

4.2 County Summaries – Comparison of Demand to Supply

4.2.1 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Bell County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-1).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-2).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 22 rural municipal water systems in Bell County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- Demands for Salado reflect the Census Designated Place (CDP) area; however, projected demands of the broader Salado WSC service area are contained in the County-Other category.
- From the year 2000 to 2050, municipal demand increases from 47,389 acft to 81,663 acft.
- Steam-electric demand of 11,200 acft is projected by the year 2010.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, projected manufacturing demand increases from 4,040 acft to 8,700 acft; projected manufacturing demand is about 8 percent of current countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand is small compared to county total demands, comprising only about 4 percent of all demands.

Supplies

- Surface water supply is obtained from water contracts with the Brazos River Authority for supply from Lakes Belton and Stillhouse Hollow, and from run-of-river rights on the Lampasas and Leon Rivers.
- Groundwater supplies are from the Trinity and Edwards (BFZ) aquifers. Use is limited, mostly concentrated in small town and livestock uses, and comprising only two percent of total countywide water supplies.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- Current supplies are in excess of year 2050 M&I demands.
- Manufacturing and steam-electric shows a projected shortage that can be satisfied by reclassifying existing surface water supplies to manufacturing use.
- Projected demands (Bell & Coryell Counties) at Fort Hood reflect expected on-base population during periods of full staffing and mobilization of reserve units. Projected demands for these conditions exceed water supply available from Fort Hood's water rights.
- City of Holland shows a projected shortage after 2010.
- Morgans Point Resort shows an existing shortage.

Bell County

- Salado WSC, serving both the City and a larger service area, is projected to be water short beginning about 2020.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Temple surface water supply is limited by raw water conveyance capacity.
- Salado WSC surface water supply, which serves the City of Salado and County-Other is limited due to no infrastructure. Additionally, a portion of their surface water supply contract with BRA from Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir expires in 2021.
- Kempner WSC (serves County-Other) surface water supply from a contract with Central Texas WSC is limited due to facility capacity.

4.2.2 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Bosque County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-3).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-4).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 18 rural municipal water systems in Bosque County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 3,176 acft to 3,617 acft.
- Steam-electric demand of 5,600 acft is projected by 2010.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, projected manufacturing demand increases from 857 acft to 1,336 acft; manufacturing demand is about 20 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 2,200 acft (34 percent of total demand in 2000). With increasing M&I demand, agricultural demands decrease to 17 percent by 2050.

Supplies

- Surface water supply is obtained from the North Bosque River and other local sources.
- Groundwater sources are the Brazos River Alluvium and Trinity aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- County summary shows immediate M&I shortages due to limited groundwater supply during dry conditions.
- The City of Clifton has sufficient water due to groundwater and recent development of surface water supplies.
- Due to limited groundwater supply, the City of Meridian has a current water shortage by 2010.
- Due to limited groundwater availability, County-Other shows a current and long-term shortage.
- Due to limited groundwater availability, Manufacturing shows a current and long-term shortage.
- Projected steam-electric demand of 5,600 acft cannot be met with current supplies.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through the 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Clifton surface water supply is limited by infrastructure capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.3 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Brazos County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-5).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-6).

Demands

- Water demand projections for five rural municipal water systems in Brazos County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 35,104 acft to 58,765 acft.
- Projected steam-electric demand of 5,000 acft stays constant; manufacturing demand increases slightly over the planning period.
- Irrigation and livestock demand decreases over the planning period from 10,946 acft to 8,887 acft. Irrigation demand decreases from 18 percent of county total demand to 10 percent due to the increasing share of M&I uses.

Supplies

- Surface water is obtained from the Brazos River Authority and local sources.
- Abundant groundwater supplies in Brazos County include the Carrizo-Wilcox, Brazos River Alluvium, Gulf Coast, Sparta, and Queen City aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through the year 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through the year 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Bryan groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of College Station / Texas A&M groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- Texas A&M surface water supply from a BRA contract from Lake Limestone is limited due to no infrastructure.
- Wellborn WSC (serves County-Other) surface water supply from a BRA contract from Lake Limestone is limited due to no infrastructure.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.4 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Burleson County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-7).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-8).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 14 rural municipal water systems in Burleson County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 2,196 acft to 2,518 acft.
- Projected irrigation and livestock demand decreases over the planning period from 7,930 acft/yr to 6,662 acft/yr. Over time, irrigation demand decreases from 64 percent of county total demand to 57 percent.

Supplies

- Surface water is from local sources.
- Abundant groundwater supplies in Burleson County include the Carrizo-Wilcox, Brazos River Alluvium, Sparta and Queen City aquifers.
- Groundwater use from the Alluvium and Carrizo are the majority of county water supplies. Groundwater supplies above current use are available in Burleson County and have been prorated among users to meet projected demands. In most cases, users will need to construct facilities to utilize available groundwater to meet increased demands.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through the 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Caldwell groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Somerville groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.5 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Callahan County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-9).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-10).

Demands

- Water demand projections for four rural municipal water systems in Callahan County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand decreases from 1,700 acft/yr to 1,308 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand decreases over the planning period from 1,535 acft/yr to 1,484 acft/yr.

Supplies

- Surface water supply is from local sources.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Trinity Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- The City of Baird is showing current and long-term shortages.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- Westbound WSC (serves County-Other) surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with the City of Eastland in 2022.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.6 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Comanche County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-11).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-12).

Demands

- Water demand projections for three rural municipal water systems in Comanche County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand decreases from 1,902 acft/yr to 1,755 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand decreases over the planning period from 53,283 acft/yr to 50,750 acft/yr.
- Irrigation demand comprises about 90 percent of total water demand in the county.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lake Proctor and other local sources.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Trinity Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- A current and longer-term water shortage was identified for irrigation use.

Water Supply Constraints

- None.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.7 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Coryell County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-13).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-14).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 13 rural municipal water systems in Coryell County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand increases from 14,505 acft/yr to 26,265 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand decreases slightly over the planning period from 1,749 acft/yr to 1,587 acft/yr.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lakes Belton and Stillhouse Hollow and other local supplies.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Trinity Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- A longer-term water shortage was identified for M&I uses after 2020.
- City of Copperas Cove is projected to have a shortage after 2020.
- City of Gatesville is projected to have a shortage after 2010.
- Fort Hood (Coryell County portion) is experiencing current and long-term shortages.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- Projected demands (Bell & Coryell Counties) at Fort Hood reflect expected on-base population during periods of full staffing and mobilization of reserve units. Projected demands for these conditions exceed water supply available from Fort Hood's water rights.
- City of Gatesville surface water supply is limited due to expiring BRA contract from Lake Belton in 2021.
- Kempner WSC (serves County-Other) surface water supply from a contract with Central Texas WSC is limited due to facility capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.8 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Eastland County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-15).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-16).

Demands

- Water demand projections for five rural municipal water systems in Eastland County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand decreases from 3,739 acft/yr to 2,805 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand stays fairly constant over the planning period at about 13,750 acft/yr, comprising about 92 percent of total water demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lakes Leon and Cisco and other local sources. Surface water supply amounts are declining due to sedimentation of reservoirs and resulting loss of reservoir volume and firm yield.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Trinity Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- However within the county total, the City of Cisco has a current and long-term shortage.
- There is a current and long-term irrigation shortage.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Eastland surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with Eastland County WSD in 2032.
- City of Ranger surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with Eastland County WSD in 2032.
- Mining water supply is limited due to expiring contract with BRA from Possum Kingdom Reservoir in 2016.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.9 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Erath County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-17).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-18).

Demands

- Water demand projections for four rural municipal water systems in Erath County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand increases from 5,312 acft/yr to 6,805 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand stays fairly constant over the planning period at about 16,500 acft/yr and comprises about 43 percent of total water demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lake Proctor and other local sources.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Trinity Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- County summary shows immediate shortages in municipal supply.
- City of Stephenville shows a current and continuing water supply shortage.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Stephenville surface water supply is limited due to no infrastructure from Lake Proctor.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.10 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Falls County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-19).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-20).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 13 rural municipal water systems in Falls County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 2,860 acft to 3,164 acft.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand decreases over the planning period from 7,586 acft/yr to 6,647 acft/yr with irrigation demand decreasing from 59 percent of county total demand to 53 percent.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from local sources and the Brazos River Authority.
- Abundant groundwater supplies include the Brazos River Alluvium, Carrizo-Wilcox, and the Trinity aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Marlin surface water supply from Brushy Creek Reservoir is limited due to no infrastructure.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.11 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Fisher County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-21).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-22).

Demands

- Water demand projections for four rural municipal water systems in Fisher County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases from 852 acft to 648 acft.
- Irrigation and livestock demand is projected to decrease slightly over the planning period from 3,242 acft/yr to 2,888 acft/yr; irrigation demand is about 54 percent of county total demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from local sources, the Colorado River MWD, and the Cities of Sweetwater and Stamford.
- Groundwater supplies are obtained from the Seymour and Dockum aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Roby surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with City of Sweetwater in 2023.
- Bitter Creek WSC (serves County-Other) surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with City of Sweetwater in 2013.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.12 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Grimes County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-23).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-24).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 10 rural municipal water systems in Grimes County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 2,778 acft to 3,441 acft.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand stays constant over the planning period at 2,058 acft/yr.

Supplies

- Surface water use for use in steam-electric cooling is provided from Gibbons Creek Reservoir and Lake Limestone.
- Abundant groundwater supplies that currently meet other water uses in Grimes County are available from the Gulf Coast, Carrizo-Wilcox, Sparta, Brazos River Alluvium, and Queen City aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Anderson groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Navasota groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.

Table 4-23. Grimes County Population, Water Supply, and Water Demand Projections

Population Projection		Year					
		2000	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050
		21,545	24,534	27,302	29,814	29,659	33,190
Supply and Demand by Type of Use		Year					
		2000 (acft)	2010 (acft)	2020 (acft)	2030 (acft)	2040 (acft)	2050 (acft)
Municipal	Municipal Demand	2,778	2,923	3,067	3,237	3,128	3,441
	Municipal Existing Supply						
	Groundwater	19,167	19,167	19,167	19,167	19,167	19,167
	Surface water	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total Existing Municipal Supply	19,167	19,167	19,167	19,167	19,167	19,167
	Municipal Balance	16,389	16,244	16,100	15,930	16,039	15,726
Industrial	Manufacturing Demand	280	314	351	391	435	483
	Manufacturing Existing Supply						
	Groundwater	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340
	Surface water	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total Manufacturing Supply	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340
	Manufacturing Balance	1,060	1,026	989	949	905	857
	Steam-Electric Demand	10,000	16,721	16,721	16,721	16,721	16,721
	Steam-Electric Existing Supply						
	Groundwater	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Surface water	10,000	16,721	16,721	16,721	16,721	16,721
	Total Steam-Electric Supply	10,000	16,721	16,721	16,721	16,721	16,721
	Steam-Electric Balance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining Demand	273	255	236	219	213	212	
Mining Existing Supply							
Groundwater	276	276	276	276	276	276	
Surface water	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Mining Supply	276	276	276	276	276	276	
Mining Balance	3	21	40	57	63	64	
Agriculture	Irrigation Demand	125	125	125	125	125	125
	Irrigation Existing Supply						
	Groundwater	689	689	689	689	689	689
	Surface water	1,471	1,471	1,471	1,471	1,471	1,471
	Total Irrigation Supply	2,160	2,160	2,160	2,160	2,160	2,160
	Irrigation Balance	2,035	2,035	2,035	2,035	2,035	2,035
	Livestock Demand	1,933	1,933	1,933	1,933	1,933	1,933
	Livestock Existing Supply						
	Groundwater	3,606	3,606	3,606	3,606	3,606	3,606
	Surface water	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Livestock Supply	3,606	3,606	3,606	3,606	3,606	3,606	
Livestock Balance	1,673	1,673	1,673	1,673	1,673	1,673	
Total	Municipal & Industrial Demand	13,331	20,213	20,375	20,568	20,497	20,857
	Existing Municipal & Industrial Supply						
	Groundwater	20,783	20,783	20,783	20,783	20,783	20,783
	Surface water	10,000	16,721	16,721	16,721	16,721	16,721
	Total Municipal & Industrial Supply	30,783	37,504	37,504	37,504	37,504	37,504
	Municipal & Industrial Balance	17,452	17,291	17,129	16,936	17,007	16,647
	Agriculture Demand	2,058	2,058	2,058	2,058	2,058	2,058
	Existing Agricultural Supply						
	Groundwater	4,295	4,295	4,295	4,295	4,295	4,295
	Surface water	1,471	1,471	1,471	1,471	1,471	1,471
	Total Agriculture Supply	5,766	5,766	5,766	5,766	5,766	5,766
	Agriculture Balance	3,708	3,708	3,708	3,708	3,708	3,708
	Total Demand	15,389	22,271	22,433	22,626	22,555	22,915
	Total Supply						
	Groundwater	25,078	25,078	25,078	25,078	25,078	25,078
	Surface water	11,471	18,192	18,192	18,192	18,192	18,192
Total Supply	36,549	43,270	43,270	43,270	43,270	43,270	
Total Balance	21,160	20,999	20,837	20,644	20,715	20,355	

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.13 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Hamilton County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-25).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-26).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 3 rural municipal water systems in Hamilton County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand decreases from 1,301 acft/yr to 819 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand stays fairly constant over the planning period at about 3,400 acft/yr and comprises about 48 percent of total water demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lake Proctor and other local sources.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Trinity Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- None.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.14 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Haskell County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-27).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-28).

Demands

- Water demand projections for eight rural municipal water systems in Haskell County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand increases slightly from 996 acft/yr to 1,008 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand decreases over the planning period from 22,445 acft/yr to 19,412 acft/yr.
- Steam-electric demand increases sharply from 700 acft/yr in 2000 to 3,000 acft/yr in 2020.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from local sources and Lakes Millers Creek and Stamford.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Seymour Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- However, within the total, the City of Haskell is shown to experience a water shortage unless additional contract supplies can be obtained (see below).
- Additionally, a shortage is anticipated in the steam-electric sector.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Haskell surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with North Central Texas MWD in 2010.
- City of Rule surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with North Central Texas MWD in 2019.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.15 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Hill County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-29).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-30).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 28 rural municipal water systems in Hill County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand increases slightly from 4,170 acft/yr to 4,228 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand stays fairly constant over the planning period at about 1,630 acft/yr.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from the Lakes Aquilla and Whitney and local supplies. Supply in Lake Aquilla is declining due to sedimentation.
- Groundwater supplies are obtained from the Trinity and Woodbine aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- However, within the total, the manufacturing sector is showing a continuing, small deficit. Sufficient water from municipal supply can likely be transferred as necessary to meet these manufacturing needs.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Itasca groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Whitney groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Whitney surface water supply from a BRA contract from Lake Whitney is limited due to no infrastructure.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.16 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Hood County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-31).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-32).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 38 rural municipal water systems in Hood County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand increases from 4,947 acft/yr to 10,981 acft/yr.
- Projected steam-electric demand increases from 4,500 acft/yr to 6,700 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand decreases slightly over the planning period from 7,319 acft/yr to 6,707 acft/yr.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lakes Granbury and Possum Kingdom and other local sources.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Trinity.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- However, the City of Granbury is showing shortages due to constraints (see below).
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through the year 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Granbury groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Granbury surface water supply from BRA contracts from Lake Granbury and Possum Kingdom Reservoir is limited by infrastructure capacity.
- Acton MUD (serves County-Other) surface water supply from BRA contracts from Lake Granbury and Possum Kingdom Reservoir is limited by infrastructure capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.17 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Johnson County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-33).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-34).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 25 rural municipal water systems in Johnson County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand increases from 18,879 acft/yr to 32,288 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand is constant over the planning period at 2,582 acft/yr.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are provided by Lakes Granbury, Whitney, Aquilla, and Pat Cleburne, and other local sources.
- Minor groundwater supplies are obtained from the Trinity and Woodbine aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- M&I supply shortages are projected prior after 2030.
- City of Keene has a current and long-term shortage.
- City of Venus has a current and long-term shortage.
- County-Other municipal needs are shown to have a current and long-term shortage.
- Manufacturing needs are shown to have a current and long-term shortage.
- Not shown in Table 4-33 is a 2,117 acft/yr Steam-Electric Demand from the Tenaska power plant in Cleburne. This demand is met from 448 of existing municipal supply, and 1,669 acft/yr of reuse water.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Alvarado surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with Johnson County Rural WSC in 2001.
- City of Cleburne surface water supply from BRA contract from Lake Whitney is limited due to no infrastructure.
- City of Joshua (Johnson County FWSD) surface water supply from BRA contract from Lake Granbury is limited by infrastructure capacity.
- Johnson County Rural WSC (serves County-Other) surface water supply from BRA contract from Lake Granbury is limited by infrastructure capacity.

4.2.18 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Jones County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-35).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-36).

Demands

- Water demand projections for six rural municipal water systems in Jones County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, projected municipal demand increases from 3,289 acft/yr to 3,692 acft/yr.
- Irrigation and livestock projected demand decreases over the planning period from 4,682 acft/yr to 4,145 acft/yr.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Fort Phantom Hill Reservoir and through water purchase contracts with West Central Texas Municipal Water District for water from Hubbard Creek Reservoir and small reservoirs. Surface water supply is declining due to sedimentation of reservoirs and resulting loss of reservoir volume and firm yield.
- Groundwater supply is obtained from the Seymour aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- M&I water shortages at the county level are projected after 2010.
- City of Stamford supply is first allocated to meet wholesale contract obligations. Remaining supply is shown in Table 4-36. Supply decreases due to sedimentation of Lake Stamford.
- City of Hamlin is showing shortages due to constraints (see below).
- County-Other is showing current and long-term shortages.
- Manufacturing is showing current and long-term shortages.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Hamlin surface water supply is limited by conveyance capacity.

4.2.19 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Kent County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-37).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-38).

Demands

- Water demand projections for six rural municipal water systems in Kent County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases from 207 acft to 116 acft.
- Mining use is projected to decline substantially over time.
- Irrigation and livestock demand is projected to decline slightly from 965 acft to 880 acft in 2050.

Supplies

- Surface water supply is obtained from local sources and used for livestock watering.
- Primary groundwater sources are the Seymour and Dockum.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Jayton groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.20 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Knox County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-39).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-40).

Demands

- Water demand projections for six rural municipal water systems in Knox County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases slightly from 908 acft to 897 acft.
- No manufacturing or steam-electric demand is forecast for the county, and a small mining use is projected to decline slightly over time.
- Irrigation demand is projected to decline from 31,529 acft in 2000 to 27,843 acft in 2050, but still comprising about 95 percent of total county use.

Supplies

- Small surface water supplies are obtained from Millers Creek Reservoir and local sources.
- Primary groundwater sources are the Seymour and Blaine aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- Due to constraints, M&I shows a shortage beginning after 2010 (see below).
- Agriculture shows a current and long-term shortage.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Benjamin groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Knox City surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with North Central Texas MWD in 2010.
- City of Munday surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with North Central Texas MWD in 2010.
- City of Goree (in County-Other) surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with North Central Texas MWD in 2010.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.21 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Lamparas County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-41).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-42).

Demands

- Water demand projections for three rural municipal water systems in Lamparas County were calculated to support county-other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 3,225 acft to 5,586 acft.
- Manufacturing use is forecast to increase slightly and mining use remain about the same.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 1,160 acft, ranging from about 16 to 25 percent of total demand over time.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lake Stillhouse Hollow, Sulphur Creek, and other local.
- Primary groundwater sources are the Marble Falls, Trinity, and Ellenburger-San Saba aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Lamparas surface water supply from a contract with Kempner WSC is limited due to facility capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.22 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Lee County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-43).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-44).

Demands

- Water demand projections for six rural municipal water systems in Lee County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 3,226 acft to 4,150 acft.
- Mining water use is projected to increase significantly by the year 2010 as new lignite mining blocks are opened in the county.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases slightly.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 1,975 acft.

Supplies

- Surface water is obtained from local sources, and its current use is very limited.
- Groundwater sources are the Carrizo-Wilcox, Sparta, and Queen City aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Giddings groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Lexington groundwater supply is limited by well capacity

Contracts to Supply San Antonio Water System

- The San Antonio Water System (SAWS), located in the South Central Texas Region (L), has contracted to purchase Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer groundwater produced from land owned or leased by Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa) in Milam, Lee, and Bastrop Counties. The Region L water plan calls for 55,000 acft/yr to be purchased through this contract. Water to be sold by Alcoa originates primarily from their on-going lignite mining activities. Water not originating from mining activities will be obtained by pumping groundwater on land leased from San Antonio City Public Service. Table 4-43A reports water quantities to be delivered from Lee County to SAWS consistent with the water plan being prepared by the South Central Texas Region RWPG.

4.2.23 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Limestone County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-45).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-46).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 16 rural municipal water systems in Limestone County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand slightly increases from 3,482 acft to 3,837 acft.
- Steam-electric demand of 20,000 acft is projected by 2010.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases significantly from 453 acft to 1,061 acft., but still only comprises about 3 to 4 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at 1,427 acft, or 5 to 6 percent of total countywide demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lakes Limestone and Mexia and other local sources.
- Groundwater sources are Carrizo-Wilcox, Trinity, and Woodbine aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- The City of Groesbeck is experiencing current and long-term shortages.
- A small water shortage is projected in the manufacturing sector that might be addressed through the provision of municipal or steam-electric supplies.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Thorton groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- Bistone WSD (serve County-Other) surface water supply is limited due to infrastructure capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.24 Comparison of Demand to Supply – McLennan County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-47).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-48).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 46 rural municipal water systems in McLennan County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 45,387 acft to 59,925 acft.
- Steam-electric demand of 35,000 acft is projected to be needed by 2050.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases from 3,106 acft to 5,652 acft, comprising about 5 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at 4,935 acft, or about 5 to 7 percent of total countywide demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lake Waco, Tradinghouse Creek Reservoir, Lake Creek Reservoir, Brazos River Authority, and other local sources
- Groundwater sources are the Brazos River Alluvium, Trinity, and Woodbine aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- Groundwater shortages are also identified in the mining sector.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Robinson surface water supply is limited due to infrastructure capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.25 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Milam County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-49).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-50).

Demands

- Water demand projections for nine rural municipal water systems in Milam County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 5,032 acft to 5,460 acft.
- Current steam-electric demand of 8,860 acft is projected to increase to 16,000 acft by 2050.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases from 6,820 acft to 9,800 acft; manufacturing demand is about 14 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 3,000 acft.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from the Lakes ALCOA and Granger and other local sources.
- Groundwater sources are the Carrizo-Wilcox and Trinity aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient municipal supplies through 2050.
- Steam-Electric shows a shortage beginning in 2020; this shortage could be met with surplus manufacturing groundwater supplies.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Rockdale groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Thorndale surface water supply from Brushy Creek is limited due to no infrastructure.
- ALCOA steam-electric surface water supply is limited due to expiring BRA contract from Lake Granger in 2019.

Contracts to Supply San Antonio Water System

- The San Antonio Water System (SAWS), located in the South Central Texas Region (L), has contracted to purchase Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer groundwater produced from land owned or leased by Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa) in Milam, Lee, and Bastrop Counties. The Region L water plan calls for 55,000 acft/yr to be purchased through this contract. Water to be sold by Alcoa originates primarily from their on-going lignite mining activities. Water not originating from mining activities will be obtained by pumping groundwater on land leased from San Antonio City Public Service. Table 4-49A reports water quantities to be delivered from Milam County to SAWS consistent with the water plan being prepared by the South Central Texas Region RWPG.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.26 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Nolan County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-51).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-52).

Demands

- Water demand projections for four rural municipal water systems in Nolan County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases from 4,909 acft to 4,377 acft.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases from 558 acft to 885 acft, and comprises about 9 percent of current countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 2,600 acft or 32 percent of total countywide demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Oak Creek Reservoir, Lakes Sweetwater and Trammel, and other local sources.
- Groundwater sources are the Dockum and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- Within that total, there is a current and long term manufacturing shortage.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- Bitter Creek WSC, City of Trent, and Fort Chadborne Ranch (all serve County-Other) surface water supplies are limited due to expiring contracts with City of Sweetwater in 2013, 2023, and 2013 respectively.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.27 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Palo Pinto County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-53).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-54).

Demands

- Water demand projections for nine rural municipal water systems in Palo Pinto County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases slightly from 4,348 acft to 4,714 acft.
- Steam-electric demand of 3,000 acft is projected by 2010.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases slightly from 65 acft to 125 acft, but is only about 0.9 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 1,500 acft or 17 percent of total countywide.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Possum Kingdom reservoir, Lake Palo Pinto, and other local sources.
- Groundwater source is the Trinity Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- Due to constraints the City of Palo Pinto is showing a shortage in 2010 (see below).
- There are sufficient agricultural supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Graford surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with the City of Mineral Wells in 2040.
- City of Mineral Wells surface water supply is limited by raw water capacity.
- City of Palo Pinto surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with the City of Mineral Wells in 2007.
- County-Other surface water supply is limited due to expiring contracts with the City of Mineral Wells.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.28 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Robertson County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-55).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-56).

Demands

- Water demand projections for nine rural municipal water systems in Robertson County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 2,936 acft to 3,598 acft.
- Current steam-electric water demand of 15,000 acft is projected to significantly increase to 40,000 acft by the year 2050.
- Small manufacturing demands are expected to increase from 42 acft in 2000 to 98 acft in 2050, but comprise only about 0.2 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand are forecast to decline slightly from 22,449 acft (55 percent of county use) in the year 2000 to 20,083 (31 percent of county use) by 2050.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lake Limestone and Twin Oaks Reservoir.
- Groundwater sources are the Carrizo-Wilcox, Brazos River Alluvium, Sparta, and Queen City aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- Due to constraints, the City of Hearne is showing shortages prior to 2030 (see below).
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Franklin groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Hearne groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.29 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Shackelford County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-57).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-58).

Demands

- Water demand projections for five rural municipal water systems in Shackelford County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases from 751 acft to 493 acft.
- Mining demand is expected to decline slightly from 433 acft in 2000 to 390 acft by 2050.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at around 975 acft or 45 percent of total demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from local sources and the City of Abilene.
- No major or minor aquifer groundwater use is reported in the county.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050 with the exception of noticeable shortages projected for the mining sector.
- There are current and long-term shortages in agriculture.

Water Supply Constraints

- None.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.30 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Somervell County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-59).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-60).

Demands

- Water demand projections for one rural municipal water system in Somervell County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 1,029 acft to 2,487 acft.
- Current steam-electric demand of 18,000 acft for the nuclear plant is projected to increase slightly to 23,200 acft by 2010.
- No manufacturing water demand is predicted, and mining use is anticipated to decrease slightly.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 465 acft or 2 percent of total countywide demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Squaw Creek Reservoir, Brazos River Authority, and other local sources.
- Minor groundwater supplies are obtained from the Trinity Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- The county summary shows near-term M&I shortages in drought conditions due to limited groundwater supply.
- The City of Glen Rose is indicated to be currently water short during dry years due to limited groundwater supply and will need an additional supplies in the future.
- County-Other municipal, mostly around Glen Rose, also show significant shortages due to dependence on limited groundwater.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through the 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- None.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.31 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Stephens County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-61).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-62).

Demands

- Water demand projections for four rural municipal water system in Stephens County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases from 1,983 acft to 1,840 acft.
- A small amount of manufacturing water use and no steam-electric demand is forecast. Mining use is predicted to decrease over time.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 1,250 acft or around 34 percent of total countywide demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supply is obtained from Hubbard Creek Reservoir and local sources.
- Limited use from small unclassified groundwater resources.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are current and long-term shortages in agriculture.

Water Supply Constraints

- None.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.32 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Stonewall County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-63).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-64).

Demands

- Water demand projections for one rural municipal water system in Stonewall County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For the year 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases from 371 acft to 271 acft.
- No manufacturing or steam-electric demand is forecast, and mining uses are predicted to drop from 219 acft to 17 acft over the 50-year planning period.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at around 1,100 acft over the planning period or about 65 percent of total demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supply is obtained from local sources.
- Groundwater supply is primarily from the Seymour Aquifer.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are current and long-term shortages in agriculture.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Aspermont groundwater supply is limited by well capacity.
- City of Aspermont surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with North Central Texas MWD in 2019.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.33 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Taylor County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-65).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-66).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 13 rural municipal water systems in Taylor County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases from 30,682 acft to 42,399 acft.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases from 1,775 acft to 2,575 acft and comprises about 5 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Steam-electric demand of 300 acft/year is projected stay constant while mining uses are anticipated to decrease slightly.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 4,100 acft/year or about 8 to 11 percent of total demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from the Lakes Hubbard Creek, Abilene, Kirby, and local sources.
- Minor groundwater supplies are obtained from the Trinity and Edwards-Trinity (Plateau) aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- The City of Abilene shows a shortage prior to 2020 due to constraints (see below).
- The communities of Merkel and Tye are water short due to limited surface water availability.
- County summary shows near- and longer-term shortages in manufacturing, mining, and irrigation. Manufacturing shortages could potentially be met with other existing supplies available in the county. .

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Abilene surface water supply from Colorado River MWD is limited due to no infrastructure from Lake O.H. Ivie.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.34 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Throckmorton County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-67).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-68).

Demands

- Water demand projections for three rural municipal water system in Throckmorton County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases from 291 acft to 210 acft.
- No steam-electric or manufacturing demand is predicted, and mining uses should remain around 34 acft per year.
- No irrigation demand is forecast. Livestock demand stays fairly constant at 989 acft or about 75 percent of total demand.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lake Throckmorton and other local sources.
- Limited use from small unclassified groundwater resources.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- The City of Throckmorton appears to be in a new drought of record; a new firm yield for Lake Throckmorton needs to be evaluated after the current drought.
- County-Other municipal shows immediate shortages due to dependence on limited groundwater.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through the year 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- None.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.35 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Washington County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-69).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-70).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 12 rural municipal water systems in Washington County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases slightly from 4,459 acft to 4,152 acft.
- No steam-electric demand is forecast, and small mining uses should decrease slightly.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases from 495 acft to 663 acft and comprises about 10 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at 1,709 acft or about 25 percent of total countywide use.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from Lake Somerville and other local sources.
- Groundwater sources are the Gulf Coast and Brazos River Alluvium aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient M&I water supplies through 2050.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- None.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.36 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Williamson County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-71).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-72).

Demands

- Water demand projections for 23 rural municipal water systems in Williamson County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand increases dramatically from 39,227 acft to 116,896 acft.
- No steam-electric demand is anticipated, but mining demand is expected to increase from 1,872 to 2,068 acft.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases from 368 acft to 481 acft, comprising about 0.4 percent of countywide M&I use. *[Note: Projected manufacturing demand is reported from the 1997 Consensus State Water Plan data and appears relatively low for the level of economic activity in the county. Previously, the Trans-Texas Water Plan had projected 23,700 acft/yr of manufacturing demand in the county by 2050. This additional manufacturing water demand will be planned for accordingly.]*
- Irrigation and livestock demand stays fairly constant at about 170 acft over the planning period.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from the Lake Georgetown, Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir, and Lake Travis.
- Groundwater sources are the Edwards (BFZ) and Trinity aquifers.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- County summary shows immediate shortages in mining, and by 2030, in countywide municipal uses.
- Due to constraints (see below) Brushy Creek MUD, City of Georgetown, City of Leander, City of Round Rock, City of Taylor, and County Other are showing projected shortages.
- City of Florence is showing a shortage prior to 2010.
- City of Granger is showing a shortage prior to 2010.
- City of Hutto is showing a shortage prior to 2010.
- City of Thrall is showing a shortage prior to 2010.
- County-Other shows a current and long-term shortage.
- There are sufficient agricultural water supplies through 2050.

Water Supply Constraints

- Brushy Creek MUD surface water supply from a BRA contract from Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir is limited due to no infrastructure.
- Brushy Creek MUD surface water supply is limited due to expiring contract with City of Round Rock in 2006.
- City of Georgetown surface water supply from Lake Georgetown is limited due to infrastructure capacity.
- City of Leander surface water supply from Stillhouse Hollow is limited due to no infrastructure.
- City of Round Rock surface water supply from Lake Georgetown is limited due to infrastructure capacity.
- City of Taylor surface water supply from Lake Granger is limited due to infrastructure capacity.
- Jonah WSD (serves County-Other) surface water supply from Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir is limited due to infrastructure capacity.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

4.2.37 Comparison of Demand to Supply – Young County

- Water demand and potential supply summary for all six use categories (Table 4-73).
- Demand and supply summary for municipal use reflects supply constraints such as expiring contracts and infrastructure limitations (Table 4-74).

Demands

- Water demand projections for four rural municipal water systems in Young County were calculated to support County-Other municipal projections.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, municipal demand decreases from 2,828 acft to 2,414 acft.
- Steam-electric demand of 3,000 to 3,500 acft is projected to be needed in the near-term, comprising almost half of countywide water use.
- For 2000 to 2050 period, manufacturing demand increases from 158 acft to 299 acft, but comprises only about 4 percent of countywide M&I use.
- Irrigation and livestock demand is predicted to decline slightly from 1,335 acft to 1,257 acft by 2050.

Supplies

- Surface water supplies are obtained from the Lakes Graham and Eddleman, Whiskey Creek Reservoir, and other local sources.
- Limited use from small unclassified groundwater resources.

Comparison of Demand to Supply

- There are sufficient municipal water supplies through 2050.
- There are current and long-term manufacturing and steam-electric shortages.
- There are current and long-term agricultural shortages.

Water Supply Constraints

- City of Graham surface water supply from a BRA contract from Possum Kingdom Reservoir is limited due to no infrastructure.

(This page intentionally left blank.)