

**REGION H WATER PLANNING GROUP
POPULATION DEMANDS COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETING
APRIL 17, 2023**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ivan Langford, Veronica Osegueda (for Michael Turco), and Byron Ryder

MEMBERS ABSENT: Marvin Marcell and Robert Istre

NON-VOTING MEMBERS: Michele Foss, Texas Water Development Board

CONSULTANT TEAM: Courtney Corso and Philip Taucer

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

There were no guest introductions for this item.

3. REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2022 COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Langford made a motion to approve the minutes from June 21, 2022. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ryder and carried.

4. RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC ISSUES RELATED TO AGENDA ITEMS 5 THROUGH 9.

There were no public comments.

5. DISCUSS COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND SCHEDULE

Mr. Taucer presented the upcoming schedule for activities related to population and demand projections, including the upcoming deadline for submittal of projection revision requests to Texas Water Development Board (TWDB).

6. DISCUSS METHODOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PER CAPITA WATER DEMANDS AND CALCULATION OF PLUMBING CODE SAVINGS FOR DETERMINING MUNICIPAL DEMANDS.

Mr. Taucer summarized the TWDB approach to developing dry-year per capita water demand levels for Water User Groups (WUGs), including the estimation of future savings from plumbing codes and gradual replacement of older water fixtures with more efficient technology. Ms. Foss provided additional background. Mr. Langford asked if the TWDB analysis had reconsidered older estimates of household size, with Ms. Foss confirming that TWDB had retained a uniform three persons per household for all WUGs for purposes of the plumbing code savings analysis. Judge Ryder noted that local electric companies have recently been using a value of approximately 2.5 persons per household for planning in the area. The Committee and consultant team noted that the ongoing review of draft per-capita demands for the region should consider the potential for impacts from household size.

7. RECEIVE PRESENTATION ON AND DISCUSS POPULATION AND WATER DEMAND PROJECTIONS, SUPPORTING DATA, AND THE PROCESS FOR REQUESTING REVISED PROJECTIONS AND CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE REGION H PLANNING WATER PLANNING GROUP (RHWPG).

Mr. Taucer and Ms. Osegueda provided a summary of the methodologies utilized in the development of draft TWDB population projections and development of the Joint Regulatory Plan Review (JRPR) by the Harris-Galveston Subsidence District and Fort Bend Subsidence District. The Committee and consultant team discussed the details of the methodology utilized by the JRPR to distribute projected growth spatially with consideration for current development, transportation infrastructure, wetlands, floodplains, and non-developable areas. Mr. Taucer then briefed the group on projected populations and geographic distributions of population for each county within Region H. The Committee discussed the results, noting that there have been concerns with undercounts in the 2020 Census which may impact projections for some areas. The committee also noted that TWDB's draft projections included some population declines in counties in the northern portion of Region H. Ms. Foss indicated that a substantial number of counties, predominantly rural, had projected decreases in population this cycle. Judge Ryder noted that while the draft TWDB projections for Leon County show a population decrease, there has been recent post-COVID development in some parts of the county, including three new subdivisions near Centerville and two in the Jewett and Normangee area; these may not have been captured by 2020 data. Mr. Langford noted that new floodplain maps may impact San Jacinto County. The Committee made recommendations regarding projection adjustment requests for consideration by the full RHWPG, including recommending alignment of Region H population projections with those from the JRPR for applicable counties. The Committee also recommended the use of the 0.5 migration scenario for counties with projected population declines where doing so would result in a higher projection to avoid underrepresenting demands in those areas.

8. DISCUSS METHODOLOGY FOR SURVEYING WATER USER GROUPS (WUGS) FOR INPUT REGARDING POPULATION PROJECTIONS AND OTHER DATA FOR USE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2026 REGIONAL WATER PLAN.

Mr. Taucer gave the Committee a brief overview of the WUG survey for the ongoing planning cycle, noting that the survey has been significantly streamlined and shortened relative to prior cycles with the intent of increasing response rates. Ms. Corso noted that while the survey is nearing readiness for distribution, it may be released shortly after the May RWPG meeting to confirm the use of JRPR projections in the survey.

9. RECEIVE PRESENTATION ON IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR WATER PROVIDERS FOR REGION H AND CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE RHWPG.

Mr. Taucer briefed the committee on the Major Water Provider (MWP) classification and presented the results of a proposed methodology for identifying potential MWPs based on intervals of projected water demand or supply allocation similar to that utilized for the 2021 Region H Regional Water Plan. It was noted that identification of MWPs had also be discussed with the Non-Population Demands Committee due to the potential for non-municipal MWPs. Mr. Langford noted that the use of an overall allocation metric results in the inclusion of a number of entities which are retail-only providers or provide only limited wholesale supplies outside of their retail service area; in many cases, these predominantly-retail systems represent a small portion of overall regional demand and show little recent or projected future growth which would drive water management strategies. Ms. Foss noted that some regions have utilized a metric including sales to other entities in identifying MWPs. The Committee recommended

maintaining the volumetric threshold utilized in the 2021 Region H Regional Water Plan with the addition of a metric applying a minimum threshold for supply outside of an entity's own retail service area.

10. RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

11. ADJOURN

Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.