

# Region K Population and Municipal Demand Projection Revision Memo

To Texas Water Development Board Staff Page 1

---

CC John Burke, Lauri Gillam, File

---

Subject **Requested Population and Municipal Demand Projection Revisions**

---

From Jaime Burke

---

Date January 10, 2018

---

The Region K Regional Water Planning Group and the Region K Population and Water Demand Committee have spent the last year reviewing the draft municipal projections from the TWDB and coordinating with the municipal WUGs in the region to determine appropriate revisions for the TWDB staff to consider. At the January 10, 2018 Region K meeting, the Region K RWPG approved to request the following revisions to the draft municipal projections, for consideration by the TWDB staff.

**Municipal Population and Demand Projection Requested Revisions:**

Many of the following requested revisions involve changing the base GPCD for a WUG from the city-boundary GPCD to the utility-boundary GPCD. The documentation to support these revisions includes the following:

On June 30<sup>th</sup>, TWDB staff sent an email containing historical population and GPCD estimates for Utility WUGs. The email explained that “The base GPCDs used to calculate draft water demand projections were carried over from the 2017 State Water Plan, which were based on city boundaries. The historical GPCDs provided in the attached table were developed using utility population and water use data from the WUS and estimated based on utility service area boundaries. Therefore, you will see some differences between the base GPCDs in the draft projections and historical GPCD estimates in many WUGs.” The email went on to state that “This information can be potentially used as supporting documentation/data to justify changes to the draft population or the base GPCDs in the draft projections.”

1. **Bastrop County** – No population revisions; requesting revision to base GPCD for City of Bastrop.
  - a. **Bastrop** – Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	191	Demand (AF)	2,244	2,978	3,951	5,288	7,111	9,536
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>2,046</b>	<b>2,709</b>	<b>3,590</b>	<b>4,803</b>	<b>6,458</b>	<b>8,660</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-16	Demand (AF)	-198	-269	-361	-485	-653	-876

2. **Blanco County** – No population revisions; requesting revision to base GPCD for City of Blanco.

- a. **Blanco** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	161	Demand (AF)	365	423	456	472	485	493
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>425</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-20	Demand (AF)	-49	-58	-63	-65	-67	-68

3. **Burnet County** – Requesting revision to population for County-Other, Granite Shoals, and Meadowlakes MUD; requesting revision to base GPCD for Burnet, Cottonwood Shores, and Horseshoe Bay; requesting WUG name change for Chisholm Trail SUD.

- a. **Burnet** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	231	Demand (AF)	1,844	2,197	2,497	2,790	3,054	3,284
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,661</b>	<b>1,976</b>	<b>2,244</b>	<b>2,506</b>	<b>2,742</b>	<b>2,949</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-22	Demand (AF)	-183	-221	-253	-284	-312	-335

- b. **Chisholm Trail SUD** – Chisholm Trail SUD requested WUG name be changed to Georgetown. Request should be consistent with Region G.

- c. **Cottonwood Shores** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	154	Demand (AF)	227	268	304	339	371	398
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>433</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	12	Demand (AF)	18	23	26	29	31	35

- d. **County-Other, Burnet** – Increase County-Other population to balance out other population changes so no change to Burnet County total population. Revised demands reflected – no change to base GPCD.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	20,892	22,826	22,151	24,000	26,259	28,955
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>22,242</b>	<b>25,317</b>	<b>25,666</b>	<b>28,405</b>	<b>30,920</b>	<b>33,087</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	1,350	2,491	3,515	4,405	4,661	4,132

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	146	Demand (AF)	3,207	3,424	3,272	3,520	3,842	4,234
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
GPCD	146	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>3,414</b>	<b>3,798</b>	<b>3,792</b>	<b>4,167</b>	<b>4,524</b>	<b>4,838</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	207	374	520	647	682	604

- e. **Granite Shoals** - Request to decrease population due to lower anticipated growth than the numbers show. Homes are on individual septic, and do not expect fast growth. Moved population balance to County-Other. Revised demands reflected – no change to base GPCD.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	6,751	8,168	9,363	10,506	11,512	12,383
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>5,401</b>	<b>6,211</b>	<b>6,832</b>	<b>7,515</b>	<b>8,643</b>	<b>10,371</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	-1,350	-1,957	-2,531	-2,991	-2,869	-2,012

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	103	Demand (AF)	722	850	960	1,069	1,169	1,256
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
GPCD	103	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>701</b>	<b>765</b>	<b>877</b>	<b>1,052</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	-144	-204	-259	-304	-292	-204

- f. **Horseshoe Bay** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade. (Similar request for Horseshoe Bay under Llano County)

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	569	Demand (AF)	747	1,048	1,302	1,545	1,759	1,945
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>767</b>	<b>952</b>	<b>1,128</b>	<b>1,285</b>	<b>1,421</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-149	Demand (AF)	-199	-281	-350	-417	-474	-524

- g. **Meadowlakes MUD** - Request decrease to population in 2030-2070, based on expected build-out conditions. Mike Williams, Public Works Director, said they are currently at 90% buildout, and will reach 100% buildout early in the 2020 decade. Moved balance to County-Other. Revised demands reflected – no change to base GPCD.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	2,540	3,074	3,524	3,954	4,332	4,660
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>2,540</b>	<b>2,540</b>	<b>2,540</b>	<b>2,540</b>	<b>2,540</b>	<b>2,540</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	0	-534	-984	-1,414	-1,792	-2,120

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	308	Demand (AF)	852	1,020	1,163	1,301	1,425	1,532
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>834</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	0	-178	-324	-465	-589	-698

4. **Colorado County** – No population revisions; requesting revision to base GPCD for City of Weimar.

- a. **Weimar** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	229	Demand (AF)	532	545	554	574	593	613
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>569</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-15	Demand (AF)	-36	-38	-39	-41	-42	-44

5. **Fayette County** – Requesting small revision to 2020 population for County-Other and Fayette County WCID Monument Hill; requesting revision to base GPCD for County-Other, Fayette County WCID Monument Hill, Fayette WSC, and La Grange.

a. **County-Other, Fayette** – Requesting decrease to County-Other 2020 population to balance out population increase to Fayette County WCID Monument Hill so no change to Fayette County total population. Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	9,589	10,943	11,825	12,511	13,015	13,353
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<b>Population</b>	<b>9,532</b>	10,943	11,825	12,511	13,015	13,353
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	-57	0	0	0	0	0

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	112	Demand (AF)	1,095	1,198	1,259	1,313	1,362	1,397
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,238</b>	<b>1,370</b>	<b>1,444</b>	<b>1,509</b>	<b>1,566</b>	<b>1,606</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	14	Demand (AF)	143	172	185	196	204	209

b. **Fayette County WCID Monument Hill** – Request slight increase to 2020 population based on TCEQ WDD listed current population of 744. Draft projections/historical data does not match submitted water use reports. Request increasing GPCD and demand to better represent 2011 water use. Water use reports have been included as supporting documentation.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	703	803	870	926	970	1,003
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<b>Population</b>	<b>760</b>	803	870	926	970	1,003
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	57	0	0	0	0	0

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	144	Demand (AF)	106	118	126	133	139	143
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>225</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	82	Demand (AF)	74	67	73	77	80	82

- c. **Fayette WSC** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	119	Demand (AF)	636	705	750	791	826	854
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>803</b>	<b>857</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>945</b>	<b>978</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	15	Demand (AF)	86	98	107	114	119	124

- d. **La Grange** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	154	Demand (AF)	883	979	1,041	1,097	1,147	1,187
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>1,063</b>	<b>1,132</b>	<b>1,194</b>	<b>1,248</b>	<b>1,292</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	12	Demand (AF)	74	84	91	97	101	105

6. **Gillespie County** – no revisions requested

7. **Hays County** – Requesting revision to population for Austin, County-Other, Dripping Springs WSC, and West Travis County Public Utility Agency; requesting revision to base GPCD for Austin and West Travis County Public Utility Agency

- a. **Austin** – Request increases to Austin population projections based on their submitted City Demographer’s projections. A portion of those increases is requested for inclusion in the Hays County portion of Austin.

Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated based on the increased population and the revised base GPCD incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

Austin has submitted a formal revision request to the RWPG. It has been included in this request as supporting documentation. See Austin under Travis County and Williamson County for similar requests.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	74	796	1,560	3,957	9,535	17,255
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>1,074</b>	<b>4,796</b>	<b>7,560</b>	<b>11,957</b>	<b>17,535</b>	<b>25,255</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	1,000	4,000	6,000	8,000	8,000	8,000

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	157	Demand (AF)	13	133	260	660	1,591	2,880
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>827</b>	<b>1,304</b>	<b>2,063</b>	<b>3,025</b>	<b>4,357</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	5	Demand (AF)	175	694	1,044	1,403	1,434	1,477

- b. **County-Other, Hays** – Request decrease to population in County-Other to balance out population revisions elsewhere in the county, so there is no change to Hays County total population. Demand decreases reflective of decreased population – no base GPCD change.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	17,821	22,702	28,847	35,419	39,663	43,122
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>10,986</b>	<b>8,661</b>	<b>13,216</b>	<b>16,522</b>	<b>19,284</b>	<b>26,804</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	-6,835	-14,041	-15,631	-18,897	-20,379	-16,318

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	118	Demand (AF)	2,192	2,720	3,390	4,134	4,617	5,016
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,351</b>	<b>1,038</b>	<b>1,553</b>	<b>1,929</b>	<b>2,245</b>	<b>3,118</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	-841	-1,682	-1,837	-2,205	-2,372	-1,898

- c. **Dripping Springs WSC** – Request increase to population based on the following input from the WSC: Currently in our CCN (as of 30 Apr 2017), DSWSC has 1810 meters totaling 2400 LUE’s, which we consider a population equal to 7,200. At this rate plus taking in the pending projects and contracted projects, population to increase from 11,000 in 2020 to 44,000 in 2070. Dripping Springs WSC obtains a portion of their water supply from WTCPUA, so their numbers are coordinated with WTCPUA. Additional information is provided as supporting documentation. Demand increases reflective of increased population – no base GPCD change.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	5,165	6,368	7,833	9,666	11,736	14,092
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>18,500</b>	<b>24,000</b>	<b>31,000</b>	<b>39,500</b>	<b>44,000</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	5,835	12,132	16,167	21,334	27,764	29,908

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	165	Demand (AF)	906	1,098	1,339	1,646	1,995	2,394
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
GPCD	165	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,930</b>	<b>3,190</b>	<b>4,103</b>	<b>5,278</b>	<b>6,716</b>	<b>7,476</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	1,024	2,092	2,764	3,632	4,721	5,082

- d. **West Travis County PUA** - Request decrease to population for 2030-2070. WUG provided overall numbers, including retail and wholesale, by county (Hays and Travis). Dripping Springs WSC requested increases, and is served by WTCPUA as a wholesale customer. Region K coordinated with WTCPUA regarding splits and retail/wholesale. Draft projections for Hays County were too high, so requesting to decrease. Additional information is provided as supporting documentation.

Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated based on the decreased population and the revised base GPCD incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

See West Travis County PUA under Travis County for similar request.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	12,788	18,076	24,517	32,568	41,666	52,021
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>12,788</b>	<b>15,985</b>	<b>17,981</b>	<b>22,131</b>	<b>26,281</b>	<b>30,431</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	0	-2,091	-6,536	-10,437	-15,385	-21,590

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	391	Demand (AF)	5,501	7,739	10,476	13,901	17,775	22,188
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>4,499</b>	<b>5,590</b>	<b>6,273</b>	<b>7,711</b>	<b>9,151</b>	<b>10,593</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-70	Demand (AF)	-1,002	-2,149	-4,203	-6,190	-8,624	-11,595

8. **Llano County** – No population revisions; requesting revision to base GPCD for Horseshoe Bay

- a. **Horseshoe Bay** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade. (Similar request for Horseshoe Bay under Burnet County)

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	569	Demand (AF)	3,091	3,187	3,097	3,134	3,086	3,017
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>2,268</b>	<b>2,333</b>	<b>2,264</b>	<b>2,289</b>	<b>2,255</b>	<b>2,203</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-149	Demand (AF)	-823	-854	-833	-845	-831	-814



9. **Matagorda County** – No population revisions; requesting revision to base GPCD for Markham MUD and Palacios.

- a. **Markham MUD** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	112	Demand (AF)	116	117	116	118	119	120
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>99</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-17	Demand (AF)	-19	-21	-20	-22	-21	-21

- b. **Palacios** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	130	Demand (AF)	677	688	691	698	708	716
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>638</b>	<b>645</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-11	Demand (AF)	-62	-65	-67	-69	-70	-71

10. **Mills County** – No revisions

11. **San Saba County** - no population revisions; requesting revision to base GPCD for Richland SUD

- a. **Richland SUD** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade. Region K has coordinated with Region F to ensure consistency between regions.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	135	Demand (AF)	136	139	137	133	136	139
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>235</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	82	Demand (AF)	88	92	92	91	93	96

12. **Travis County** – Overall, projections show that Region K is approximately 1.5% underprojected as compared to Census data. Region K requests that the Travis County population be increased to include the additional 1.5% of the region’s total.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	1,273,260	1,508,642	1,732,860	1,897,769	2,033,120	2,185,909
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>1,298,624</b>	<b>1,538,784</b>	<b>1,767,636</b>	<b>1,936,583</b>	<b>2,075,875</b>	<b>2,233,259</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	25,364	30,142	34,776	38,814	42,755	47,350

Requesting sub-WUG to County-Other (Aqua Texas – Rivercrest). Region K has included population and demand projections broken out from County-Other. Also acknowledging that TWDB staff have developed population and demand projections for Rough Hollow in Travis County CRU and Sweetwater CRU, and Region K is not requesting any revisions to those numbers.

Requesting revisions to population for Austin, County-Other, Lakeway MUD, Leander, Manville WSC, Oak Shores Water System, Pflugerville, Sunset Valley, Travis County WCID 17, Travis County WCID Point Venture, Wells Branch MUD, and West Travis County Public Utility Agency.

Requesting revisions to the base GPCD for Austin, Barton Creek West WSC, Barton Creek WSC, Cottonwood Creek MUD 1, Hurst Creek MUD, Jonestown WSC, Lakeway MUD, Leander, Shady Hollow MUD, Sunset Valley, Travis County MUD 10, Travis County MUD 2, Travis County MUD 4, Travis County WCID 10, Travis County WCID 19, Travis County WCID Point Venture, Wells Branch MUD, and West Travis County Public Utility Agency.

- a. **Aqua Texas- Rivercrest** (sub-WUG to County-Other) – Sub-WUG has been broken out of County-Other and we have used historical data to estimate population and demands, assuming buildout conditions. Used water efficiency savings similar to Oak Shores Water System.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>774</b>	<b>774</b>	<b>774</b>	<b>774</b>	<b>774</b>	<b>774</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	774	774	774	774	774	774

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	n/a	Demand (AF)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>312</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	374	Demand (AF)	317	315	313	312	312	312

- b. **Austin** – Request increases to Austin population projections based on their submitted City Demographer’s projections. A majority of those increases is requested for inclusion in the Travis County portion of Austin. A portion of County-Other has been moved under Austin as part of the requested revision, based on those that are retail customers of Austin.

Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated based on the increased population and the revised base GPCD incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

Austin has submitted a formal revision request to the RWPG. It has been included in this request as supporting documentation. See Austin under Hays County and Williamson County for similar requests.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	960,709	1,125,478	1,285,243	1,402,811	1,496,994	1,607,291
REVISED	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	<b>976,785</b>	<b>1,153,560</b>	<b>1,337,673</b>	<b>1,464,157</b>	<b>1,564,930</b>	<b>1,701,504</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	16,076	28,082	52,430	61,346	67,936	94,213

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	157	Demand (AF)	162,496	187,844	214,509	234,131	249,850	268,259
REVISED	BASE	REVISED	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	<b>162</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>170,686</b>	<b>198,992</b>	<b>230,751</b>	<b>252,570</b>	<b>269,954</b>	<b>293,513</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	5	Demand (AF)	8,190	11,148	16,242	18,439	20,104	25,254

- c. **Barton Creek West WSC** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	272	Demand (AF)	396	392	389	388	387	387
REVISED	BASE	REVISED	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	<b>299</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>427</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	27	Demand (AF)	40	41	41	40	40	40

- d. **Barton Creek WSC** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	649	Demand (AF)	504	594	681	745	798	858
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>893</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	26	Demand (AF)	20	25	28	31	32	35

- e. **Cottonwood Creek MUD 1** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	80	Demand (AF)	116	133	149	161	172	184
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>148</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-13	Demand (AF)	-21	-26	-29	-32	-34	-36

- f. **County-Other, Travis** – Decrease County-Other population to balance out other population changes so no change to Travis County total population, other than 1.5% overall increase. Revised demands reflected – no change to base GPCD.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	14,744	13,073	11,999	8,903	6,411	7,067
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>6,206</b>	<b>6,206</b>	<b>6,206</b>	<b>6,206</b>	<b>6,206</b>	<b>6,206</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	-8,538	-6,867	-5,793	-2,697	-205	-861

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	136	Demand (AF)	2,067	1,818	1,663	1,229	879	967
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>860</b>	<b>857</b>	<b>851</b>	<b>849</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	-1,197	-955	-803	-372	-28	-118

- g. **Hurst Creek MUD** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	447	Demand (AF)	1,520	1,511	1,505	1,502	1,501	1,501
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,718</b>	<b>1,709</b>	<b>1,703</b>	<b>1,700</b>	<b>1,699</b>	<b>1,699</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	57	Demand (AF)	198	198	198	198	198	198

- h. **Jonestown WSC** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	138	Demand (AF)	574	601	629	665	699	732
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>744</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>866</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	23	Demand (AF)	101	108	115	122	129	134

- i. **Lakeway MUD** - Request decreased population based on following data from WUG: Assumption of 2.56 persons per household per 2016 Census. Buildout reached at 5,088 LUEs in 2054. 2016 LUE connections = 4,160, plus 25 new per year. Provided potable water operations for 2011, calculating GPCD to be 234. Request for revised demands reflect population and GPCD reductions, incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade. Supporting documentation provided.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	13,904	18,295	18,295	18,295	18,295	18,295
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>10,906</b>	<b>11,546</b>	<b>12,186</b>	<b>12,826</b>	<b>13,025</b>	<b>13,025</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	-2,998	-6,749	-6,109	-5,469	-5,270	-5,270

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	301	Demand (AF)	4,561	5,943	5,909	5,893	5,888	5,886
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>2,757</b>	<b>2,882</b>	<b>3,019</b>	<b>3,166</b>	<b>3,212</b>	<b>3,211</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-67	Demand (AF)	-1,804	-3,061	-2,890	-2,727	-2,676	-2,675

- j. **Leander** - Request revised population based on past and current growth rates, as well as anticipated growth rates. Request increased population in 2020 and 2030, and decreased population in 2040 through 2070. Requested revisions have been coordinated with Region G. Request to increase base GPCD to 128, based on 2015 water use data provided by

TWDB staff. Revisions to demands reflect population and GPCD changes, incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade. Supporting documentation provided.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	9,491	24,827	43,093	46,640	48,403	50,610
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>11,246</b>	<b>26,735</b>	<b>28,349</b>	<b>29,963</b>	<b>30,689</b>	<b>32,033</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	1,755	1,908	-14,744	-16,677	-17,714	-18,577

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	114	Demand (AF)	1,133	2,907	5,020	5,422	5,623	5,877
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,519</b>	<b>3,550</b>	<b>3,747</b>	<b>3,953</b>	<b>4,046</b>	<b>4,222</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	14	Demand (AF)	386	643	-1,273	-1,469	-1,577	-1,655

- k. **Manville WSC** – Request to decrease Manville WSC’s population, based on current population and anticipated growth rates, provided by WUG. Revisions to demands reflect population changes – no base GPCD change.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	22,045	27,156	31,976	37,373	42,136	46,566
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>15,661</b>	<b>19,292</b>	<b>22,716</b>	<b>26,550</b>	<b>29,934</b>	<b>33,081</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	-6,384	-7,864	-9,260	-10,823	-12,202	-13,485

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	148	Demand (AF)	3,434	4,148	4,835	5,623	6,329	6,991
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>2,439</b>	<b>2,946</b>	<b>3,435</b>	<b>3,994</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>4,966</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	-995	-1,202	-1,400	-1,629	-1,833	-2,025

- i. **Oak Shores Water System** - Request revision to population, based on information provided by WUG and TCEQ Drinking Water Watch database. Buildout should occur in 2030 decade after 55 more homes are built. WUG thought demands are a little low, and should be 150 AF in 2020 and 170 AF in 2030 and beyond. Population and demands revised to reflect request, starting with current population, incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	467	553	636	696	746	802
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>632</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	79	79	-4	-64	-114	-170

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	253	Demand (AF)	128	149	171	186	199	214
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
GPCD	253	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>169</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	22	22	-1	-17	-30	-45

- m. **Pflugerville** - Request decrease to population, beginning in 2030. WUG submitted that build-out is expected in 2060 at a population of 130,167. Rescaled population for 2030-2050. Demands reflect population changes – no change to base GPCD.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	62,745	85,016	106,017	129,532	150,287	169,592
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>62,745</b>	<b>78,245</b>	<b>95,599</b>	<b>112,807</b>	<b>130,167</b>	<b>130,167</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	0	-6,771	-10,418	-16,725	-20,120	-39,425

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	155	Demand (AF)	10,403	13,928	17,298	21,087	24,438	27,564
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
GPCD	155	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>10,403</b>	<b>12,819</b>	<b>15,598</b>	<b>18,364</b>	<b>21,167</b>	<b>21,156</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	0	-1,109	-1,700	-2,723	-3,271	-6,408

- n. **Rough Hollow in Travis County CRU (new WUG)** – TWDB calculated projections, pulled out of County-Other. RWPG comfortable with TWDB projections – no changes.
- o. **Shady Hollow MUD** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	151	Demand (AF)	695	677	661	653	651	651
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>793</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>759</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>749</b>	<b>749</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	20	Demand (AF)	98	98	98	97	98	98

- p. **Sunset Valley** - Request decrease to population. WUG provided calculation details to show why population should be lower. Information is provided as supporting documentation. Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating decreased population and TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	1,179	1,414	1,725	2,074	2,383	2,669
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>930</b>	<b>1,063</b>	<b>1,234</b>	<b>1,432</b>	<b>1,662</b>	<b>1,929</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	-249	-351	-491	-642	-721	-740

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	312	Demand (AF)	400	476	578	694	797	892
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>753</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	50	Demand (AF)	-32	-59	-95	-135	-148	-139

- q. **Sweetwater CRU** – TWDB calculated projections, pulled out of County-Other. RWPG comfortable with TWDB projections – no changes.
- r. **Travis County MUD 10** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	260	Demand (AF)	98	115	131	143	153	164
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>124</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-61	Demand (AF)	-24	-28	-32	-35	-38	-40



- s. **Travis County MUD 2** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	142	Demand (AF)	379	439	498	542	580	623
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>525</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-20	Demand (AF)	-57	-67	-77	-85	-91	-98

- t. **Travis County MUD 4** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	755	Demand (AF)	2,051	2,365	2,662	2,994	3,288	3,563
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,728</b>	<b>1,945</b>	<b>2,188</b>	<b>2,402</b>	<b>2,603</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-201	Demand (AF)	-551	-637	-717	-806	-886	-960

- u. **Travis County WCID 10** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	319	Demand (AF)	2,644	2,865	3,080	3,332	3,561	3,776
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>3,499</b>	<b>3,802</b>	<b>4,094</b>	<b>4,433</b>	<b>4,739</b>	<b>5,026</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	100	Demand (AF)	855	937	1,014	1,101	1,178	1,250

- v. **Travis County WCID 17** – Request increase to 2020 population, based on WUG-reported population of 34,290 to TWDB for 2016, which is higher than draft projected 2020 population of 33,117. Growth is faster than projected. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	33,117	39,741	43,715	44,473	45,671	47,125
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
<b>Population</b>	<b>36,720</b>	39,741	43,715	44,473	45,671	47,125
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	3,603	0	0	0	0	0

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	236	Demand (AF)	8,450	10,053	11,016	11,186	11,479	11,841
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
GPCD	236	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>9,370</b>	10,053	11,016	11,186	11,479	11,841
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	920	0	0	0	0	0

- w. **Travis County WCID 19** - Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	628	Demand (AF)	474	472	470	469	469	469
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>444</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-33	Demand (AF)	-25	-25	-25	-25	-25	-25

- x. **Travis County WCID Point Venture** – Request to increase population numbers in 2020 and 2030. 2015 TWDB population estimate was 786. Adding close to 50 residents per year = 1,036 population in 2020. Adjusted 2030 population slightly upwards, then no change to draft 2040 – 2070 numbers. Request decrease base GPCD to 228, based on 2015 historical GPCD number, as WUG was comfortable with 2015 population number reported. Demands have been recalculated incorporating revised population and TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	723	1,215	1,568	1,900	2,273	2,601
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	2040	2050	2060	2070
<b>Population</b>	<b>1,036</b>	<b>1,325</b>	1,568	1,900	2,273	2,601
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	313	110	0	0	0	0

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	283	Demand (AF)	222	370	474	573	685	783
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>624</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-55	Demand (AF)	33	-48	-96	-117	-140	-159

- y. **Wells Branch MUD** – Request increase to population, based on information submitted by WUG. Current Data: No. of SF residential connections = 2,912, Population = 8,736; No. of apartment units = 4,435, Population = 11,087. Total population = 19,823 between Travis and Williamson Counties. Total Water Consumption for Oct. 2015-Sept. 2016 (gallons) = 450,764,000. Average/Mo. = 37.5 mil gallons. The District is almost completely built-out.

Limited remaining commercial and institutional construction, but very little land available for growth after that. Request to reduce GPCD to reflect revised population based on 2011 historical water use. Population and GPCD modified to reflect request. Also see Williamson County.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	14,989	14,989	14,989	14,989	14,989	14,989
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>18,750</b>	<b>18,750</b>	<b>18,750</b>	<b>18,750</b>	<b>18,750</b>	<b>18,750</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	3,761	3,761	3,761	3,761	3,761	3,761

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	107	Demand (AF)	1,638	1,601	1,576	1,562	1,558	1,558
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,376</b>	<b>1,331</b>	<b>1,300</b>	<b>1,282</b>	<b>1,277</b>	<b>1,276</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-32	Demand (AF)	-262	-270	-276	-280	-281	-282

- z. **West Travis County PUA** - Request increase to population. WUG provided overall numbers, including retail and wholesale, by county (Hays and Travis). Region K coordinated with WTCPUA regarding splits and retail/wholesale. Draft projections for Travis County were too low, so requesting to increase. Additional information is provided as supporting documentation.

Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD. Demands have been recalculated based on the increased population and the revised base GPCD incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

See West Travis County PUA under Hays County for similar request.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	7,394	8,537	9,615	10,824	11,890	12,880
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>19,039</b>	<b>21,037</b>	<b>22,715</b>	<b>25,324</b>	<b>26,990</b>	<b>28,480</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	11,645	12,500	13,100	14,500	15,100	15,600

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	391	Demand (AF)	3,181	3,655	4,109	4,620	5,072	5,494
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>6,698</b>	<b>7,357</b>	<b>7,925</b>	<b>8,824</b>	<b>9,398</b>	<b>9,914</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-70	Demand (AF)	3,517	3,702	3,816	4,204	4,326	4,420

13. **Wharton County** – No population revisions; requesting revision to base GPCD for County-Other

- a. **County-Other, Wharton** – Request that demand projections use 2011 utility-boundary GPCD as base GPCD, to be consistent with Region P request. Demands have been recalculated based on the increased population and the revised base GPCD incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	126	Demand (AF)	1,898	1,936	1,972	2,044	2,111	2,173
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>1,930</b>	<b>1,971</b>	<b>2,008</b>	<b>2,082</b>	<b>2,150</b>	<b>2,214</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	2	Demand (AF)	32	35	36	38	39	41

14. **Williamson County** – Requesting population revisions to Austin and County-Other; requesting revisions to base GPCD for Austin and Wells Branch MUD.

- a. **Austin** - Request to increase population. Region K County-Other population in Williamson County is nearly all retail customers of City of Austin. Request to move 97% of County-Other population under Austin. Demands have been recalculated based on the increased population and the revised base GPCD incorporating TWDB-provided water efficiency savings by decade. Also see Travis, Hays counties.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	47,680	59,897	74,334	89,882	107,514	126,860
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>61,729</b>	<b>79,661</b>	<b>93,459</b>	<b>108,319</b>	<b>125,171</b>	<b>143,660</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	14,049	19,764	19,125	18,437	17,657	16,800

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	157	Demand (AF)	8,065	9,997	12,406	15,001	17,944	21,173
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>10,787</b>	<b>13,742</b>	<b>16,122</b>	<b>18,685</b>	<b>21,592</b>	<b>24,782</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	5	Demand (AF)	2,722	3,745	3,716	3,684	3,648	3,609

- b. **County-Other, Williamson** – Request to decrease population based on moving 97% of population under Austin. (See Austin, Williamson County request above.) Demands have been recalculated based on the decreased population – no base GPCD changes.

DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	14,483	20,375	19,717	19,007	18,203	17,320
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>Population</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>520</b>
DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
Population	-14,049	-19,764	-19,125	-18,437	-17,657	-16,800

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	148	Demand (AF)	2,248	3,089	2,958	2,838	2,712	2,579
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
GPCD	148	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>77</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	0	Demand (AF)	-2,181	-2,996	-2,869	-2,753	-2,631	-2,502

c. **Wells Branch MUD** - Request to reduce GPCD to reflect revised Travis and Williamson population based on 2011 historical water use. See Travis County for additional explanation.

DRAFT	BASE	DRAFT	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	107	Demand (AF)	117	115	113	112	112	112
<b>REVISED</b>	<b>BASE</b>	<b>REVISED</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>2070</b>
<b>GPCD</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>Demand (AF)</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>73</b>
DIFFERENCE	BASE	DIFFERENCE	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
GPCD	-32	Demand (AF)	-38	-39	-39	-39	-39	-39