.0%	0	1,408	100.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	11,306	1,408	-87.5%	25,968	1,408	-94.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	11,306	0	-100.0%	25,968	0	-100.0%
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,358	2,358	0.0%	2,358	2,358	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,961	641	-67.3%	2,289	746	-67.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	812	812	0.0%	812	812	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	481	779	62.0%	481	779	62.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	737	1,032	40.0%	737	1,032	40.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	648	1,028	58.6%	648	1,028	58.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	4,527	4,527	0.0%	6,105	6,105	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	15,249	3,658	-76.0%	23,142	3,878	-83.2%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG’s region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split’s projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	10,722	0	-100.0%	17,037	0	-100.0%
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	13	13	0.0%	13	13	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	486	486	0.0%	180	180	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	473	473	0.0%	167	167	0.0%
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	15,470	16,279	5.2%	16,763	17,796	6.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	9,626	11,041	14.7%	11,490	13,177	14.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	16,802	16,802	0.0%	16,802	16,802	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,000	3,520	252.0%	1,000	3,520	252.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,814	1,814	0.0%	1,937	1,937	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,139	238	-79.1%	1,633	380	-76.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	436	472	8.3%	420	456	8.6%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	355	451	27.0%	355	451	27.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,813	1,883	3.9%	1,813	1,883	3.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,681	1,874	11.5%	1,681	1,874	11.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	424	424	0.0%	582	582	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	413	115	-72.2%	571	129	-77.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	57	57	0.0%	57	57	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	295	295	0.0%	97	97	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	238	238	0.0%	40	40	0.0%
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	8,225	9,190	11.7%	10,224	11,647	13.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	6,905	8,093	17.2%	10,032	11,715	16.8%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	276	100.0%	215	569	164.7%
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	5,000	5,000	0.0%	5,000	5,000	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,790	3,211	79.4%	3,835	3,211	-16.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HARDIN COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,647	721	-56.2%	1,826	708	-61.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,636	710	-56.6%	1,815	697	-61.6%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HARDIN COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	3,414	989	-71.0%	3,712	989	-73.4%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	3,414	989	-71.0%	3,712	989	-73.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HARDIN COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	226	226	0.0%	226	226	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	163	198	21.5%	163	198	21.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HARDIN COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	294	46	-84.4%	445	51	-88.5%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	288	40	-86.1%	439	45	-89.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HARDIN COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	12	12	0.0%	12	12	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	12	12	0.0%	12	12	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HARDIN COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	12,321	10,090	-18.1%	12,311	10,704	-13.1%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	4,692	5,163	10.0%	5,431	5,875	8.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HARDIN COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	0	1	100.0%	0	1	100.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	0	1	100.0%	0	1	100.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,583	540	-65.9%	1,357	540	-60.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,043	700	-32.9%	817	226	-72.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	160	100.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	772	252	-67.4%	662	129	-80.5%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	384	303	-21.1%	384	303	-21.1%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	51	100.0%	0	174	100.0%
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,865	3,793	32.4%	2,018	2,166	7.3%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,253	1,006	-19.7%	1,253	1,006	-19.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	78	0	-100.0%	96	0	-100.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	54	0	-100.0%	95	0	-100.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	119	0	-100.0%	119	0	-100.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	77	77	0.0%	28	28	0.0%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG’s region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split’s projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	77	100.0%	0	28	100.0%
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,454	2,872	17.0%	2,674	3,433	28.4%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,746	2,176	24.6%	2,942	3,727	26.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	5	2	-60.0%	408	440	7.8%
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	375	294	-21.6%	365	293	-19.7%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	184	151	-17.9%	169	141	-16.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,239	2,899	29.5%	2,239	2,899	29.5%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,989	2,137	-28.5%	4,578	2,137	-53.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	756	0	-100.0%	2,339	0	-100.0%
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,238	2,238	0.0%	2,893	2,893	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,630	1,564	-4.0%	2,542	2,439	-4.1%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	343	343	0.0%	493	493	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	307	169	-45.0%	460	232	-49.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	322	322	0.0%	22	22	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	322	322	0.0%	22	22	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	5,896	3,799	-35.6%	5,757	3,732	-35.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	3,190	4,013	25.8%	2,976	3,795	27.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	1,776	100.0%	0	1,709	100.0%
<b>JASPER COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,659	2,544	-4.3%	2,664	2,443	-8.3%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,467	1,698	-31.2%	2,302	1,583	-31.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>JASPER COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	127	151	18.9%	127	151	18.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	36	151	319.4%	36	151	319.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>JASPER COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	796	796	0.0%	796	796	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	362	10,000	2662.4%	362	10,000	2662.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	9,204	100.0%	0	9,204	100.0%
<b>JASPER COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	91,936	91,868	-0.1%	91,936	91,868	-0.1%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	91,580	45,973	-49.8%	100,356	57,364	-42.8%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG’s region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split’s projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	8,420	0	-100.0%
<b>JASPER COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	148	148	0.0%	14	16	14.3%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	148	148	0.0%	14	14	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>JASPER COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	6,520	7,163	9.9%	6,515	7,120	9.3%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,355	3,242	37.7%	2,284	3,128	37.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,937	2,414	-17.8%	4,241	4,063	-4.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,560	2,076	-18.9%	7,537	6,802	-9.8%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	3,296	2,739	-16.9%
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	208,433	204,341	-2.0%	208,433	204,341	-2.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	161,952	88,536	-45.3%	173,833	88,536	-49.1%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,006	1,006	0.0%	1,006	1,006	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	943	837	-11.2%	943	837	-11.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	242,797	242,797	0.0%	399,214	399,214	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	423,258	202,902	-52.1%	707,817	233,902	-67.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	180,461	0	-100.0%	308,603	0	-100.0%
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	194	194	0.0%	368	368	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	194	194	0.0%	368	368	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	57,618	58,723	1.9%	61,541	61,679	0.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	57,537	58,048	0.9%	68,437	69,325	1.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	110	100.0%	6,896	8,231	19.4%
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	0	900	100.0%	0	900	100.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	13,426	3,291	-75.5%	30,839	3,291	-89.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	13,426	2,391	-82.2%	30,839	2,391	-92.2%
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,185	1,185	0.0%	1,881	1,881	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,185	686	-42.1%	1,881	1,090	-42.1%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	509	440	-13.6%	509	440	-13.6%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	400	266	-33.5%	400	266	-33.5%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,720	2,720	0.0%	2,720	2,720	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	4,364	9,693	122.1%	5,779	12,836	122.1%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	1,644	6,973	324.1%	3,059	10,116	230.7%
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	12,564	12,508	-0.4%	13,758	12,530	-8.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,564	2,508	-2.2%	3,758	2,529	-32.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,525	1,525	0.0%	1,525	1,525	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	7,000	7,000	0.0%	707	707	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	5,475	5,475	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	12,675	13,310	5.0%	16,568	17,538	5.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	10,342	10,900	5.4%	16,161	17,012	5.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	234	264	12.8%
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	7,280	0	-100.0%	7,280	0	-100.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	6,911	0	-100.0%	15,874	0	-100.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	8,594	0	-100.0%
<b>NEWTON COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,425	1,425	0.0%	1,425	1,425	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	969	886	-8.6%	875	800	-8.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NEWTON COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	380	380	0.0%	380	380	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	375	101	-73.1%	375	101	-73.1%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NEWTON COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	259	259	0.0%	259	259	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	121	168	38.8%	121	168	38.8%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NEWTON COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	568	568	0.0%	931	931	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	568	52	-90.8%	931	56	-94.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NEWTON COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	314	314	0.0%	314	314	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	429	429	0.0%	107	107	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	115	115	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>NEWTON COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	872	940	7.8%	865	926	7.1%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	648	741	14.4%	624	710	13.8%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG’s region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split’s projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	36	100.0%	0	36	100.0%
<b>NEWTON COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	13,442	13,442	0.0%	13,442	13,442	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	14,132	5,778	-59.1%	32,463	5,778	-82.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	690	0	-100.0%	19,021	0	-100.0%
<b>ORANGE COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,899	2,862	-1.3%	3,066	2,862	-6.7%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,899	2,700	-6.9%	3,066	2,856	-6.8%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ORANGE COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,298	1,298	0.0%	1,298	1,298	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	3,730	1,824	-51.1%	4,056	1,824	-55.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	2,432	526	-78.4%	2,758	526	-80.9%
<b>ORANGE COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	326	326	0.0%	326	326	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	208	255	22.6%	208	255	22.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ORANGE COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	61,929	55,991	-9.6%	61,915	55,991	-9.6%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	64,461	44,335	-31.2%	94,026	48,193	-48.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	2,532	0	-100.0%	32,111	0	-100.0%
<b>ORANGE COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	327	327	0.0%	327	327	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	309	309	0.0%	327	327	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ORANGE COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	9,165	7,999	-12.7%	9,525	8,279	-13.1%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	7,744	7,012	-9.5%	8,148	7,330	-10.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>ORANGE COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	5,791	5,791	0.0%	5,791	5,791	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	4,966	4,298	-13.5%	10,637	4,298	-59.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	4,846	0	-100.0%
<b>PANOLA COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,800	1,800	0.0%	1,800	1,800	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,620	1,595	-1.5%	1,702	1,664	-2.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>PANOLA COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	574	602	4.9%	574	602	4.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	64	574	796.9%	64	574	796.9%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>PANOLA COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,670	1,670	0.0%	1,670	1,670	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,480	2,652	79.2%	1,480	2,652	79.2%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.



**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	982	100.0%	0	982	100.0%
<b>PANOLA COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,259	1,259	0.0%	1,468	1,468	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,393	852	-38.8%	1,777	1,272	-28.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	134	0	-100.0%	309	0	-100.0%
<b>PANOLA COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	9,235	9,107	-1.4%	9,648	9,520	-1.3%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	5,916	5,916	0.0%	3,938	3,938	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>PANOLA COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,455	2,478	0.9%	2,506	2,531	1.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,933	1,965	1.7%	2,018	2,073	2.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	21	100.0%
<b>POLK COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	743	743	0.0%	957	957	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	743	397	-46.6%	957	494	-48.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>POLK COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	769	769	0.0%	769	769	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	428	230	-46.3%	428	230	-46.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>POLK COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	634	634	0.0%	634	634	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	357	174	-51.3%	357	174	-51.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>POLK COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	613	613	0.0%	1,009	1,009	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	604	433	-28.3%	1,000	466	-53.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>POLK COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	186	186	0.0%	186	186	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	123	123	0.0%	9	9	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>POLK COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	292	614	110.3%	292	790	170.5%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	225	595	164.4%	292	788	169.9%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>RUSK COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	4,331	4,331	0.0%	4,331	4,331	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,889	1,042	-63.9%	4,172	1,507	-63.9%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>RUSK COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	598	592	-1.0%	598	592	-1.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	100	276	176.0%	100	276	176.0%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>RUSK COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,496	1,496	0.0%	1,534	1,534	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,207	1,660	37.5%	1,292	1,777	37.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	200	100.0%	0	243	100.0%
<b>RUSK COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	349	348	-0.3%	471	470	-0.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	317	32	-89.9%	439	34	-92.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>RUSK COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,915	1,915	0.0%	1,915	1,915	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,990	2,990	0.0%	3,592	3,592	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	1,075	1,075	0.0%	1,677	1,677	0.0%
<b>RUSK COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	11,452	13,547	18.3%	11,774	15,153	28.7%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	6,489	8,633	33.0%	9,915	13,103	32.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	184	184	0.0%
<b>RUSK COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	44,201	44,201	0.0%	44,201	44,201	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	27,458	45,304	65.0%	63,069	45,304	-28.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	1,103	100.0%	18,868	1,103	-94.2%
<b>SABINE COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	761	721	-5.3%	761	721	-5.3%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	149	134	-10.1%	132	120	-9.1%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SABINE COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	732	732	0.0%	732	732	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	159	129	-18.9%	448	363	-19.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SABINE COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	847	843	-0.5%	847	843	-0.5%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	467	246	-47.3%	785	265	-66.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SABINE COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,278	2,278	0.0%	2,278	2,278	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,500	1,500	0.0%	776	776	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SABINE COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,327	1,656	24.8%	1,328	1,642	23.6%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	881	925	5.0%	863	900	4.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,087	1,087	0.0%	1,089	1,089	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	589	481	-18.3%	532	434	-18.4%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	62	62	0.0%	62	62	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	62	4	-93.5%	62	4	-93.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	921	608	-34.0%	1,400	654	-53.3%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	903	2,004	121.9%	1,382	3,066	121.9%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	1,396	100.0%	0	2,412	100.0%
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	17	17	0.0%	17	17	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	8	6	-25.0%	13	6	-53.8%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,898	1,898	0.0%	1,898	1,898	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	4,000	4,000	0.0%	662	662	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	2,102	2,102	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	595	705	18.5%	593	691	16.5%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	567	677	19.4%	546	644	17.9%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SHELBY COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	2,326	1,430	-38.5%	2,660	1,583	-40.5%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,021	898	-55.6%	2,433	1,082	-55.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SHELBY COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	98	98	0.0%	98	98	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	26	10	-61.5%	26	10	-61.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SHELBY COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	3,898	3,898	0.0%	3,898	3,898	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	5,265	11,858	125.2%	10,822	24,373	125.2%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	1,367	7,960	482.3%	6,924	20,475	195.7%
<b>SHELBY COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,821	3,282	80.2%	2,540	3,740	47.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,510	1,696	12.3%	2,170	1,696	-21.8%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SHELBY COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	3,325	3,325	0.0%	1,725	1,725	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	3,283	3,283	0.0%	1,087	1,087	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SHELBY COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	3,045	4,644	52.5%	3,588	4,839	34.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	2,390	3,753	57.0%	3,029	4,691	54.9%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	360	100.0%
<b>SMITH COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	823	823	0.0%	1,816	1,816	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	823	475	-42.3%	1,816	1,209	-33.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SMITH COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,486	1,486	0.0%	1,659	1,659	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,486	448	-69.9%	1,659	448	-73.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SMITH COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,115	1,115	0.0%	1,115	1,115	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,115	580	-48.0%	1,115	580	-48.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>SMITH COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	3,656	3,656	0.0%	5,116	5,116	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	5,120	2,956	-42.3%	7,553	3,348	-55.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	1,464	0	-100.0%	2,437	0	-100.0%
<b>SMITH COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	26	26	0.0%	26	26	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	134	134	0.0%	58	58	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	108	108	0.0%	32	32	0.0%
<b>SMITH COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	33,296	31,903	-4.2%	44,177	43,029	-2.6%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	32,365	32,504	0.4%	46,502	46,941	0.9%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	116	1,752	1410.3%	2,396	4,049	69.0%
<b>TRINITY COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	995	260	-73.9%	996	260	-73.9%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	230	131	-43.0%	250	144	-42.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TRINITY COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	170	303	78.2%	170	303	78.2%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	500	278	-44.4%	500	278	-44.4%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	330	0	-100.0%	330	0	-100.0%
<b>TRINITY COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	478	478	0.0%	478	478	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	478	202	-57.7%	478	202	-57.7%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TRINITY COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	5	5	0.0%	5	5	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	5	5	0.0%	5	5	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TRINITY COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	312	467	49.7%	316	479	51.6%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	58	213	267.2%	61	225	268.9%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG’s region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split’s projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

**Region I Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)\***

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TYLER COUNTY   COUNTY-OTHER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,494	1,494	0.0%	1,376	1,376	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,494	793	-46.9%	1,376	711	-48.3%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TYLER COUNTY   IRRIGATION WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	682	647	-5.1%	682	647	-5.1%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	675	354	-47.6%	675	354	-47.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TYLER COUNTY   LIVESTOCK WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	314	314	0.0%	314	314	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	288	249	-13.5%	288	249	-13.5%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TYLER COUNTY   MANUFACTURING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	476	0	-100.0%	506	0	-100.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	476	0	-100.0%	506	0	-100.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TYLER COUNTY   MINING WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	237	237	0.0%	237	237	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	160	160	0.0%	29	29	0.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>TYLER COUNTY   MUNICIPAL WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	7,766	7,767	0.0%	7,766	7,772	0.1%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,876	2,726	45.3%	1,779	2,597	46.0%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	212	100.0%	0	156	100.0%
<b>TYLER COUNTY   STEAM ELECTRIC POWER WUG TYPE</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,029	1,029	0.0%	1,029	1,029	0.0%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,029	200	-80.6%	1,029	200	-80.6%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
<b>REGION I</b>						
EXISTING WUG SUPPLY TOTAL	1,027,695	1,012,689	-1.5%	1,216,723	1,200,916	-1.3%
PROJECTED DEMAND TOTAL	1,108,800	738,081	-33.4%	1,607,250	839,601	-47.8%
WATER SUPPLY NEEDS TOTAL	236,971	44,773	-81.1%	508,008	68,328	-86.5%

\*WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG’s region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2016 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split’s projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the Needs totals.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 9**

**TWDB DB22 Report #10b. Source Data Compared to 2016 RWP**

### Region I Source Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
<b>ANDERSON COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	29,792	49,104	64.8%	29,792	49,104	64.8%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	2,274	2,469	8.6%	2,274	2,469	8.6%
<b>ANGELINA COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	45,898	46,757	1.9%	45,515	46,374	1.9%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	735	675	-8.2%	735	675	-8.2%
<b>CHEROKEE COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	34,245	44,771	30.7%	34,245	43,963	28.4%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	1,756	1,682	-4.2%	1,756	1,682	-4.2%
<b>HARDIN COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	34,959	34,927	-0.1%	34,959	34,927	-0.1%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	212	212	0.0%	212	212	0.0%
<b>HENDERSON COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	17,000	18,788	10.5%	17,000	18,788	10.5%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	770	770	0.0%	770	770	0.0%
<b>HOUSTON COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	13,313	36,700	175.7%	13,313	36,700	175.7%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	3,860	4,520	17.1%	3,860	4,520	17.1%
<b>JASPER COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	67,573	67,484	-0.1%	67,494	67,484	0.0%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	383,166	382,977	0.0%	383,166	382,977	0.0%
<b>JEFFERSON COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	2,445	2,525	3.3%	2,445	2,525	3.3%
REUSE AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	13,687	13,687	0.0%	13,687	13,687	0.0%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	825,935	821,269	-0.6%	831,590	826,924	-0.6%
<b>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	28,162	28,897	2.6%	28,162	28,897	2.6%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	3,016	2,949	-2.2%	3,016	2,949	-2.2%
<b>NEWTON COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	34,177	34,219	0.1%	34,139	34,219	0.2%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	147,598	133,441	-9.6%	147,598	133,441	-9.6%
<b>ORANGE COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	20,013	19,364	-3.2%	20,013	19,364	-3.2%
REUSE AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	15	15	0.0%	15	15	0.0%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	284,614	284,614	0.0%	284,614	284,614	0.0%
<b>PANOLA COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	8,227	8,376	1.8%	8,069	8,068	0.0%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	1,855	1,828	-1.5%	1,855	1,828	-1.5%
<b>POLK COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	13,516	16,527	22.3%	12,854	16,527	28.6%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	416	416	0.0%	416	416	0.0%
<b>RESERVOIR COUNTY</b>						
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	1,995,968	1,994,570	-0.1%	1,975,130	1,972,305	-0.1%
<b>RUSK COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	21,640	21,634	0.0%	21,611	21,615	0.0%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	2,571	2,565	-0.2%	2,571	2,565	-0.2%
<b>SABINE COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	11,789	8,437	-28.4%	11,789	8,437	-28.4%



**Region I Source Data Comparison to 2016 Regional Water Plan (RWP)**

	2020 PLANNING DECADE			2070 PLANNING DECADE		
	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)	2016 RWP	2021 RWP	DIFFERENCE (%)
REUSE AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	20	20	0.0%	20	20	0.0%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	887	883	-0.5%	887	883	-0.5%
<b>SAN AUGUSTINE COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	5,499	5,111	-7.1%	5,499	5,111	-7.1%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	536	536	0.0%	536	536	0.0%
<b>SHELBY COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	11,217	10,894	-2.9%	9,729	9,099	-6.5%
REUSE AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	233	233	0.0%	299	299	0.0%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	4,332	4,332	0.0%	4,332	4,332	0.0%
<b>SMITH COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	50,185	54,319	8.2%	50,185	54,307	8.2%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	655	655	0.0%	655	655	0.0%
<b>TRINITY COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	2,827	1,823	-35.5%	2,827	1,823	-35.5%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	511	452	-11.5%	511	452	-11.5%
<b>TYLER COUNTY</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	38,199	38,211	0.0%	38,156	38,211	0.1%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	370	335	-9.5%	370	335	-9.5%
<b>REGION I</b>						
GROUNDWATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	490,676	548,868	11.9%	487,796	545,543	11.8%
REUSE AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	13,955	13,955	0.0%	14,021	14,021	0.0%
SURFACE WATER AVAILABILITY TOTAL (acre-feet per year)	3,662,037	3,642,150	-0.5%	3,646,854	3,625,540	-0.6%

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 10a**

**Modifications to Draft Available Water Supplies**

Model Modification Assumptions

## **Summary of WAM Modifications in the Development of Surface Water Supplies for the East Texas 2021 Regional Water Plan**

The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) requires regional water planning groups (RWPG) to use Full Authorization Water Availability Models (WAM Run 3) maintained by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) in the development of surface water availability for regional water plans (RWPs). In a letter submitted to TWDB on July 3, 2018, the Region I Consultant Team on behalf of the East Texas Regional Water Planning Group (Region I) requested a hydrologic variance to use modified versions of the Run 3 WAMs for the Trinity River, Neches River, and Sabine River Basins to develop supplies for the Region I 2021 RWP. This hydrologic variance request is still pending approval.

For the Trinity River Basin, Region I adopted the updated Trinity Basin WAM developed by the Region C Water Planning Group. These changes are documented in Region C's hydrologic variance request to the TWDB. Region I also includes part of the Neches-Trinity Coastal Basin. As no changes were proposed by Region I to the Neches-Trinity WAM, surface water supplies in that basin were developed using the unmodified Neches-Trinity Coastal Basin WAM Run 3. This memorandum describes the modifications made to the Neches River and Sabine River WAMs by Region I.

### **Neches River Basin WAM for the 2021 Region I RWP**

Changes to the WAM for the 2021 RWP are based on changes in previous cycles, as well as the inclusion of updated sedimentation of major reservoirs, as specified by Exhibit C ("Second Amended General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development"). The following sections describe all changes made to the TCEQ Neches WAM Run 3 (2012) to develop the modified Neches WAM, which will be used to determine existing supplies in the Neches River Basin in the Region I 2021 RWP.

#### **Area-Capacity Relationships**

Exhibit C requires RWPGs to include anticipated sedimentation of all major reservoirs (those with a capacity greater than 5,000 ac-ft) in the WAM model runs. There are 12 such permitted reservoirs in the Neches Basin; information related to sedimentation of these reservoirs is shown in Table 1.

Lake Columbia has not yet been constructed, so to be conservative, Lake Columbia's full design capacity and original area-capacity curve was used when evaluating firm yields for all other reservoirs. Conversely, to estimate the yield from Lake Columbia, it was assumed that the reservoir would be built in 2020 and begin collecting sediment at that time.

**Table 1. Sedimentation Rates and Projected Storage Capacity of Major Reservoirs in the Neches River Basin**

Reservoir	Most Recent Survey		Sediment-Contributing Drainage Area (mi <sup>2</sup> )	Sedimentation Rate (ac-ft/yr/mi <sup>2</sup> )	Projected 2070 Capacity (ac-ft)
	Year	Conservation Pool Capacity (ac-ft)			
Lake Athens	1998	29,475	22	4.35	22,719
Lake Columbia**	*	195,500	277	0.19	192,910
Lake Jacksonville	2006	25,732	34	2.88	19,508
Lake Kurth	1996	14,769	4	8.57	12,265
Lake Nacogdoches	1994	39,523	89	1.75	27,664
Lake Naconiche	*	9,072	27	0.19	8,750
Lake Palestine	2012	367,310	817	0.76	331,689
Pinkston Lake	*	7,380	14	0.19	7,130
Sam Rayburn Reservoir	2004	2,876,033	3,010	0.18	2,839,698
Lake B. A. Steinhagen	2011	69,259	3,251	0.06	58,731
Lake Striker	1996	22,865	182	0.85	11,561
Lake Tyler	2013	77,284	107	1.00	71,192

\* No survey available. Conservation pool capacity reflects design capacity.

\*\* Permitted but not yet constructed. Projected 2070 capacity based on assumption of sedimentation beginning 1/1/2020.

## Subordination of Sam Rayburn Reservoir and B. A. Steinhagen Lake

### Background

Special conditions 5C and 5D of Certificate of Adjudication 06-4411 require subordination of LNVA's rights in the Rayburn-Steinhagen system to (a) water rights upstream of the proposed Weches and Ponta Dam sites and (b) intervening municipal rights above Sam Rayburn Reservoir. These conditions were last amended in Amendment H, filed August 14, 2008, and granted July 20, 2010, which limited subordination to rights with priority dates between November 1963 and April 2008.

Several changes were implemented in the WAM related to dual simulation, output, and the refilling of Rayburn and Steinhagen.

- Water rights benefiting from subordination were updated to run in both the first and second WRAP simulation.
- FNI added additional rights for each water right benefiting from Rayburn/Steinhagen subordination, such that the original right does not have subordination, and the added right applies the subordination and backs up the original without subordination. In doing so, the effects of subordination can be distinguished in the model output.
- Subordination rights at Rayburn and Steinhagen to back up other rights were modeled to not refill storage (Type 2 water rights) so that Rayburn and Steinhagen would not be refilling between multiple subordinations.
- The 1963 rights for impoundment at Rayburn and Steinhagen were reordered so that Rayburn, the upstream reservoir, would be filled from available streamflow before Steinhagen is refilled.

## **Reservoir System Operations**

### ***UNRMWA – Lake Palestine and Rocky Point Dam***

The Upper Neches River Municipal Water Authority operates Lake Palestine in conjunction with its downstream dam on the Neches River in Anderson and Cherokee Counties. The 2012 WAM Run 3 allows rights associated with the downstream dam to draw from both reservoirs, which limits the firm yield of Lake Palestine when it is used to back up the downstream dam. This set of rights was modified so that downstream diversions would first be backed up by the subordination agreement at Steinhagen Lake, and any remaining shortages would be backed up by Lake Palestine.

### ***LNVA – Sam Rayburn Backup of Pine Island Bayou***

The modified WAM approved by TWDB for the development of supplies in the 2011 RWP included “operation of LNVA’s water rights [...] as a system by including backup of LNVA’s Pine Island water rights with storage from Sam Rayburn.”

### **Minimum Elevations – Sam Rayburn and B.A. Steinhagen**

WS and OR records were used to set inactive pool capacity for Sam Rayburn Reservoir. The top elevation of inactive pool is 149 ft msl, and the inactive pool capacity was updated each decade based on updated area-capacity-elevation curves. The City of Lufkin has a right to a lakeside diversion of up to 28,000 ac-ft/yr from Sam Rayburn Reservoir; no inactive pool capacity was applied for this right. This diversion is lakeside and does not generate hydropower, so it is not limited by the inlet elevation.

A dead pool capacity was also set for B. A. Steinhagen using an inactive pool elevation of 81 ft msl. Inactive pools were not applied to subordination-related backup rights for either reservoir.

### **Lake Tyler**

For the 2021 Region I WAM, Lake Tyler was modeled as a single reservoir, and associated water rights were adjusted accordingly. This is consistent with the development of the original Neches WAM, which treated this source as one reservoir.

### **Environmental Flows Standard for Permit 5585**

The TCEQ Run 3 WAM included an incorrect target value for the instream flow record at Lake Naconiche (5585A) due to a unit conversion error. The target was corrected to 4744 ac-ft/yr (see IF record at 5585A).

## Sabine River Basin WAM for the 2021 Region I RWP

The following sections describe all changes made to the TCEQ Sabine WAM Run 3 (2015) to develop the modified Sabine WAM, which will be used to determine existing supplies from the Sabine River Basin in the Region I 2021 RWP.

### Area-Capacity Relationships

Exhibit C requires RWPGs to include anticipated sedimentation of all major reservoirs (those with a capacity greater than 5,000 ac-ft) in the WAM model runs. There are 12 such permitted reservoirs in the Sabine Basin; information related to sedimentation of these reservoirs is shown in Table 2. For each of the 12 reservoirs, sedimentation conditions were estimated based on an average annual sedimentation rate and the number of years since the last survey.

**Table 2. Sedimentation Rates and Projected Storage Capacity of Major Reservoirs in the Sabine River Basin**

Reservoir	Most Recent Survey		Sediment-Contributing Drainage Area (mi <sup>2</sup> )	Sedimentation Rate (ac-ft/yr/mi <sup>2</sup> )	Projected 2070 Capacity (ac-ft)
	Year	Conservation Pool Capacity (ac-ft)			
Lake Tawakoni	2009	871,693	756	2.96	736,428
Lake Fork Reservoir	2009	636,504	493	3.83	522,671
Lake Gladewater	2000	4,738	35	1.33	1,480
Lake Cherokee	2015	44,475	158	0.26	42,230
Brandy Branch Reservoir	*	29,513	4	0.24	29,429
Martin Lake	2014	75,726	130	0.37	73,097
Murvaul Lake	1998	38,284	115	1.64	24,873
Toledo Bend Reservoir	*	4,477,000	5,384	0.12	4,410,291
Lake Hawkins	1962	11,890	30	0.24	11,117
Lake Holbrook	*	7,990	15	0.24	7,604
Lake Quitman	*	7,440	31	0.24	6,639
Lake Winnsboro	*	8,100	27	0.24	7,403

\* No recent survey available. Conservation pool capacity reflects design capacity.

### Firm Yield of Toledo Bend Reservoir

Hydropower operations at Toledo Bend were excluded during the determination of total available supply from the lake. However, hydropower operations were included in the evaluation of supplies for all other reservoirs and run-of-river supplies. The canal water rights owned by Sabine River Authority (SRA) in the lower basin modeled as being subordinate to diversions from Toledo Bend Reservoir for the purposes of determining firm yield. The remainder of the yield of Toledo Bend was evaluated assuming all diversions were taken lakeside. Within the WAM, all diversions from the lake are shared equally between SRA-Texas and SRA-Louisiana, including the additional unpermitted yield.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 10b**

**Modifications to Draft Available Water Supplies**

Original Unmodified Firm Yield

**Original and Modified Firm Yield for Reservoirs**

Reservoir	Unmodified WAM Firm Yield (ac-ft/yr)						Modified Firm Yield (ac-ft/yr)					
	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<b>Trinity Basin</b>												
Houston County Lake	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
<b>Neches Basin</b>												
Lake Athens	5,950	5,864	5,778	5,692	5,606	5,520	5,950	5,864	5,778	5,692	5,606	5,520
Lake Jacksonville	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200
Lake Nacogdoches	16,920	16,516	16,112	15,708	15,304	14,900	16,200	15,800	15,400	15,000	14,600	14,200
Lake Tyler	20,280	20,198	20,116	20,034	19,952	19,870	34,830	34,666	34,502	34,338	34,174	34,010
Lake Columbia	78,090	78,090	78,090	78,090	78,090	78,090	75,800	75,720	75,640	75,560	75,480	75,400
Pinkston Reservoir*	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
Lake Kurth	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500
Striker Creek Reservoir	16,585	16,207	15,829	15,451	15,073	14,695	20,340	19,635	18,890	18,150	16,715	14,690
Lake Palestine System	190,000	189,274	188,548	187,822	187,096	186,370	197,710	196,110	194,610	193,010	191,310	189,010
Sam Rayburn & Steinhagen System	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000
Lake Timpson	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350
Bellwood Lake	953	953	953	953	953	953	996	996	996	996	996	996
Rusk City Lake	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
San Augustine City Lake	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285
<b>Sabine Basin**</b>												
Lake Cherokee	31,456	31,309	31,162	31,015	30,867	30,720	31,456	31,309	31,162	31,015	30,867	30,720
Martin Lake	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Lake Murvaul	21,367	20,686	20,006	19,325	18,644	17,963	21,367	20,686	20,006	19,325	18,644	17,963
Toledo Bend Reservoir	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Lake Center*	485	485	485	485	485	485	1,460	1,460	1,460	1,460	1,460	1,460

**Notes**

\*Modified firm yields for Pinkston Reservoir and Lake Center were determined in a separate study conducted for the City of Center by FNI using previous WAM Run 3 versions. These model runs were approved for use in the 2016 RWP.

\*\*Modifications to the Sabine Basin WAM were limited to required sedimentation and the exclusion of hydropower from firm yield modeling of Toledo Bend Reservoir, so unmodified and modified yields in the Sabine Basin are equivalent with the exception of Lake Center.

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 11**

**Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies**

## East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies

**Project No:** 1600-003-01

**Date:** August 15, 2018

**Prepared For:** East Texas Regional Water Planning Group

**Prepared By:** Cynthia A. Syvarth, PE, Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.  
Spandana Tummuri, PhD, PE, ENV SP, Freese and Nichols, Inc.  
Rex H. Hunt, PE, Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.

This memorandum documents the process used by the East Texas Regional Water Planning Area to identify Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies (WMS) for the East Texas Regional Water Planning Area (ETRWPA or Region I) 2021 Regional Water Plan (2021 Plan). The process was presented at an ETRWPG general meeting dated December 11, 2017 held to receive public input on the process. No public comments were received and the process was approved by the ETRWPG.

The screening criteria used to assess the feasibility of potential strategies in the ETRWPA are provided as follows. These criteria were adopted as guidelines, and strategies could be retained or dismissed at the discretion of the ETRWPG.

### GENERAL

- Feasible strategy must have an identified sponsor or authority.
- Feasible strategy must consider the end use. This includes water quality, distance to end use, etc. For example, long transmission systems with pumping are not likely to be economically feasible for irrigation use.
- Strategy should provide a reasonable percentage of the projected need (except conservation, which will be evaluated for all needs).
- Strategy must meet existing federal and state regulations.
- Strategies must be based on proven technology.
- Strategy must be able to be implemented.
- Strategy must be appropriate for regional water planning.

### WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY TYPES

In accordance with Texas Water Code §16.053(e)(3) and Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 31, §357.34(c), the ETRWPG must evaluate all WMSs the regional water planning group determines to be potentially feasible. The types of WMSs to be evaluated are described below.

# East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies

---

## **1. Water Conservation**

The guidelines for water planning require that water conservation be considered as a strategy for every identified need. If water conservation is not adopted, the reason must be documented. Water conservation in the ETRWPA is driven more by economics than lack of readily available supply, and therefore, not every user will have the need to implement conservation. Additional screening criteria for conservation strategies were adopted to comply with this general policy. The criteria are outlined below.

- Municipal conservation strategies will be evaluated for municipal WUGs that have a need identified during the planning period and a current per capita water use greater than 140 gpcd. This is the TWDB recommended goal for municipal users based on the Conservation Task Force recommendations. Municipal conservation will not be evaluated for WUGs with current usage less than 140 gpcd.
- Industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) conservation strategies will be considered for cities with ICI use that exceeds 20 percent of the city's total water use.
- Industrial conservation will be evaluated for counties with manufacturing demands greater than 1,000 ac-ft per year and/or have identifiable industries with water use greater than 500 ac-ft per year.
- Steam-electric power water demands consider a high level of conservation in the development of the projections. No additional conservation measures will be considered for steam-electric power.
- Irrigation conservation measures will be considered by crop type and water source.
- Conservation will not be considered for livestock or mining water demands. The cost of water in these industries comprises a small percentage of the overall business cost, and it is not expected that these industries will see an economic benefit to water conservation.
- Review best managements practices (BMPs) for applicability and updates
- Identify possible permanent reductions in water demands

## **2. Drought Management Measures**

Drought management WMSs are implemented in response to drought conditions. These strategies provide a safety factor for water users during drought. Drought management measures will not be adopted as strategies to meet long-range needs.

## **3. Wastewater Reuse**

Reuse projects will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Both direct and indirect reuse will be considered based on current practices and other opportunities, as appropriate.

# East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies

---

## **4. Management of Existing Water Supplies**

Use of existing supplies should be optimized, where possible, to meet new demands. Following is a discussion of how various types of existing supplies might be expanded.

## **5. Conjunctive Use of Groundwater and Surface Water Supplies**

The conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water supplies may be considered when groundwater supplies are available and can be conjunctively used with surface water supplies. Applicable groundwater conservation district rules will be considered for such conjunctive systems.

## **6. Acquisition of Available Existing Water Supplies**

In general, supplies should be owned by the water group with a need for additional supply or available to that group for purchase or permitting; however, the connection to existing supplies will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Acquisition of supplies includes purchasing existing groundwater wells or the right to surface water that another entity already has the physical and legal means to access. The ETRWPG will consider acquisition of supplies when an entity in need of supplies is adjacent to an entity with a surplus of supplies and both entities have shown an interest in the proposed acquisition.

## **7. Development of New Water Supplies**

The development of new water supplies may be necessary to meet new water demands.

## **8. Regional Water Supply Facilities**

A strategy of this type would include regional facilities or local facilities managed at a regional level.

## **9. Seawater or Brackish Groundwater Desalination Facilities**

A strategy of this type would be large-scale and would serve local or regional brackish groundwater zones identified and designated under Texas Water Code §16.060(b)(5). The ETRWPG will consider desalination on a case-by-case basis.

## **10. Marine Seawater Desalination Facilities**

A strategy of this type would be large-scale and would serve local or regional entities. The ETRWPG will consider desalination on a case-by-case basis.

## **11. Voluntary Water Transfer**

This strategy type would include, but not be limited to, contracts, water marketing, regional water banks, sales, leases, options, subordination agreements, and financing agreements. Voluntary redistribution with the involved parties will be considered and the ETRWPG will come to a consensus on an approach. If the involved parties are not interested, this option will not be pursued. Voluntary subordination of existing water rights will be considered if the involved parties are amenable to the strategy. Alternatively,

## **East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies**

---

the ETRWPG may recommend that the water right holder consider selling water under their water right to the willing buyer.

### ***12. Emergency Transfers***

Emergency Transfers of water will be considered in accordance with Texas Administrative Code §11.139 for temporary, interim supplies.

### ***13. Interbasin Transfers***

The ETRWPG will recommend interbasin transfers when necessary to transport water from the source to its destination. Interbasin transfers will be evaluated in accordance with current regulations.

### ***14. System Optimization***

New or additional system operations may be considered to optimize existing systems if they are feasible and the owner wishes to adopt such strategies. Existing operating policies will be considered during evaluation of available supplies.

### ***15. Reallocation of Reservoir Storage***

Reallocation of reservoir storage will be considered if the owner is amenable to reallocation and, where reallocation in federal reservoirs is being considered (such as from flood to conservation storage), an appropriate and willing local sponsor can be found to sponsor a federal study.

### ***16. Enhancements of Yields***

ETRWPG will consider yield enhancement projects, as appropriate, for the water source and identified need. Projects such as dredging and application for additional water rights, where permissible, will be considered.

### ***17. Improvements of Water Quality***

Water quality improvement projects will be considered for municipal supplies that bring the existing water supply into compliance with state and federal regulations. General water quality projects may be considered if they improve the usability of the water source to help meet demands.

### ***18. New Surface Water Supply***

New surface water resources that can be permitted will be considered, provided a reasonable amount of supply to meet the identified need is located within a reasonable distance of the end users, and recommended new sources would be expected to provide water supplies at a reasonable cost.

### ***19. New Groundwater Supply***

The ETRWPG will consider groundwater supplies in areas where additional groundwater is available.

## **East Texas Regional Water Planning Area Identification of Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies**

---

### **20. Brush Control**

Brush control is not considered a cost effective water supply strategy in the ETRWPA due to the large amount of rainfall and lack of invasive brush species, and will not be considered as a WMS.

### **21. Precipitation Enhancement**

The ETRWPA has an abundance of precipitation. Precipitation enhancement will not be considered as a WMS.

### **22. Aquifer Storage and Recovery**

Aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) will be considered where the structure of the aquifer is such that this method is applicable. The ETRWPG will consider an ASR project if an ASR study has already been performed.

### **23. Cancellation of Water Rights**

The ETRWPG will generally not pursue water right cancellation as a means of obtaining additional water supplies. Instead, the ETRWPG will recommend that the water right holder consider selling water under their water right to the willing buyer.

### **24. Rainwater Harvesting**

Rainwater Harvesting has not historically been considered for Region I as a feasible WMS. The ETRWPG will consider rainwater harvesting for projects with a project sponsor.

## **SELECTIONS FOR TASK 5B EVALUATION**

The process for selection of the WMSs is described as follows:

1. Define groupings or common areas with supply deficiencies.
2. Develop a comprehensive list of potentially feasible strategies, per screening process.
3. Contact potential suppliers/WUGs to determine current strategies under consideration.
4. Prepare qualitative rating based on cost, reliability, environmental impact, impacts on other water resources, impacts on agricultural and natural resources, and political acceptability for the various strategies.
5. Select one or more strategies as appropriate for each need or group.
6. Contact each WUG with a need and confirm the selected strategies are acceptable.
7. Review the Region I 2016 Regional Water Plan WMSs with project sponsors to update the information and verify whether or not the entity would like to carry the strategy forward into the 2021 Plan.
8. Present proposed WMSs to the ETRWPG in a public meeting for discussion, modification, and approval.



**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 12**

**Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies to Date**

**2021 Potentially Feasible Water Management Strategies to Date**  
**August 15, 2018**

County	Water User Group	WMS Type	Source Name (if applicable)	Strategy Source
ANDERSON	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, ANDERSON	EXISTING SURPLUS	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
ANDERSON	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, ANDERSON	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
ANDERSON	THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
ANDERSON	THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
ANGELINA	LUFKIN	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
ANGELINA	MANUFACTURING, ANGELINA	EXISTING SURPLUS	KURTH LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
ANGELINA	MANUFACTURING, ANGELINA	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
ANGELINA	MANUFACTURING, ANGELINA	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
ANGELINA	MINING, ANGELINA	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
ANGELINA	MINING, ANGELINA	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
CHEROKEE	ALTO	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	ALTO RURAL WSC	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	ALTO RURAL WSC	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	ALTO RURAL WSC	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need
CHEROKEE	ALTO RURAL WSC	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need
CHEROKEE	BULLARD	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
CHEROKEE	BULLARD	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
CHEROKEE	COUNTY-OTHER, CHEROKEE	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	JACKSONVILLE	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	MINING, CHEROKEE	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
CHEROKEE	MINING, CHEROKEE	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
CHEROKEE	NEW SUMMERFIELD	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	NORTH CHEROKEE WSC	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	RUSK	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	RUSK RURAL WSC	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, CHEROKEE	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	2016 Plan
CHEROKEE	TROUP	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
HENDERSON	ATHENS	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need
HENDERSON	ATHENS	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
HENDERSON	CHANDLER	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
HENDERSON	CHANDLER	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
HENDERSON	CHANDLER	EXISTING SURPLUS	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
HENDERSON	CHANDLER	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need
HENDERSON	CHANDLER	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
HENDERSON	COUNTY-OTHER, HENDERSON	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
HENDERSON	EDOM WSC	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
HENDERSON	IRRIGATION, HENDERSON	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	INDIRECT REUSE	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
HENDERSON	IRRIGATION, HENDERSON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	ATHENS LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
HENDERSON	LIVESTOCK, HENDERSON	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	INDIRECT REUSE	2016 Plan
HENDERSON	LIVESTOCK, HENDERSON	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	INDIRECT REUSE	2016 Plan
HENDERSON	LIVESTOCK, HENDERSON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	ATHENS LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
HENDERSON	LIVESTOCK, HENDERSON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	ATHENS LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
HENDERSON	MINING, HENDERSON	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
HOUSTON	CROCKETT	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
HOUSTON	IRRIGATION, HOUSTON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	2016 Plan
HOUSTON	IRRIGATION, HOUSTON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	2016 Plan
HOUSTON	IRRIGATION, HOUSTON	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	2016 Need
HOUSTON	MINING, HOUSTON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
HOUSTON	MINING, HOUSTON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
HOUSTON	TDCJ EASTHAM UNIT	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
HOUSTON	THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
HOUSTON	THE CONSOLIDATED WSC	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
JASPER	MANUFACTURING, JASPER	EXISTING SURPLUS	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan

County	Water User Group	WMS Type	Source Name (if applicable)	Strategy Source
JASPER	MANUFACTURING, JASPER	EXISTING SURPLUS	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
JASPER	MANUFACTURING, JASPER	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
JEFFERSON	BEAUMONT	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
JEFFERSON	BEAUMONT	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
JEFFERSON	BEAUMONT	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
JEFFERSON	BEAUMONT	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
JEFFERSON	BEAUMONT	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
JEFFERSON	BEAUMONT	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
JEFFERSON	BEAUMONT	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need, 2021 Need
JEFFERSON	COUNTY-OTHER, JEFFERSON	EXISTING SURPLUS	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	COUNTY-OTHER, JEFFERSON	EXISTING SURPLUS	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	COUNTY-OTHER, JEFFERSON	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
JEFFERSON	COUNTY-OTHER, JEFFERSON	EXISTING SURPLUS	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	MANUFACTURING, JEFFERSON	EXISTING SURPLUS	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	MANUFACTURING, JEFFERSON	EXISTING SURPLUS	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	MANUFACTURING, JEFFERSON	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
JEFFERSON	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
JEFFERSON	PORT ARTHUR	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need
JEFFERSON	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, JEFFERSON	EXISTING SURPLUS	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
JEFFERSON	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, JEFFERSON	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
NACOGDOCHES	COUNTY-OTHER, NACOGDOCHES	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
NACOGDOCHES	COUNTY-OTHER, NACOGDOCHES	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	LAKE NACONICHE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
NACOGDOCHES	D & M WSC	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY		2016 Need
NACOGDOCHES	D&M WSC	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
NACOGDOCHES	LIVESTOCK, NACOGDOCHES	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
NACOGDOCHES	LIVESTOCK, NACOGDOCHES	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need, 2021 Need
NACOGDOCHES	MINING, NACOGDOCHES	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
NACOGDOCHES	MINING, NACOGDOCHES	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
NACOGDOCHES	NACOGDOCHES	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
NACOGDOCHES	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, NACOGDOCHES	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
NACOGDOCHES	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, NACOGDOCHES	EXISTING SURPLUS	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
NACOGDOCHES	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, NACOGDOCHES	EXISTING SURPLUS	NACOGDOCHES LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
NACOGDOCHES	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, NACOGDOCHES	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
NACOGDOCHES	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, NACOGDOCHES	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
NACOGDOCHES	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, NACOGDOCHES	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need
NEWTON	BROOKELAND FWSD	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
NEWTON	MINING, NEWTON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
NEWTON	MINING, NEWTON	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
NEWTON	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, NEWTON	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
NEWTON	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, NEWTON	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
ORANGE	IRRIGATION, ORANGE	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
ORANGE	IRRIGATION, ORANGE	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
ORANGE	IRRIGATION, ORANGE	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
ORANGE	MANUFACTURING, ORANGE	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
ORANGE	MANUFACTURING, ORANGE	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
ORANGE	MANUFACTURING, ORANGE	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
ORANGE	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
ORANGE	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
ORANGE	PORT ARTHUR	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
ORANGE	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, ORANGE	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
ORANGE	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, ORANGE	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need

County	Water User Group	WMS Type	Source Name (if applicable)	Strategy Source
PANOLA	LIVESTOCK, PANOLA	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
PANOLA	MANUFACTURING, PANOLA	EXISTING SURPLUS	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
PANOLA	MANUFACTURING, PANOLA	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
RUSK	HENDERSON	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	STRIKER LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
RUSK	HENDERSON	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	STRIKER LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
RUSK	LIVESTOCK, RUSK	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
RUSK	MANUFACTURING, RUSK	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
RUSK	MANUFACTURING, RUSK	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
RUSK	MINING, RUSK	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
RUSK	MINING, RUSK	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
RUSK	MINING, RUSK	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
RUSK	NEW LONDON	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
RUSK	NEW LONDON	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
RUSK	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
RUSK	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
RUSK	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
RUSK	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
RUSK	OVERTON	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need
RUSK	OVERTON	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
RUSK	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, RUSK	EXISTING SURPLUS	SABINE RUN-OF-RIVER	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
RUSK	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, RUSK	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SABINE	G M WSC	EXISTING SURPLUS	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
SAN AUGUSTINE	MINING, SAN AUGUSTINE	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	NECHES RUN-OF-RIVER	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
SAN AUGUSTINE	MINING, SAN AUGUSTINE	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SHELBY	CENTER	EXISTING SURPLUS	CENTER LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
SHELBY	CENTER	EXISTING SURPLUS	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
SHELBY	LIVESTOCK, SHELBY	EXISTING SURPLUS	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
SHELBY	LIVESTOCK, SHELBY	EXISTING SURPLUS	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
SHELBY	LIVESTOCK, SHELBY	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	ARP	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
SMITH	BULLARD	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
SMITH	BULLARD	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan, 2021 Need
SMITH	BULLARD	EXISTING SURPLUS	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan, 2021 Need
SMITH	BULLARD	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	BULLARD	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	BULLARD	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	CRYSTAL SYSTEMS TEXAS	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	JACKSON WSC	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
SMITH	LINDALE	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	LINDALE	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	LINDALE	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	LINDALE RURAL WSC	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
SMITH	MANUFACTURING, SMITH	EXISTING SURPLUS	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
SMITH	MANUFACTURING, SMITH	EXISTING SURPLUS	PALESTINE LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
SMITH	MANUFACTURING, SMITH	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need
SMITH	MANUFACTURING, SMITH	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
SMITH	MINING, SMITH	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	MINING, SMITH	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need, 2021 Need
SMITH	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
SMITH	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
SMITH	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
SMITH	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
SMITH	OVERTON	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan

County	Water User Group	WMS Type	Source Name (if applicable)	Strategy Source
SMITH	R P M WSC	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2016 Need
SMITH	R P M WSC	NEW GROUNDWATER SUPPLY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Need
SMITH	R P M WSC	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
SMITH	TROUP	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
SMITH	WHITEHOUSE	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	COLUMBIA LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
TRINITY	IRRIGATION, TRINITY	EXISTING SURPLUS	YEGUA-JACKSON AQUIFER	2016 Plan
TRINITY	IRRIGATION, TRINITY	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2016 Need
TYLER	TYLER COUNTY WSC	Purchase from Provider (Voluntary Transfer)		2021 Need
TYLER	WOODVILLE	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
TYLER	WOODVILLE	DEMAND REDUCTION		2016 Plan
VARIES	MULTIPLE ENTITIES	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION		2021 Requirement
VARIES	MULTIPLE ENTITIES	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION		2021 Requirement
VARIES	MULTIPLE ENTITIES	REUSE (DIRECT AND INDIRECT, POTABLE AND NON-POTABLE)		2021 Requirement
VARIES	MULTIPLE ENTITIES	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER (VOLUNTARY TRANSFER)		2021 Requirement
	HOUSTON COUNTY WCID #1	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	HOUSTON COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
	HOUSTON COUNTY WCID #1	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
	HOUSTON COUNTY WCID #1	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	2016 Plan
	LOWER NECHES VALLEY AUTHORITY	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	SAM RAYBURN-STEINHAGEN LAKE/RESERVOIR SYSTEM	2016 Plan
	LOWER NECHES VALLEY AUTHORITY	EXISTING SURPLUS	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
	SABINE RIVER AUTHORITY	EXISTING AVAILABILITY	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan
	SABINE RIVER AUTHORITY	AVAILABILITY INCREASE	TOLEDO BEND LAKE/RESERVOIR	2016 Plan

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 13a**

**Water Availability Models and Runs**

Hydrologic Variance Request



Kelley Holcomb, Chair  
P.O. Box 635030  
Nacogdoches TX 75963  
936-633-7543

July 3, 2018

Mr. Jeff Walker  
Executive Administrator  
Texas Water Development Board  
1700 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701

Re: Request for Modifications to Water Availability Models for Planning Purposes  
in the East Texas Regional Water Planning Area

Dear Mr. Walker,

On May 16, 2018, the East Texas Regional Water Planning Group (ETRWPG) considered and approved an approach to water availability modeling for surface water supplies for the current round of planning. The purpose of this letter is to inform the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) of the approach approved at that time.

The East Texas Regional Water Planning Area (ETRWPA) uses supplies from four river basins, Trinity, Neches, Sabine, and Neches-Trinity. Following are highlights of the four basin models and the changes made to the models to determine the available surface water supplies for the ETRWPA in this round of regional water planning:

- All models will incorporate updated area-capacity relationships to account for sedimentation in major reservoirs, as required by “Exhibit C: General Guidelines for Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Plan Development.”
- The ETRWPG will use the Neches-Trinity Coastal Basin WAM Run 3, as developed by TCEQ, for surface water supplies in that basin. No changes are proposed to the Neches-Trinity WAM.
- Changes to the Trinity WAM were made as part of the Region C planning efforts. The ETRWPG adopted and retained the changes made to the Trinity WAM. For surface water supplies located in the Trinity River Basin, the ETRWPG will use the updated Trinity Basin WAM developed for Region C.
- The TCEQ updated the Neches River WAM in 2012. Following review of the Run 3 WAM files for the basin, the ETRWPG requests approval to update the Neches River WAM to more accurately represent current operating conditions in the basin. The ETRWPG intends to use the Neches River WAM Full Authorization run (Run 3) as developed by TCEQ in 2012 with modifications to address the following:





- Subordination of rights associated with Sam Rayburn Reservoir and Lake B.A. Steinhagen.
  - Hydropower generation at Sam Rayburn Reservoir and regulation of releases by Lake B. A. Steinhagen.
  - System operations, where appropriate.
  - Incorrect representation of environmental flow standards related to Permit No. 5585.
  - Minimum operating elevation in Sam Rayburn Reservoir.
- The TCEQ updated the Sabine River WAM in 2015. Following review of the Run 3 WAM files, the ETRWPG requests approval to update these models to more accurately represent current operating conditions in the basin. The ETRWPG intends to use the Sabine River WAM Full Authorization run (Run 3), as developed by TCEQ in 2015, to determine surface water supplies in that basin. The changes made to the TCEQ-approved WAM by the ETRWPG include the following:
    - Area-capacity relationships updated to reflect current and future sedimentation conditions for major reservoirs in the basin.
    - The canal water rights owned by Sabine River Authority (SRA) in the lower basin were modeled as being backed up by releases from Toledo Bend Reservoir.
    - The remainder of the yield of Toledo Bend evaluated assuming all diversions were taken lakeside.
    - Hydropower operations at Toledo Bend were excluded during the determination of total available supply from the lake. Hydropower operations, as modeled by TCEQ, were included in the evaluation of supplies for all other reservoirs and run-of-river supplies.

Supplies for Lake Pinkston in the Neches River Basin and Lake Center in the Sabine Basin were determined separately from the WAMs; instead, the supplies are based on the 2016 study completed by the City of Center.

- For the City of Beaumont, available supply will be evaluated based on daily time-step maximum diversion rates and current infrastructure. The City of Beaumont is the only major municipal water user with a run-of-the river water right. Other major users that receive water from run-of-the river water rights purchase water either from the Lower



Neches Valley Authority or the Sabine River Authority, or they use saline water. The purchased water is backed up by stored water that is owned and operated by the river authorities, making this supply less vulnerable to drought. This approach was applied in the development of supplies for the 2016 East Texas Regional Water Plan.

As intended by Senate Bill 1, the assessment of surface water availability in the ETRWPA will be conducted to accurately reflect water supplies that are available for use. Should new information become available within the project timeline, this will be incorporated into the supply analyses. Examples of such changes include new water supply studies for specific sources, updates to the area-capacity relationships for reservoirs with new volumetric surveys, new water rights permits, and revised operating policies and/or contractual agreements.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please call me if you have any questions regarding our request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kelley Holcomb', written in a cursive style.

Kelley Holcomb, Chair  
East Texas Regional Water Planning Group

cc: Mr. Lann Bookout, Texas Water Development Board  
Ms. Stacy Corley, City of Nacogdoches  
Mr. Rex Hunt, PE, Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.  
Ms. Cynthia Syvarth, PE, Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.  
Ms. Spandana Tummuri, PE, Freese and Nichols, Inc.

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 13b**

**Water Availability Models and Runs**

WAM Model Summary

**Summary of Model Runs to Determine Surface Water Source Availability**

Model Information					Execution			
Modified Model Root File Name	Run 3 Version Date	Description	EA Approval Date	DB22 Source Name	Model	Model Version	Modeler	Date
<b>Neches-Trinity Basin</b>								
NT3	1/2/2013	n/a	n/a	Neches-Trinity Run-of-River	WRAP	2015	FNI	3/8/2018
<b>Trinity Basin</b>								
2021RegCBase_TrinCurrent_RORirr	10/7/2014	Modifications by Region C RWPG	pending	Trinity Run-of-River	WRAP	2015	FNI	4/26/2018
2021RegCBase_TrinCurrent_HoustonCo	10/7/2014	Modifications by Region C RWPG	pending	Houston County Lake	WRAP	2015	FNI	5/1/2018
2021RegCBase_Trin2070_HoustonCo	10/7/2014	Modifications by Region C RWPG; Sedimentation for 2070	pending	Houston County Lake	WRAP	2015	FNI	5/1/2018
<b>Neches Basin</b>								
neches_regioni_20180625	10/1/2012	Modified Neches WAM	pending	Neches Run-of-River	WRAP	2015	FNI	6/25/2018
neches_2020_20180627	10/1/2012	Modified Neches WAM; Sedimentation for 2020	pending	Athens Lake/Reservoir	WRAP	2015	FNI	6/28/2018
neches_2030_20180627		Modified Neches WAM; Sedimentation for 2030		Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir				
neches_2040_20180627		Modified Neches WAM; Sedimentation for 2040		Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir				
neches_2050_20180627		Modified Neches WAM; Sedimentation for 2050		Tyler Lake/Reservoir				
neches_2060_20180627		Modified Neches WAM; Sedimentation for 2060		Columbia Lake/Reservoir				
neches_2070_20180627		Modified Neches WAM; Sedimentation for 2070		Kurth Lake/Reservoir				
neches3	8/20/2008	Neches WAM Run 3 (prior version) run for City of Center study	2016 RWP*	Pinkston Lake/Reservoir*	WRAP	2014	FNI	2014
<b>Sabine Basin</b>								
sabine3_ROR	7/6/2015	Sabine WAM Run 3	pending	Sabine Run-of-River	WRAP	2018	FNI	7/9/2018
sabine3_current	7/6/2015	Sabine WAM Run 3; Reservoir conditions updated to most recent survey. **	pending	Cherokee Lake/Reservoir	WRAP	2018	FNI	6/29/2018
sabine3_2070				Sabine WAM Run 3; Sedimentation for 2070				
sabine3_2020_ToledoBendFY	7/6/2015	Sabine WAM Run 3; Reservoir conditions updated to most recent survey. ** Firm yield evaluated for Toledo Bend as described in memorandum.	pending	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	WRAP	2018	FNI	6/29/2018
sabine3_2070_ToledoBendFY								
sabine3	6/17/2004	Sabine WAM Run 3 (prior version) run for City of Center study	2016 RWP*	*	WRAP	2014	FNI	2014

Notes

\*Firm yields for Pinkston Reservoir and Lake Center were determined in a separate study conducted for the City of Center by FNI using previous WAM Run 3 versions. These model runs were approved for use in the 2016 RWP.

\*\*Reservoir firm yields in the Sabine River Basin were interpolated between the year of the most current survey and 2070 to determine supplies for 2020 - 2060.

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 14**

**Groundwater Availability Determination Methodology**

**EAST TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AREA**  
**GROUNDWATER SOURCE AVAILABILITY DETERMINATION METHODOLOGY**

Water Supply Source	County	Basin	Methodology
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Anderson	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Anderson	Trinity	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Cherokee	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Henderson	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Houston	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Nacagdoches	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Panola	Cypress	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Panola	Sabine	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Rusk	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Rusk	Sabine	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	San Augustine	Sabine	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Shelby	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Shelby	Sabine	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Smith	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Hardin	Neches	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Hardin	Trinity	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Jasper	Neches	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Jasper	Sabine	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Jefferson	Neches	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Newton	Neches	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Newton	Sabine	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Orange	Neches	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Orange	Neches-Trinity	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Orange	Sabine	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Polk	Neches	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled Null), RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Gulf Coast Aquifer	Tyler	Neches	MAG-GAM Run 16-024
Other Aquifer	Anderson	Trinity	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Cherokee	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Hardin	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Henderson	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Henderson	Trinity	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Houston	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Orange	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Orange	Sabine	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Panola	Sabine	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Polk	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Rusk	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Rusk	Sabine	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	San Augustine	Sabine	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Shelby	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Shelby	Sabine	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Smith	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Other Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use
Queen City Aquifer	Anderson	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Queen City Aquifer	Anderson	Trinity	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Queen City Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Queen City Aquifer	Cherokee	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024

Queen City Aquifer	Henderson	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Queen City Aquifer	Houston	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Queen City Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Queen City Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Queen City Aquifer	Rusk	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Queen City Aquifer	Rusk	Sabine	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Queen City Aquifer	Smith	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Queen City Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Sparta Aquifer	Anderson	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Sparta Aquifer	Anderson	Trinity	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Sparta Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Sparta Aquifer	Cherokee	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Sparta Aquifer	Houston	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Sparta Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Sparta Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Sparta Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Sparta Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Sparta Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Sparta Aquifer	San Augustine	Sabine	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Sparta Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	MAG - GAM Run 17-024
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Houston	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Polk	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	San Augustine	Sabine	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Tyler	Neches	GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled Null), RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use

**METHODOLOGIES UTILIZED:**

- MAG - GAM Run 17-024
- MAG - GAM Run 16-024
- GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled)
- GCD Non-Relevant (TWDB Modeled Null)
- RWPG Assigned Max. 8-Year Historical Annual Use

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 15  
Simplified Planning**



**Wednesday, August 15, 2018, 10:00 AM**  
**Nacogdoches Recreation Center**  
**1112 North Street**  
**Nacogdoches, Texas 75961**  
**AGENDA**

1. Call to Order.
2. Invocation & Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Roll Call/Determination of Quorum.
4. Consideration and approval of the minutes of the May 16, 2018 meeting.
5. Report from City of Nacogdoches – Stacy Corley
6. Reports of adjoining regions activity:
  - a. Region C – Vacant
  - b. Region D – Leah Adams
  - c. Region H – Scott Hall
7. Reports from Standing Committees:
  - a. Executive Committee – Kelley Holcomb
  - b. Finance Committee – Mark Dunn
  - c. Bylaws Committee – David Alders
  - d. Technical Committee – Scott Hall
  - e. Nominations Committee – Monty Shank
8. Reports from other state agencies:
  - a. Texas Water Development Board staff – Lann Bookout
  - b. Texas Department of Parks & Wildlife – Terry Stelly
  - c. Texas Department of Agriculture – Manual Martinez
  - d. Texas Soil and Water Conservation Board – Rusty Ray
9. Report from consultant team – Rex Hunt
  - a. Review of Round 5 Planning Schedule
  - b. Review of Simplified Planning Process
10. Educational Presentation: Region C Drought Planning Methodologies – Brian McDonald
11. Public Comments. (limited to 3 minutes)
12. Consideration and approval of the FY 2019 Annual Budget.
13. Consideration and possible approval of a request for the East Texas Regional Water Planning Group Intent to utilize Simplified Planning for the Fifth Cycle of Regional Water Planning for the East Texas Regional Water Planning Area – Rex Hunt.
14. Consideration and approval for the East Texas Regional Water Planning Group Chair to submit the Task 4C Technical Memorandum to the Texas Water Development Board on or before September 10, 2018.
15. Consideration and possible approval of the appointment of new Voting Members – Monty Shank
16. Consideration and possible approval of a change in By-Laws to allow for the designation of an Alternate for Voting Members.
17. General Discussion.
18. Set Next Meeting Date.
19. Adjourn.



**Standing Committees**  
**Wednesday, August 15, 2018, 9:30 AM**  
**AGENDA**

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 Committees are:

**Executive Committee (no meeting)**

**Nominations Committee (9:30 AM)**

1. Discussion on vacancies on the RWPG

**By-Laws Committee (9:30 AM)**

1. Discussion on proposed changes in By-Laws relating to SB 347 85(R)

**Finance Committee (9:30 AM)**

1. Discussion on proposed FY 2019 budget

**Technical Committee (9:30AM)**

1. Review comments received to date from the public, Water User Groups, and Wholesale Water Providers that impact the Technical Memorandum
2. Review the draft Task 4C Technical Memorandum

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 16**

**Water and Groundwater Availability Model Summaries**

**An Attachment 16 is not included in this memorandum;  
See Attachments 13a and 13b for WAM Model Documentation.**

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 17a**

**Public Comments**

Technical Memorandum Notice

**East Texas Regional Water Planning Group**  
**Region I**  
**10:00 AM Wednesday**  
**August 15, 2018**  
**C.L. Simon Recreation Center**  
**1112 North Street, Nacogdoches, Texas 75961**

**NOTICE TO PUBLIC**  
**Notice of Meeting to Consider Approving Submittal of Technical Memorandum**

To All Interested Parties:

The Region I Water Planning Group area includes all or part of the following counties: Anderson, Angelina, Cherokee, Hardin, Henderson (partial), Houston, Jasper, Jefferson, Nacogdoches, Newton, Orange, Panola, Polk (partial), Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith (partial), Trinity (partial) and Tyler.

The Region I Water Planning Group (ETRWPG) will consider action to approve submission of a Technical Memorandum developed during preparation of the Region I 2021 Regional Water Plan, as included in Item 14 of the agenda. The memorandum details regional planning activities to date during development of the 2021 Regional Water Plan, including preliminary analyses of water demand projections, water supply availability and existing supplies, water needs, and the ETRWPG's declaration of intent whether to pursue or forgo simplified planning. The proposed memorandum will be discussed and acted upon during a public meeting of the ETRWPG on August 15, 2018. The proposed Technical Memorandum will be made available on the Region I website ([www.etexwaterplan.org](http://www.etexwaterplan.org)) upon completion prior to the public meeting and as well as following the meeting.

The ETRWPG will accept written and oral comments at the public meeting. Written comments from the public regarding the Technical Memorandum may also be submitted to the ETRWPG until August 30, 2018 for inclusion with the Technical Memorandum when submitted to the Texas Water Development Board. Comments may be submitted to ETRWPG by email to [corleys@ci.nacogdoches.tx.us](mailto:corleys@ci.nacogdoches.tx.us) or by mail as follows:

Stacy Corley  
City of Nacogdoches  
Administrative Contact for Region I  
P. O. Box 635030  
Nacogdoches, Texas 75963

For additional information, please contact:

- Region I c/o Kelley Holcomb, General Manager, ANRA, P. O. Box 387 Lufkin, Texas 75902, telephone 936-633-7543, or email [kholcomb@anra.org](mailto:kholcomb@anra.org)

Persons with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and would like to request auxiliary aids or services are requested to contact Stacy Corley at (936) 559-2528 at least three business days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.



**East Texas Regional Water Planning Area  
Task 4C Technical Memorandum**

---

**Attachment 17b**

**Public Comments**

Documentation of Public Comments Received

**An Attachment 17b is not included in this memorandum;  
No public comments were received.**

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK