DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Anderson County Total	**59,147**	**59,243**	**58,964**	**58,619**	**58,279**	**57,944**
Anderson County / Neches Basin Total	**22,380**	**22,494**	**22,424**	**22,347**	**22,277**	**22,221**
Berryville	15	15	15	15	15	14
Brushy Creek WSC*	1,881	1,878	1,853	1,830	1,806	1,783
Frankston	1,001	1,000	987	974	962	949
Frankston Rural WSC	1,563	1,561	1,540	1,521	1,502	1,482
Neches WSC	1,226	1,224	1,208	1,193	1,177	1,162
Norwood WSC	914	913	902	891	880	867
Palestine	9,339	9,329	9,215	9,104	8,993	8,882
Slocum WSC	2,599	2,595	2,561	2,529	2,496	2,464
Walston Springs WSC	2,302	2,496	2,707	2,936	3,184	3,453
County-Other	1,540	1,483	1,436	1,354	1,262	1,165
Anderson County / Trinity Basin Total	**36,767**	**36,749**	**36,540**	**36,272**	**36,002**	**35,723**
Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	706	705	696	686	677	669
B B S WSC*	1,064	1,061	1,048	1,035	1,021	1,008
B C Y WSC	1,645	1,642	1,620	1,600	1,580	1,559
Brushy Creek WSC*	931	930	918	906	895	883
Elkhart	1,796	1,795	1,774	1,752	1,732	1,711
Four Pines WSC	3,351	3,351	3,319	3,287	3,256	3,223
Norwood WSC	63	63	62	61	60	60
Palestine	8,319	8,310	8,208	8,109	8,011	7,911
Pleasant Springs WSC	900	899	887	876	866	854
Slocum WSC	224	224	221	218	215	213
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	4,311	4,311	4,311	4,311	4,311	4,311
TDCJ Coffield Michael	5,755	5,755	5,755	5,755	5,755	5,755
The Consolidated WSC	2,809	2,852	2,896	2,940	2,985	3,031
Tucker WSC	967	966	953	941	929	917
Walston Springs WSC	871	945	1,025	1,111	1,205	1,307
County-Other	3,055	2,940	2,847	2,684	2,504	2,311
Angelina County Total	**88,634**	**90,179**	**90,902**	**91,791**	**92,671**	**93,542**
Angelina County / Neches Basin Total	**88,634**	**90,179**	**90,902**	**91,791**	**92,671**	**93,542**
Angelina WSC	3,845	3,913	3,941	3,979	4,017	4,052
Central WCID of Angelina County	6,016	6,124	6,181	6,242	6,303	6,364
Diboll	4,546	4,630	4,680	4,728	4,776	4,823
Four Way SUD	5,220	5,309	5,348	5,399	5,452	5,501
Hudson WSC	10,407	10,587	10,667	10,771	10,873	10,975

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Huntington	2,117	2,154	2,172	2,193	2,214	2,235
Lufkin	40,845	41,558	41,880	42,290	42,694	43,097
M & M WSC	3,205	3,262	3,284	3,317	3,348	3,379
Pollok-Redtown WSC	1,786	1,816	1,830	1,848	1,866	1,884
Redland WSC	2,596	2,640	2,660	2,685	2,711	2,736
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	249	248	248	248	248	248
Woodlawn WSC	2,130	2,167	2,182	2,205	2,226	2,246
Zavalla	688	699	705	711	717	725
County-Other	4,984	5,072	5,124	5,175	5,226	5,277
Cherokee County Total	**50,217**	**49,789**	**48,968**	**48,043**	**47,127**	**46,220**
Cherokee County / Neches Basin Total	**50,217**	**49,789**	**48,968**	**48,043**	**47,127**	**46,220**
Afton Grove WSC	1,439	1,477	1,518	1,562	1,608	1,657
Alto	940	930	914	892	873	852
Alto Rural WSC	4,021	4,398	4,813	5,275	5,786	6,353
Blackjack WSC	515	509	499	488	477	465
Bullard	375	371	365	356	349	340
Craft Turney WSC	4,720	4,671	4,580	4,478	4,377	4,274
Gum Creek WSC	1,106	1,095	1,073	1,050	1,025	1,001
Jacksonville	13,352	13,218	12,975	12,705	12,435	12,165
New Summerfield	910	900	883	863	844	824
North Cherokee WSC	3,995	3,952	3,875	3,789	3,704	3,616
Pollok-Redtown WSC	75	74	74	72	70	68
Rusk	5,226	5,252	5,265	5,272	5,291	5,322
Rusk Rural WSC	3,378	3,353	3,301	3,240	3,182	3,126
South Rusk County WSC	27	28	26	27	23	23
Southern Utilities*	3,372	3,336	3,271	3,198	3,126	3,053
Troup	59	58	57	56	55	53
Walnut Grove WSC	81	81	79	78	76	74
Wells	793	838	886	937	993	1,054
West Jacksonville WSC	1,605	1,588	1,556	1,523	1,487	1,453
Wright City WSC	325	320	314	308	300	294
County-Other	3,903	3,340	2,644	1,874	1,046	153
Hardin County Total	**67,850**	**75,133**	**81,452**	**79,574**	**77,719**	**75,894**
Hardin County / Neches Basin Total	**67,658**	**74,945**	**81,271**	**79,403**	**77,558**	**75,742**
Hardin County WCID 1	985	1,003	1,021	1,039	1,058	1,077
Kountze	2,141	2,129	2,103	2,057	2,010	1,965

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Lumberton MUD	33,189	40,689	47,439	46,337	45,245	44,174
North Hardin WSC	8,016	8,228	8,445	8,668	8,896	9,131
Silsbee	7,825	8,260	8,719	9,203	9,714	10,253
Sour Lake	1,580	1,570	1,549	1,514	1,478	1,444
West Hardin WSC*	3,736	3,712	3,664	3,579	3,496	3,414
Wildwood POA	625	620	612	598	584	570
County-Other	9,561	8,734	7,719	6,408	5,077	3,714
Hardin County / Trinity Basin Total	**192**	**188**	**181**	**171**	**161**	**152**
Lake Livingston WSC*	146	146	144	140	137	134
County-Other	46	42	37	31	24	18
Henderson County Total	**25,474**	**26,404**	**26,918**	**27,503**	**28,080**	**28,649**
Henderson County / Neches Basin Total	**25,474**	**26,404**	**26,918**	**27,503**	**28,080**	**28,649**
Athens*	210	213	211	211	211	211
Berryville	727	697	752	757	762	766
Bethel Ash WSC*	2,752	2,773	2,885	2,932	2,978	3,022
Brownsboro	1,285	1,395	1,377	1,419	1,461	1,503
Brushy Creek WSC*	30	31	30	30	30	30
Chandler	4,095	5,045	6,216	7,658	9,435	11,624
Edom WSC*	262	284	280	289	297	306
Frankston	35	39	38	40	41	43
Leagueville WSC	2,230	2,374	2,374	2,438	2,502	2,566
Moore Station WSC	2,134	2,307	2,283	2,352	2,421	2,489
Murchison	576	567	600	607	613	619
R P M WSC*	415	458	446	461	476	491
Virginia Hill WSC*	1,693	1,752	1,788	1,827	1,865	1,903
County-Other*	9,030	8,469	7,638	6,482	4,988	3,076
Houston County Total	**21,221**	**20,385**	**19,547**	**19,032**	**18,522**	**18,017**
Houston County / Neches Basin Total	**3,355**	**2,657**	**2,132**	**1,648**	**1,242**	**883**
Grapeland	540	551	566	573	579	586
Pennington WSC*	148	134	114	107	99	90
The Consolidated WSC	175	182	190	194	197	201
County-Other	2,492	1,790	1,262	774	367	6
Houston County / Trinity Basin Total	**17,866**	**17,728**	**17,415**	**17,384**	**17,280**	**17,134**
Crockett	6,099	5,743	5,184	5,032	4,827	4,583
Grapeland	796	812	835	844	854	864

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Lovelady	483	463	443	433	425	417
Pennington WSC*	279	253	215	203	186	170
TDCJ Eastham Unit	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464
The Consolidated WSC	7,548	7,852	8,174	8,347	8,495	8,636
County-Other	197	141	100	61	29	0
Jasper County Total	**31,617**	**30,090**	**28,222**	**26,537**	**24,869**	**23,217**
Jasper County / Neches Basin Total	**18,220**	**17,215**	**15,969**	**14,820**	**13,646**	**12,434**
Brookeland FWSD	289	274	256	239	224	207
Jasper	7,304	6,963	6,545	6,168	5,793	5,426
Rayburn Country MUD	825	783	732	687	641	596
Rural WSC	1,074	1,019	953	893	833	774
South Jasper County WSC	555	527	493	462	431	401
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	2,676	2,543	2,376	2,229	2,082	1,935
County-Other	5,497	5,106	4,614	4,142	3,642	3,095
Jasper County / Sabine Basin Total	**13,397**	**12,875**	**12,253**	**11,717**	**11,223**	**10,783**
Jasper	35	34	32	30	28	26
Jasper County WCID 1	1,968	1,960	1,969	1,996	2,052	2,146
Kirbyville	2,015	2,009	2,018	2,048	2,106	2,205
Mauriceville SUD	148	152	149	143	135	127
South Jasper County WSC	1,625	1,542	1,441	1,352	1,262	1,172
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	901	932	972	1,023	1,092	1,186
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	914	868	812	761	711	661
County-Other	5,791	5,378	4,860	4,364	3,837	3,260
Jefferson County Total	**260,350**	**262,787**	**262,035**	**258,655**	**255,308**	**251,994**
Jefferson County / Neches Basin Total	**51,461**	**52,564**	**53,452**	**52,747**	**52,047**	**51,355**
Beaumont	39,818	40,919	42,050	41,504	40,964	40,429
Bevil Oaks	1,039	1,049	1,047	1,035	1,021	1,009
China	9	9	9	9	9	9
Groves	523	523	523	523	523	523
Jefferson County WCID 10	579	584	583	576	569	562
Meeker MWD	697	704	702	694	685	677
Nederland	664	671	669	661	653	645
Nome	357	361	359	355	350	346
Port Neches	7,075	7,147	7,127	7,041	6,956	6,872
County-Other	700	597	383	349	317	283

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Jefferson County / Neches-Trinity Basin Total	**208,889**	**210,223**	**208,583**	**205,908**	**203,261**	**200,639**
Beaumont	86,992	89,396	91,866	90,675	89,494	88,326
China	971	981	979	967	955	943
Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	4,514	4,514	4,514	4,514	4,514	4,514
Groves	16,448	16,448	16,448	16,448	16,448	16,448
Jefferson County WCID 10	3,360	3,394	3,385	3,343	3,303	3,263
Meeker MWD	1,901	1,920	1,914	1,891	1,868	1,847
Nederland	18,753	18,941	18,888	18,660	18,435	18,214
Nome	156	158	157	156	154	152
Port Arthur	47,614	48,091	47,961	47,383	46,812	46,249
Port Neches	6,812	6,880	6,861	6,778	6,696	6,615
Trinity Bay Conservation District*	208	210	209	211	204	204
West Jefferson County MWD	8,182	8,232	8,306	8,407	8,511	8,618
County-Other	12,978	11,058	7,095	6,475	5,867	5,246
Nacogdoches County Total	**69,121**	**71,271**	**73,210**	**76,305**	**79,370**	**82,405**
Nacogdoches County / Neches Basin Total	**69,121**	**71,271**	**73,210**	**76,305**	**79,370**	**82,405**
Appleby WSC	3,646	3,766	3,876	4,060	4,242	4,421
Caro WSC	2,567	2,652	2,729	2,859	2,987	3,112
Cushing	792	819	842	882	922	960
D & M WSC	7,496	7,743	7,968	8,346	8,720	9,086
Etoile WSC	1,450	1,497	1,541	1,614	1,686	1,757
Garrison	862	889	911	948	985	1,020
Lilly Grove SUD	2,461	2,541	2,614	2,736	2,856	2,975
Melrose WSC	2,482	2,564	2,638	2,764	2,886	3,009
Nacogdoches	36,389	37,462	38,422	39,870	41,314	42,756
Swift WSC	2,556	2,641	2,717	2,848	2,975	3,100
Woden WSC	2,211	2,283	2,349	2,461	2,571	2,679
County-Other	6,209	6,414	6,603	6,917	7,226	7,530
Newton County Total	**11,193**	**10,105**	**8,921**	**7,830**	**6,750**	**5,681**
Newton County / Sabine Basin Total	**11,193**	**10,105**	**8,921**	**7,830**	**6,750**	**5,681**
Bon Wier WSC	418	363	305	252	200	147
Brookeland FWSD	395	357	316	279	242	206
Mauriceville SUD	468	468	439	397	349	298
Newton	1,506	1,371	1,223	1,087	956	832
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	124	111	98	87	75	64
South Newton WSC	1,641	1,483	1,312	1,157	1,004	858

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
County-Other	6,641	5,952	5,228	4,571	3,924	3,276
Orange County Total	**87,065**	**88,479**	**88,819**	**87,583**	**86,365**	**85,164**
Orange County / Neches Basin Total	**25,686**	**25,368**	**25,242**	**24,306**	**23,442**	**22,618**
Bridge City	2,064	2,216	2,237	2,300	2,360	2,415
Kelly G Brewer	519	523	525	514	503	493
Mauriceville SUD	1,034	1,094	1,127	1,137	1,134	1,124
Orange County WCID 1	10,545	10,072	10,047	9,392	8,767	8,167
Orangefield WSC	3,234	3,699	4,231	4,839	5,535	6,331
County-Other	8,290	7,764	7,075	6,124	5,143	4,088
Orange County / Neches-Trinity Basin Total	**1,309**	**1,404**	**1,415**	**1,453**	**1,490**	**1,522**
Bridge City	1,294	1,390	1,402	1,442	1,480	1,514
County-Other	15	14	13	11	10	8
Orange County / Sabine Basin Total	**60,070**	**61,707**	**62,162**	**61,824**	**61,433**	**61,024**
Bridge City	8,503	9,131	9,216	9,479	9,722	9,949
Kelly G Brewer	572	577	579	567	556	544
Mauriceville SUD	9,756	10,322	10,642	10,732	10,702	10,613
Orange	20,001	20,422	20,510	20,303	20,096	19,889
Orange County WCID 1	1,688	1,613	1,608	1,504	1,403	1,308
Orange County WCID 2	3,082	3,067	3,072	2,978	2,887	2,799
Orangefield WSC	4,152	4,749	5,431	6,212	7,105	8,126
Pinehurst	2,119	2,162	2,171	2,148	2,125	2,102
South Newton WSC	1,321	1,351	1,357	1,344	1,331	1,318
County-Other	8,876	8,313	7,576	6,557	5,506	4,376
Panola County Total	**21,909**	**21,174**	**20,156**	**19,357**	**18,566**	**17,783**
Panola County / Cypress Basin Total	**44**	**39**	**35**	**32**	**29**	**27**
Panola-Bethany WSC*	39	35	31	28	25	23
County-Other	5	4	4	4	4	4
Panola County / Sabine Basin Total	**21,865**	**21,135**	**20,121**	**19,325**	**18,537**	**17,756**
Beckville	654	581	519	466	421	383
Carthage	6,237	6,186	6,098	5,982	5,870	5,760
Clayton WSC	188	206	228	238	249	260
Deberry WSC	477	420	345	299	253	206
Elysian Fields WSC*	39	41	42	45	46	46

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Gill WSC*	561	525	477	445	413	381
Hollands Quarter WSC	928	888	836	797	758	721
Minden Brachfield WSC	114	136	165	181	197	212
Panola-Bethany WSC*	686	611	548	494	448	409
Rehobeth WSC	544	492	423	378	333	290
Tatum	173	134	104	80	61	46
County-Other	11,264	10,915	10,336	9,920	9,488	9,042
Polk County Total	**9,173**	**9,905**	**10,267**	**10,662**	**11,051**	**11,434**
Polk County / Neches Basin Total	**9,173**	**9,905**	**10,267**	**10,662**	**11,051**	**11,434**
Chester WSC	289	312	323	336	348	360
Corrigan	1,409	1,519	1,572	1,630	1,688	1,744
Damascus-Stryker WSC	1,544	1,668	1,729	1,797	1,862	1,927
Lake Livingston WSC*	1,115	1,205	1,250	1,298	1,346	1,392
Leggett WSC*	14	15	16	16	17	17
Moscow WSC*	590	636	660	686	711	735
Soda WSC*	150	162	169	175	182	188
County-Other*	4,062	4,388	4,548	4,724	4,897	5,071
Rusk County Total	**51,024**	**49,735**	**47,635**	**45,260**	**42,908**	**40,579**
Rusk County / Neches Basin Total	**23,317**	**22,496**	**21,290**	**19,933**	**18,560**	**17,164**
Ebenezer WSC	717	696	660	620	581	542
Garrison	4	4	3	3	3	3
Gaston WSC	1,339	1,298	1,232	1,159	1,086	1,013
Goodsprings WSC	2,261	2,191	2,081	1,957	1,833	1,709
Henderson	9,540	9,445	9,386	9,378	9,408	9,482
Jacobs WSC	39	41	44	47	50	54
Minden Brachfield WSC	1,258	1,220	1,159	1,091	1,021	952
Mt Enterprise WSC	1,392	1,349	1,281	1,204	1,128	1,052
New London	456	442	421	396	372	347
Overton*	185	180	171	161	152	142
South Rusk County WSC	1,356	1,314	1,249	1,174	1,100	1,025
Wright City WSC	155	151	143	135	126	118
County-Other	4,615	4,165	3,460	2,608	1,700	725
Rusk County / Sabine Basin Total	**27,707**	**27,239**	**26,345**	**25,327**	**24,348**	**23,415**
Chalk Hill SUD*	2,772	2,686	2,551	2,399	2,247	2,095
Cross Roads SUD*	2,814	2,924	3,048	3,195	3,363	3,556

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Crystal Farms WSC	1,349	1,482	1,634	1,812	2,016	2,255
Elderville WSC*	1,497	1,451	1,378	1,296	1,215	1,133
Henderson	2,869	2,840	2,822	2,820	2,829	2,852
Jacobs WSC	2,606	2,762	2,936	3,140	3,371	3,637
Kilgore*	3,657	3,550	3,377	3,183	2,990	2,796
Minden Brachfield WSC	626	607	576	542	508	473
New London	330	320	304	286	269	251
New Prospect WSC	942	911	866	815	763	711
Overton*	1,775	1,722	1,639	1,546	1,452	1,360
Southern Utilities*	408	396	375	353	331	307
Tatum	1,329	1,288	1,223	1,151	1,078	1,005
West Gregg SUD*	87	106	132	163	204	255
County-Other	4,646	4,194	3,484	2,626	1,712	729
Sabine County Total	**9,225**	**8,415**	**7,671**	**7,226**	**6,785**	**6,348**
Sabine County / Neches Basin Total	**2,500**	**2,277**	**2,073**	**1,951**	**1,830**	**1,708**
Brookeland FWSD	451	411	373	352	330	308
G M WSC	1,151	1,048	954	897	841	785
Pineland	898	818	746	702	659	615
Sabine County / Sabine Basin Total	**6,725**	**6,138**	**5,598**	**5,275**	**4,955**	**4,640**
Brookeland FWSD	63	58	52	50	46	43
G M WSC	4,352	3,965	3,608	3,393	3,180	2,968
Hemphill	982	903	830	787	746	706
New WSC	66	59	54	50	48	45
County-Other	1,262	1,153	1,054	995	935	878
San Augustine County Total	**7,322**	**6,728**	**6,204**	**5,805**	**5,410**	**5,019**
San Augustine County / Neches Basin Total	**6,773**	**6,245**	**5,782**	**5,424**	**5,072**	**4,731**
Choice WSC	18	16	15	13	12	12
Denning WSC	192	173	156	145	134	123
New WSC	1,253	1,128	1,020	948	876	808
San Augustine	1,817	1,731	1,682	1,655	1,654	1,689
San Augustine Rural WSC	1,503	1,644	1,743	1,704	1,659	1,609
Sand Hills WSC	34	41	48	48	47	47
County-Other	1,956	1,512	1,118	911	690	443
San Augustine County / Sabine Basin Total	**549**	**483**	**422**	**381**	**338**	**288**
G M WSC	160	155	151	144	137	129

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
San Augustine Rural WSC	84	92	97	95	93	90
County-Other	305	236	174	142	108	69
Shelby County Total	**23,697**	**23,320**	**22,721**	**22,141**	**21,567**	**20,999**
Shelby County / Neches Basin Total	**2,610**	**2,764**	**2,930**	**3,019**	**3,104**	**3,186**
Choice WSC	205	219	237	257	281	310
Sand Hills WSC	949	1,082	1,265	1,373	1,487	1,606
Timpson	13	11	9	8	6	5
County-Other	1,443	1,452	1,419	1,381	1,330	1,265
Shelby County / Sabine Basin Total	**21,087**	**20,556**	**19,791**	**19,122**	**18,463**	**17,813**
Center	4,764	4,690	4,574	4,459	4,344	4,233
Choice WSC	593	634	684	743	813	897
East Lamar WSC	755	806	870	945	1,033	1,140
Five Way WSC	1,171	1,180	1,188	1,184	1,181	1,178
Flat Fork WSC	525	437	366	300	247	202
Huxley	1,599	1,367	1,180	1,028	903	801
Joaquin	586	469	379	299	236	187
McClelland WSC	946	846	701	601	500	393
New WSC	59	69	82	90	98	108
Sand Hills WSC	804	916	1,071	1,163	1,259	1,360
Tenaha	817	725	595	505	412	317
Timpson	852	754	614	518	421	319
County-Other	7,616	7,663	7,487	7,287	7,016	6,678
Smith County Total	**210,383**	**229,453**	**248,636**	**259,642**	**271,158**	**283,249**
Smith County / Neches Basin Total	**210,383**	**229,453**	**248,636**	**259,642**	**271,158**	**283,249**
Arp	821	752	703	638	575	513
Ben Wheeler WSC*	28	34	38	42	45	48
Bullard	4,169	4,827	5,286	5,713	6,129	6,535
Carroll WSC*	668	742	794	838	882	925
Crystal Systems Texas*	422	494	544	590	636	680
Dean WSC	4,592	4,947	5,197	5,389	5,577	5,761
Emerald Bay MUD	1,029	1,084	1,122	1,166	1,166	1,166
Jackson WSC*	2,720	2,940	3,095	3,216	3,335	3,452
Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water*	655	779	865	947	1,027	1,105
Lindale Rural WSC*	3,067	3,302	3,468	3,595	3,720	3,842
Lindale*	1,641	1,698	1,738	1,754	1,770	1,787

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Population

	WUG Population					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Overton*	31	33	34	36	36	37
R P M WSC*	72	62	55	46	38	30
Southern Utilities*	40,550	43,682	45,885	47,577	49,237	50,867
Troup	2,002	2,072	2,122	2,142	2,162	2,182
Tyler*	118,744	133,041	149,059	157,803	167,059	176,859
Walnut Grove WSC	10,389	11,137	11,663	12,055	12,440	12,818
Whitehouse	7,404	7,494	7,561	7,506	7,457	7,412
Wright City WSC	1,324	1,370	1,418	1,468	1,519	1,572
County-Other*	10,055	8,963	7,989	7,121	6,348	5,658
Trinity County Total	**2,945**	**2,757**	**2,578**	**2,460**	**2,343**	**2,227**
Trinity County / Neches Basin Total	**2,945**	**2,757**	**2,578**	**2,460**	**2,343**	**2,227**
Centerville WSC	633	566	489	432	373	310
Groveton*	340	301	254	219	183	145
Pennington WSC*	189	152	127	106	88	74
County-Other*	1,783	1,738	1,708	1,703	1,699	1,698
Tyler County Total	**18,808**	**17,694**	**16,657**	**15,861**	**15,073**	**14,293**
Tyler County / Neches Basin Total	**18,808**	**17,694**	**16,657**	**15,861**	**15,073**	**14,293**
Chester WSC	593	518	439	381	318	253
Colmesneil	688	661	638	622	607	595
Cypress Creek WSC	522	462	410	365	326	294
Moscow WSC*	21	27	35	41	46	53
Seneca WSC	738	699	662	637	612	588
Tyler County SUD	3,104	2,970	2,859	2,778	2,703	2,639
Warren WSC	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064
Wildwood POA	400	366	332	307	282	255
Woodville	4,200	4,404	4,643	4,903	5,205	5,563
County-Other	6,478	5,523	4,575	3,763	2,910	1,989
Region I Population Total	**1,126,375**	**1,153,046**	**1,170,483**	**1,169,886**	**1,169,921**	**1,170,658**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Anderson County Total	**21,680**	**21,713**	**21,698**	**21,684**	**21,674**	**21,663**
Anderson County / Neches Basin Total	**8,312**	**8,372**	**8,406**	**8,443**	**8,486**	**8,531**
Berryville	2	2	2	2	2	2
Brushy Creek WSC*	288	286	282	278	275	272
Frankston	212	211	208	205	203	200
Frankston Rural WSC	236	234	231	228	225	222
Neches WSC	156	154	152	151	149	147
Norwood WSC	140	139	138	136	135	133
Palestine	3,024	3,014	2,977	2,941	2,906	2,869
Slocum WSC	299	297	293	289	285	282
Walston Springs WSC	334	361	391	424	460	499
County-Other	208	199	192	182	169	156
Manufacturing	1,686	1,748	1,813	1,880	1,950	2,022
Steam Electric Power	888	888	888	888	888	888
Livestock	442	442	442	442	442	442
Irrigation	397	397	397	397	397	397
Anderson County / Trinity Basin Total	**13,368**	**13,341**	**13,292**	**13,241**	**13,188**	**13,132**
Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	114	114	112	110	109	108
B B S WSC*	138	137	135	133	132	130
B C Y WSC	264	262	258	255	252	249
Brushy Creek WSC*	142	141	140	138	136	134
Elkhart	304	303	299	296	292	289
Four Pines WSC	298	296	293	290	287	284
Norwood WSC	10	10	9	9	9	9
Palestine	2,693	2,685	2,652	2,620	2,588	2,556
Pleasant Springs WSC	194	194	191	189	187	184
Slocum WSC	26	26	25	25	25	24
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	1,741	1,738	1,738	1,738	1,738	1,738
TDCJ Coffield Michael	3,469	3,465	3,465	3,465	3,465	3,465
The Consolidated WSC	477	482	489	497	505	512
Tucker WSC	130	129	127	126	124	122
Walston Springs WSC	127	136	148	161	174	189
County-Other	412	394	382	360	336	310
Mining	34	34	34	34	34	34
Steam Electric Power	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408
Livestock	879	879	879	879	879	879

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation	508	508	508	508	508	508
Angelina County Total	**19,373**	**19,767**	**20,112**	**20,483**	**20,854**	**21,235**
Angelina County / Neches Basin Total	**19,373**	**19,767**	**20,112**	**20,483**	**20,854**	**21,235**
Angelina WSC	355	359	361	365	368	372
Central WCID of Angelina County	620	631	637	643	650	656
Diboll	683	693	700	707	714	721
Four Way SUD	435	439	443	447	451	455
Hudson WSC	1,003	1,020	1,028	1,038	1,047	1,057
Huntington	261	264	266	269	271	274
Lufkin	6,592	6,674	6,726	6,792	6,857	6,922
M & M WSC	260	262	264	267	269	272
Pollok-Redtown WSC	197	199	200	202	204	206
Redland WSC	201	203	205	207	209	211
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	29	29	29	29	29	29
Woodlawn WSC	242	245	246	249	251	254
Zavalla	102	103	104	104	105	107
County-Other	538	545	551	556	562	567
Manufacturing	5,612	5,819	6,034	6,258	6,489	6,729
Mining	780	819	855	887	915	940
Livestock	684	684	684	684	684	684
Irrigation	779	779	779	779	779	779
Cherokee County Total	**10,434**	**10,388**	**10,323**	**10,250**	**10,185**	**10,123**
Cherokee County / Neches Basin Total	**10,434**	**10,388**	**10,323**	**10,250**	**10,185**	**10,123**
Afton Grove WSC	214	219	225	231	238	245
Alto	218	215	211	206	202	197
Alto Rural WSC	941	1,026	1,123	1,231	1,350	1,482
Blackjack WSC	102	100	98	96	94	92
Bullard	90	89	87	85	83	81
Craft Turney WSC	635	626	613	600	586	572
Gum Creek WSC	103	101	99	97	95	92
Jacksonville	2,576	2,541	2,494	2,442	2,390	2,338
New Summerfield	113	111	109	106	104	101
North Cherokee WSC	472	465	456	446	436	425
Pollok-Redtown WSC	8	8	8	8	8	7
Rusk	855	856	858	859	863	868

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Rusk Rural WSC	331	326	321	315	310	304
South Rusk County WSC	5	5	5	5	4	4
Southern Utilities*	652	642	630	616	602	588
Troup	11	11	11	11	11	10
Walnut Grove WSC	10	10	9	9	9	9
Wells	124	130	138	146	155	164
West Jacksonville WSC	231	227	222	218	213	208
Wright City WSC	47	46	46	45	43	43
County-Other	435	370	293	208	116	17
Manufacturing	82	85	88	91	94	97
Mining	187	187	187	187	187	187
Steam Electric Power	310	310	310	310	310	310
Livestock	1,231	1,231	1,231	1,231	1,231	1,231
Irrigation	451	451	451	451	451	451
Hardin County Total	**8,422**	**9,104**	**9,726**	**9,524**	**9,325**	**9,130**
Hardin County / Neches Basin Total	**8,406**	**9,088**	**9,711**	**9,510**	**9,312**	**9,118**
Hardin County WCID 1	130	131	134	136	139	141
Kountze	248	245	242	237	231	226
Lumberton MUD	3,329	4,054	4,727	4,617	4,508	4,401
North Hardin WSC	539	553	568	583	598	614
Silsbee	1,001	1,051	1,109	1,171	1,236	1,305
Sour Lake	296	293	289	282	276	269
West Hardin WSC*	385	383	378	369	360	352
Wildwood POA	118	117	116	113	110	108
County-Other	1,093	992	877	728	577	422
Manufacturing	64	66	68	71	74	77
Mining	13	13	13	13	13	13
Steam Electric Power	1	1	1	1	1	1
Livestock	200	200	200	200	200	200
Irrigation	989	989	989	989	989	989
Hardin County / Trinity Basin Total	**16**	**16**	**15**	**14**	**13**	**12**
Lake Livingston WSC*	10	10	10	9	9	9
County-Other	5	5	4	4	3	2
Livestock	1	1	1	1	1	1

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Henderson County Total	**9,022**	**9,207**	**9,355**	**9,563**	**9,800**	**10,078**
Henderson County / Neches Basin Total	**9,022**	**9,207**	**9,355**	**9,563**	**9,800**	**10,078**
Athens*	42	42	42	42	42	42
Berryville	95	90	97	98	99	99
Bethel Ash WSC*	269	270	281	285	290	294
Brownsboro	246	267	263	271	279	288
Brushy Creek WSC*	5	5	5	5	5	5
Chandler	676	831	1,023	1,261	1,553	1,914
Edom WSC*	35	38	37	38	39	40
Frankston	7	8	8	8	9	9
Leagueville WSC	229	242	242	249	255	262
Moore Station WSC	382	412	408	420	433	445
Murchison	110	108	114	115	116	118
R P M WSC*	63	69	67	70	72	74
Virginia Hill WSC*	202	208	212	217	221	226
County-Other*	789	736	664	563	433	267
Mining*	173	182	193	222	255	296
Steam Electric Power*	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061
Livestock*	3,179	3,179	3,179	3,179	3,179	3,179
Irrigation*	459	459	459	459	459	459
Houston County Total	**8,645**	**8,643**	**8,668**	**8,763**	**8,909**	**8,832**
Houston County / Neches Basin Total	**1,389**	**1,307**	**1,263**	**1,229**	**1,219**	**1,161**
Grapeland	91	92	95	96	97	98
Pennington WSC*	25	22	19	18	16	15
The Consolidated WSC	30	31	32	33	33	34
County-Other	420	300	212	130	61	1
Manufacturing	11	11	11	12	12	13
Livestock	440	479	522	568	628	628
Irrigation	372	372	372	372	372	372
Houston County / Trinity Basin Total	**7,256**	**7,336**	**7,405**	**7,534**	**7,690**	**7,671**
Crockett	1,080	1,014	915	888	852	809
Grapeland	134	136	140	141	143	145
Lovelady	109	105	100	98	96	94
Pennington WSC*	46	42	35	33	31	28
TDCJ Eastham Unit	1,090	1,088	1,088	1,088	1,088	1,088
The Consolidated WSC	1,281	1,327	1,382	1,411	1,436	1,460

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
County-Other	33	24	17	10	5	0
Manufacturing	190	197	205	212	220	228
Mining	302	302	302	302	302	302
Livestock	1,226	1,336	1,456	1,586	1,752	1,752
Irrigation	1,765	1,765	1,765	1,765	1,765	1,765
Jasper County Total	**72,964**	**74,862**	**76,815**	**78,875**	**81,026**	**83,271**
Jasper County / Neches Basin Total	**66,746**	**68,707**	**70,721**	**72,833**	**75,028**	**77,308**
Brookeland FWSD	45	42	40	37	35	32
Jasper	1,768	1,681	1,579	1,489	1,398	1,310
Rayburn Country MUD	278	264	247	231	216	201
Rural WSC	106	100	94	88	82	76
South Jasper County WSC	55	52	48	45	42	39
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	312	295	276	259	242	224
County-Other	554	511	462	414	364	310
Manufacturing	57,668	59,802	62,015	64,310	66,689	69,156
Mining	28	28	28	28	28	28
Livestock	5,741	5,741	5,741	5,741	5,741	5,741
Irrigation	191	191	191	191	191	191
Jasper County / Sabine Basin Total	**6,218**	**6,155**	**6,094**	**6,042**	**5,998**	**5,963**
Jasper	9	8	8	7	7	6
Jasper County WCID 1	208	206	207	209	215	225
Kirbyville	407	404	406	412	424	443
Mauriceville SUD	10	10	10	10	9	9
South Jasper County WSC	160	151	142	133	124	115
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	90	93	97	102	109	118
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	107	101	94	88	82	77
County-Other	583	538	486	437	384	326
Livestock	4,532	4,532	4,532	4,532	4,532	4,532
Irrigation	112	112	112	112	112	112
Jefferson County Total	**323,700**	**359,266**	**394,429**	**428,674**	**462,931**	**497,199**
Jefferson County / Neches Basin Total	**95,559**	**111,495**	**127,445**	**143,022**	**158,601**	**174,182**
Beaumont	9,238	9,462	9,724	9,597	9,472	9,349
Bevil Oaks	99	100	100	98	97	96
China	2	2	2	2	2	2
Groves	71	70	70	70	70	70

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Jefferson County WCID 10	88	88	88	87	86	85
Meeker MWD	103	104	103	102	101	100
Nederland	83	83	83	82	81	80
Nome	101	101	101	100	99	97
Port Neches	794	797	795	785	775	766
County-Other	107	91	58	53	48	43
Manufacturing	78,622	94,346	110,070	125,795	141,519	157,243
Livestock	54	54	54	54	54	54
Irrigation	6,197	6,197	6,197	6,197	6,197	6,197
Jefferson County / Neches-Trinity Basin Total	**228,141**	**247,771**	**266,984**	**285,652**	**304,330**	**323,017**
Beaumont	20,181	20,672	21,243	20,968	20,695	20,425
China	176	177	177	174	172	170
Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	613	610	610	610	610	610
Groves	2,218	2,209	2,209	2,209	2,209	2,209
Jefferson County WCID 10	509	512	510	504	498	492
Meeker MWD	282	283	282	279	275	272
Nederland	2,339	2,350	2,344	2,315	2,287	2,260
Nome	44	45	44	44	43	43
Port Arthur	18,309	18,454	18,405	18,183	17,964	17,748
Port Neches	764	767	765	756	747	738
Trinity Bay Conservation District*	36	36	36	36	35	35
West Jefferson County MWD	929	928	936	948	960	972
County-Other	1,985	1,678	1,077	983	891	796
Manufacturing	96,378	115,654	134,930	154,205	173,481	192,757
Mining	294	312	332	354	379	406
Livestock	745	745	745	745	745	745
Irrigation	82,339	82,339	82,339	82,339	82,339	82,339
Nacogdoches County Total	**20,299**	**20,894**	**21,521**	**22,392**	**23,344**	**24,040**
Nacogdoches County / Neches Basin Total	**20,299**	**20,894**	**21,521**	**22,392**	**23,344**	**24,040**
Appleby WSC	1,044	1,076	1,107	1,160	1,212	1,263
Caro WSC	372	383	394	413	431	449
Cushing	139	144	148	155	162	168
D & M WSC	1,054	1,084	1,116	1,169	1,221	1,272
Etoile WSC	337	347	357	374	391	407
Garrison	259	266	273	284	295	305
Lilly Grove SUD	500	514	529	554	578	602

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Melrose WSC	815	839	863	904	944	985
Nacogdoches	7,421	7,614	7,809	8,104	8,397	8,690
Swift WSC	422	434	446	468	489	509
Woden WSC	262	269	276	289	302	315
County-Other	600	614	632	662	692	721
Manufacturing	2,892	2,999	3,110	3,225	3,344	3,468
Mining	891	891	891	891	891	891
Steam Electric Power	400	400	400	400	400	400
Livestock	2,625	2,754	2,904	3,074	3,329	3,329
Irrigation	266	266	266	266	266	266
Newton County Total	**14,625**	**14,704**	**14,789**	**14,890**	**15,001**	**15,128**
Newton County / Sabine Basin Total	**14,625**	**14,704**	**14,789**	**14,890**	**15,001**	**15,128**
Bon Wier WSC	86	74	63	52	41	30
Brookeland FWSD	61	55	49	43	37	32
Mauriceville SUD	31	31	30	27	23	20
Newton	343	311	278	247	217	189
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	12	11	10	9	7	6
South Newton WSC	233	211	187	165	143	122
County-Other	693	618	543	474	407	340
Manufacturing	6,140	6,367	6,603	6,847	7,100	7,363
Mining	3	3	3	3	3	3
Steam Electric Power	6,808	6,808	6,808	6,808	6,808	6,808
Livestock	114	114	114	114	114	114
Irrigation	101	101	101	101	101	101
Orange County Total	**127,454**	**131,413**	**135,440**	**139,421**	**143,563**	**147,873**
Orange County / Neches Basin Total	**15,620**	**15,644**	**15,715**	**15,693**	**15,685**	**15,686**
Bridge City	221	236	238	245	252	257
Kelly G Brewer	150	151	151	148	145	142
Mauriceville SUD	69	73	76	76	76	76
Orange County WCID 1	1,255	1,192	1,190	1,112	1,038	967
Orangefield WSC	402	457	522	598	684	782
County-Other	920	856	780	675	567	451
Manufacturing	2,044	2,120	2,199	2,280	2,364	2,452
Mining	11	11	11	11	11	11
Steam Electric Power	10,497	10,497	10,497	10,497	10,497	10,497

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Livestock	51	51	51	51	51	51
Orange County / Neches-Trinity Basin Total	**142**	**151**	**151**	**156**	**160**	**163**
Bridge City	139	148	149	154	158	161
County-Other	2	2	1	1	1	1
Livestock	1	1	1	1	1	1
Orange County / Sabine Basin Total	**111,692**	**115,618**	**119,574**	**123,572**	**127,718**	**132,024**
Bridge City	911	974	983	1,010	1,036	1,061
Kelly G Brewer	165	166	167	163	160	156
Mauriceville SUD	656	694	715	722	719	713
Orange	3,522	3,582	3,598	3,561	3,525	3,489
Orange County WCID 1	201	191	190	178	166	155
Orange County WCID 2	456	452	452	439	425	412
Orangefield WSC	515	586	671	767	877	1,004
Pinehurst	346	352	353	350	346	342
South Newton WSC	188	192	193	191	189	187
County-Other	985	916	835	723	607	482
Manufacturing	101,788	105,554	109,458	113,509	117,709	122,064
Livestock	135	135	135	135	135	135
Irrigation	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824
Panola County Total	**9,444**	**9,392**	**9,334**	**9,280**	**9,235**	**9,196**
Panola County / Cypress Basin Total	**8**	**7**	**6**	**5**	**5**	**5**
Panola-Bethany WSC*	8	7	6	5	5	5
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Panola County / Sabine Basin Total	**9,436**	**9,385**	**9,328**	**9,275**	**9,230**	**9,191**
Beckville	87	77	69	62	56	51
Carthage	1,649	1,632	1,609	1,578	1,549	1,520
Clayton WSC	257	281	311	325	340	355
Deberry WSC	94	82	68	59	50	40
Elysian Fields WSC*	5	6	6	6	6	6
Gill WSC*	91	84	77	71	66	61
Hollands Quarter WSC	124	118	111	106	101	96
Minden Brachfield WSC	13	15	19	20	22	24
Panola-Bethany WSC*	133	118	106	96	86	79
Rehobeth WSC	88	79	68	61	54	47

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Tatum	33	25	20	15	11	9
County-Other	1,073	1,031	977	937	896	854
Manufacturing	1,298	1,346	1,396	1,448	1,502	1,558
Mining	2,280	2,280	2,280	2,280	2,280	2,280
Livestock	1,142	1,142	1,142	1,142	1,142	1,142
Irrigation	1,069	1,069	1,069	1,069	1,069	1,069
Polk County Total	**1,822**	**1,916**	**1,976**	**2,037**	**2,098**	**2,161**
Polk County / Neches Basin Total	**1,822**	**1,916**	**1,976**	**2,037**	**2,098**	**2,161**
Chester WSC	49	53	55	57	59	61
Corrigan	238	255	264	274	283	293
Damascus-Stryker WSC	188	202	210	218	226	234
Lake Livingston WSC*	75	81	84	87	90	94
Leggett WSC*	2	2	3	3	3	3
Moscow WSC*	85	91	95	98	102	106
Soda WSC*	17	18	19	20	20	21
County-Other*	406	436	452	469	487	504
Manufacturing*	392	407	422	438	454	471
Mining*	26	27	28	29	30	30
Livestock*	114	114	114	114	114	114
Irrigation*	230	230	230	230	230	230
Rusk County Total	**30,230**	**30,021**	**29,743**	**29,437**	**29,114**	**28,806**
Rusk County / Neches Basin Total	**5,659**	**5,549**	**5,413**	**5,266**	**5,103**	**4,948**
Ebenezer WSC	181	175	166	156	146	137
Garrison	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gaston WSC	149	144	137	128	120	112
Goodsprings WSC	230	221	210	198	185	173
Henderson	2,353	2,323	2,308	2,306	2,313	2,332
Jacobs WSC	5	5	5	5	6	6
Minden Brachfield WSC	142	138	131	124	116	108
Mt Enterprise WSC	222	214	204	191	179	167
New London	164	158	151	142	133	124
Overton*	42	41	39	37	34	32
South Rusk County WSC	242	234	222	209	196	182
Wright City WSC	23	22	21	20	18	17
County-Other	480	430	357	269	175	75
Manufacturing	26	27	28	29	30	31

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Mining	322	322	322	322	322	322
Livestock	922	939	956	974	974	974
Irrigation	155	155	155	155	155	155
Rusk County / Sabine Basin Total	**24,571**	**24,472**	**24,330**	**24,171**	**24,011**	**23,858**
Chalk Hill SUD*	232	222	211	199	186	174
Cross Roads SUD*	296	305	318	334	351	371
Crystal Farms WSC	130	141	156	173	192	215
Elderville WSC*	161	156	148	139	131	122
Henderson	707	698	694	694	696	701
Jacobs WSC	304	321	341	365	391	423
Kilgore*	1,089	1,054	1,003	945	888	830
Minden Brachfield WSC	71	69	65	61	57	53
New London	118	115	109	102	96	90
New Prospect WSC	149	143	136	128	120	112
Overton*	404	391	372	350	330	309
Southern Utilities*	79	76	72	68	64	59
Tatum	251	242	230	216	202	189
West Gregg SUD*	9	11	13	17	21	26
County-Other	483	433	360	271	177	75
Mining	167	167	167	167	167	167
Steam Electric Power	19,406	19,406	19,406	19,406	19,406	19,406
Livestock	394	401	408	415	415	415
Irrigation	121	121	121	121	121	121
Sabine County Total	**2,419**	**2,409**	**2,429**	**2,506**	**2,457**	**2,410**
Sabine County / Neches Basin Total	**859**	**855**	**859**	**875**	**876**	**876**
Brookeland FWSD	70	63	58	54	51	47
G M WSC	129	118	107	101	94	88
Pineland	169	153	140	132	124	115
Manufacturing	449	466	483	501	520	539
Livestock	42	55	71	87	87	87
Sabine County / Sabine Basin Total	**1,560**	**1,554**	**1,570**	**1,631**	**1,581**	**1,534**
Brookeland FWSD	10	9	8	8	7	7
G M WSC	487	444	404	380	356	332
Hemphill	471	432	397	377	357	338
New WSC	5	4	4	3	3	3

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
County-Other	103	93	85	80	75	71
Mining	203	203	203	203	203	203
Livestock	281	369	469	580	580	580
San Augustine County Total	**3,329**	**3,313**	**3,324**	**3,349**	**3,303**	**3,269**
San Augustine County / Neches Basin Total	**3,208**	**3,192**	**3,199**	**3,220**	**3,178**	**3,150**
Choice WSC	2	2	2	2	2	2
Denning WSC	120	108	98	91	84	77
New WSC	86	77	69	64	59	55
San Augustine	642	610	593	583	583	595
San Augustine Rural WSC	271	296	314	307	298	290
Sand Hills WSC	6	7	8	8	8	8
County-Other	179	138	101	83	62	41
Manufacturing	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mining	1,411	1,411	1,411	1,411	1,411	1,411
Livestock	474	526	586	654	654	654
Irrigation	13	13	13	13	13	13
San Augustine County / Sabine Basin Total	**121**	**121**	**125**	**129**	**125**	**119**
G M WSC	18	17	17	16	15	14
San Augustine Rural WSC	15	16	17	17	17	16
County-Other	28	21	16	13	10	6
Livestock	59	66	74	82	82	82
Irrigation	1	1	1	1	1	1
Shelby County Total	**12,160**	**12,743**	**13,450**	**14,348**	**14,287**	**14,232**
Shelby County / Neches Basin Total	**1,031**	**1,186**	**1,378**	**1,595**	**1,610**	**1,627**
Choice WSC	28	29	31	34	37	41
Sand Hills WSC	159	181	211	230	249	268
Timpson	3	2	2	2	1	1
County-Other	152	152	149	145	139	133
Mining	3	3	3	3	3	3
Livestock	683	816	979	1,178	1,178	1,178
Irrigation	3	3	3	3	3	3
Shelby County / Sabine Basin Total	**11,129**	**11,557**	**12,072**	**12,753**	**12,677**	**12,605**
Center	2,135	2,099	2,047	1,995	1,944	1,894
Choice WSC	79	84	91	98	108	119

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
East Lamar WSC	108	114	123	134	146	162
Five Way WSC	151	152	153	152	152	151
Flat Fork WSC	114	94	79	65	53	44
Huxley	271	230	199	173	152	135
Joaquin	124	99	80	63	50	39
McClelland WSC	188	167	138	119	99	78
New WSC	4	5	6	6	7	7
Sand Hills WSC	135	153	179	194	210	227
Tenaha	250	221	182	154	126	97
Timpson	177	157	127	107	88	66
County-Other	804	804	785	764	736	700
Manufacturing	1,860	1,929	2,000	2,074	2,151	2,231
Mining	2,067	2,067	2,067	2,067	2,067	2,067
Livestock	2,655	3,175	3,809	4,581	4,581	4,581
Irrigation	7	7	7	7	7	7
Smith County Total	**54,367**	**59,455**	**64,898**	**68,066**	**71,382**	**74,857**
Smith County / Neches Basin Total	**54,367**	**59,455**	**64,898**	**68,066**	**71,382**	**74,857**
Arp	155	141	132	120	108	96
Ben Wheeler WSC*	3	3	4	4	5	5
Bullard	998	1,153	1,262	1,364	1,464	1,561
Carroll WSC*	75	83	89	94	99	104
Crystal Systems Texas*	135	158	174	189	204	218
Dean WSC	723	776	815	846	875	904
Emerald Bay MUD	254	267	276	287	287	287
Jackson WSC*	291	313	329	342	355	367
Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water*	173	206	229	250	271	292
Lindale Rural WSC*	397	426	447	463	479	495
Lindale*	382	393	403	406	410	414
Overton*	7	7	8	8	8	8
R P M WSC*	11	9	8	7	6	5
Southern Utilities*	7,836	8,411	8,835	9,161	9,481	9,795
Troup	388	401	410	414	418	422
Tyler*	34,718	38,796	43,467	46,016	48,716	51,573
Walnut Grove WSC	1,253	1,336	1,399	1,446	1,493	1,538
Whitehouse	1,005	1,012	1,021	1,014	1,007	1,001
Wright City WSC	193	199	206	213	220	228
County-Other*	1,138	1,008	898	801	714	636

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Demand

	WUG Demand (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Manufacturing*	2,857	2,963	3,072	3,186	3,304	3,426
Mining	427	446	466	487	510	534
Livestock*	500	500	500	500	500	500
Irrigation*	448	448	448	448	448	448
Trinity County Total	**790**	**763**	**735**	**716**	**697**	**678**
Trinity County / Neches Basin Total	**790**	**763**	**735**	**716**	**697**	**678**
Centerville WSC	119	106	91	81	70	58
Groveton*	46	41	34	30	25	20
Pennington WSC*	31	25	21	17	14	12
County-Other*	120	117	115	114	114	114
Mining*	9	9	9	9	9	9
Livestock*	187	187	187	187	187	187
Irrigation*	278	278	278	278	278	278
Tyler County Total	**3,927**	**3,775**	**3,652**	**3,567**	**3,487**	**3,413**
Tyler County / Neches Basin Total	**3,927**	**3,775**	**3,652**	**3,567**	**3,487**	**3,413**
Chester WSC	101	88	74	64	54	43
Colmesneil	163	156	151	147	143	140
Cypress Creek WSC	101	89	79	71	63	57
Moscow WSC*	3	4	5	6	7	8
Seneca WSC	123	116	110	106	102	98
Tyler County SUD	632	602	579	563	548	535
Warren WSC	273	272	272	272	272	272
Wildwood POA	76	69	63	58	53	48
Woodville	880	920	970	1,024	1,088	1,162
County-Other	790	670	555	457	353	241
Manufacturing	118	122	127	132	137	142
Mining	42	42	42	42	42	42
Steam Electric Power	3	3	3	3	3	3
Livestock	268	268	268	268	268	268
Irrigation	354	354	354	354	354	354
Region I Demand Total	**755,106**	**803,748**	**852,417**	**897,825**	**942,672**	**987,594**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Groundwater Source Availability Total				**488,746**	**488,746**	**488,745**	**488,745**	**488,362**	**488,362**
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Anderson	Neches	Fresh	21,958	21,958	21,958	21,958	21,958	21,958
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Anderson	Trinity	Fresh	5,066	5,066	5,066	5,066	5,066	5,066
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	Fresh	27,611	27,611	27,611	27,611	27,611	27,611
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Cherokee	Neches	Fresh	15,241	15,241	15,241	15,241	15,241	15,241
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Henderson	Neches	Fresh	3,996	3,996	3,996	3,996	3,996	3,996
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Houston	Neches	Fresh	1,721	1,721	1,721	1,721	1,721	1,721
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	Fresh	634	634	634	634	634	634
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	Fresh	20,859	20,859	20,859	20,859	20,859	20,859
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Panola	Cypress	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Panola	Sabine	Fresh	4,999	4,999	4,999	4,999	4,999	4,999
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Rusk	Neches	Fresh	7,111	7,111	7,111	7,111	7,111	7,111
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Rusk	Sabine	Fresh	6,907	6,907	6,907	6,907	6,907	6,907
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	Fresh	356	356	356	356	356	356
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	Fresh	1,032	1,032	1,032	1,032	1,032	1,032
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	Fresh	303	303	303	303	303	303
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	San Augustine	Sabine	Fresh	284	284	284	284	284	284
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Shelby	Neches	Fresh	2,621	2,621	2,621	2,621	2,621	2,621
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Shelby	Sabine	Fresh	3,698	3,698	3,698	3,698	3,698	3,698
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Smith	Neches	Fresh	17,607	17,607	17,607	17,607	17,607	17,607
Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	Fresh	266	266	266	266	266	266
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Hardin	Neches	Fresh	37,571	37,571	37,571	37,571	37,571	37,571

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

** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, ‘reservoir’ is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Hardin	Trinity	Fresh	150	150	150	150	150	150
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Jasper	Neches	Fresh	40,821	40,821	40,821	40,821	40,821	40,821
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Jasper	Sabine	Fresh	32,544	32,544	32,544	32,544	32,544	32,544
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Jefferson	Neches	Fresh	1,853	1,853	1,853	1,853	1,853	1,853
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	Fresh	13,571	13,571	13,571	13,571	13,571	13,571
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Newton	Neches	Fresh	199	199	199	199	199	199
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Newton	Sabine	Fresh	37,309	37,309	37,309	37,309	37,309	37,309
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Orange	Neches	Fresh	6,266	6,266	6,266	6,266	6,266	6,266
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Orange	Neches-Trinity	Fresh	280	280	280	280	280	280
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Orange	Sabine	Fresh	18,659	18,659	18,659	18,659	18,659	18,659
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Polk	Neches	Fresh	17,825	17,825	17,825	17,825	17,825	17,825
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Sabine	Sabine	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gulf Coast Aquifer System	Tyler	Neches	Fresh	34,390	34,390	34,390	34,390	34,390	34,390
Other Aquifer	Anderson	Trinity	Fresh	298	298	298	298	298	298
Other Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	Fresh	812	812	812	812	812	812
Other Aquifer	Cherokee	Neches	Fresh	268	268	268	268	268	268
Other Aquifer	Henderson	Neches	Fresh	5	5	5	5	5	5
Other Aquifer	Henderson	Trinity	Fresh	680	680	680	680	680	680
Other Aquifer	Houston	Neches	Fresh	378	378	378	378	378	378
Other Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	Fresh	888	888	888	888	888	888
Other Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	Fresh	1,131	1,131	1,131	1,131	1,131	1,131

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

** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, ‘reservoir’ is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Other Aquifer	Rusk	Neches	Fresh	270	270	270	270	270	270
Other Aquifer	Rusk	Sabine	Fresh	469	469	469	469	469	469
Other Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	Fresh	336	336	336	336	336	336
Other Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	Fresh	1,395	1,395	1,395	1,395	1,395	1,395
Other Aquifer	Smith	Neches	Fresh	922	922	922	922	922	922
Other Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	Fresh	700	700	700	700	700	700
Queen City Aquifer	Anderson	Neches	Fresh	11,489	11,489	11,488	11,488	11,488	11,488
Queen City Aquifer	Anderson	Trinity	Fresh	5,102	5,102	5,102	5,102	5,102	5,102
Queen City Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	Fresh	1,095	1,095	1,095	1,095	1,095	1,095
Queen City Aquifer	Cherokee	Neches	Fresh	8,812	8,812	8,812	8,812	8,812	8,812
Queen City Aquifer	Henderson	Neches	Fresh	10,516	10,516	10,516	10,516	10,516	10,516
Queen City Aquifer	Houston	Neches	Fresh	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080	2,080
Queen City Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	Fresh	216	216	216	216	216	216
Queen City Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	Fresh	2,946	2,946	2,946	2,946	2,946	2,946
Queen City Aquifer	Rusk	Neches	Fresh	39	39	39	39	39	39
Queen City Aquifer	Rusk	Sabine	Fresh	20	20	20	20	20	20
Queen City Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen City Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen City Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen City Aquifer	Shelby	Sabine	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen City Aquifer	Smith	Neches	Fresh	20,121	20,121	20,121	20,121	20,121	20,121

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

** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, ‘reservoir’ is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Queen City Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sparta Aquifer	Anderson	Neches	Fresh	109	109	109	109	109	109
Sparta Aquifer	Anderson	Trinity	Fresh	198	198	198	198	198	198
Sparta Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	Fresh	390	390	390	390	390	390
Sparta Aquifer	Cherokee	Neches	Fresh	352	352	352	352	352	352
Sparta Aquifer	Houston	Neches	Fresh	505	505	505	505	505	505
Sparta Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	Fresh	977	977	977	977	977	977
Sparta Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	Fresh	362	362	362	362	362	362
Sparta Aquifer	Rusk	Neches	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sparta Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	Fresh	36	36	36	36	36	36
Sparta Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	Fresh	13	13	13	13	13	13
Sparta Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	Fresh	163	163	163	163	163	163
Sparta Aquifer	San Augustine	Sabine	Fresh	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sparta Aquifer	Shelby	Sabine	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sparta Aquifer	Smith	Neches	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sparta Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	Fresh	152	152	152	152	152	152
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Angelina	Neches	Fresh	16,890	16,890	16,890	16,890	16,507	16,507
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Houston	Neches	Fresh	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324	1,324
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Houston	Trinity	Fresh	4,061	4,061	4,061	4,061	4,061	4,061
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Jasper	Neches	Fresh	600	600	600	600	600	600
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Nacogdoches	Neches	Fresh	235	235	235	235	235	235
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Newton	Neches	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, ‘reservoir’ is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Newton	Sabine	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Polk	Neches	Fresh	570	570	570	570	570	570
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Sabine	Neches	Fresh	3,724	3,724	3,724	3,724	3,724	3,724
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Sabine	Sabine	Fresh	575	575	575	575	575	575
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	San Augustine	Neches	Fresh	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	San Augustine	Sabine	Fresh	9	9	9	9	9	9
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Trinity	Neches	Fresh	700	700	700	700	700	700
Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	Tyler	Neches	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reuse Source Availability Total				**1,601**	**1,614**	**1,627**	**1,638**	**1,652**	**1,667**
Direct Reuse	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	Fresh	180	180	180	180	180	180
Direct Reuse	Orange	Sabine	Fresh	15	15	15	15	15	15
Direct Reuse	Sabine	Sabine	Fresh	20	20	20	20	20	20
Direct Reuse	Shelby	Sabine	Fresh	233	246	259	270	284	299
Water Recycling	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	Fresh	1,153	1,153	1,153	1,153	1,153	1,153
Surface Water Source Availability Total				**3,680,344**	**3,675,797**	**3,671,378**	**3,666,079**	**3,661,141**	**3,656,359**
Athens Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	4,540	4,480	4,420	4,360	4,300	4,240
Bellwood Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	859	859	859	859	859	859
Center Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Sabine	Fresh	500	500	500	500	500	500
Cherokee Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Sabine	Fresh	31,480	31,224	30,960	30,712	30,456	30,200
Houston County Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Trinity	Fresh	6,250	6,145	6,040	5,935	5,830	5,725

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

** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, 'reservoir' is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200	6,200
Kurth Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	17,425	17,448	17,471	17,494	17,517	17,540
Lake Naconiche Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500
Martin Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Sabine	Fresh	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Murvaul Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Sabine	Fresh	20,800	20,016	19,482	18,448	17,664	16,880
Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	14,335	13,973	13,611	13,249	12,887	12,525
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Anderson	Neches	Fresh	427	427	427	427	427	427
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Angelina	Neches	Fresh	997	997	997	997	997	997
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Cherokee	Neches	Fresh	1,694	1,694	1,694	1,694	1,694	1,694
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Hardin	Neches	Fresh	184	184	184	184	184	184
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Henderson	Neches	Fresh	770	770	770	770	770	770
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Houston	Neches	Fresh	473	473	473	473	473	473
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Jasper	Neches	Fresh	118	118	118	118	118	118
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Nacogdoches	Neches	Fresh	8,913	8,913	8,913	8,913	8,913	8,913
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Orange	Neches	Fresh	27	27	27	27	27	27
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Polk	Neches	Fresh	147	147	147	147	147	147
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Rusk	Neches	Fresh	991	991	991	991	991	991
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Sabine	Neches	Fresh	26	26	26	26	26	26
Neches Livestock Local Supply	San Augustine	Neches	Fresh	1,632	1,632	1,632	1,632	1,632	1,632
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Shelby	Neches	Fresh	2,101	2,101	2,101	2,101	2,101	2,101

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

** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, ‘reservoir’ is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Smith	Neches	Fresh	313	313	313	313	313	313
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Trinity	Neches	Fresh	233	233	233	233	233	233
Neches Livestock Local Supply	Tyler	Neches	Fresh	239	239	239	239	239	239
Neches Other Local Supply	Cherokee	Neches	Fresh	58	58	58	58	58	58
Neches Other Local Supply	Hardin	Neches	Fresh	265	265	265	265	265	265
Neches Other Local Supply	Jefferson	Neches	Fresh	7	7	7	7	7	7
Neches Other Local Supply	Nacogdoches	Neches	Fresh	420	420	420	420	420	420
Neches Other Local Supply	Polk	Neches	Fresh	1	1	1	1	1	1
Neches Other Local Supply	Tyler	Neches	Fresh	8	8	8	8	8	8
Neches Run-of-River	Anderson	Neches	Fresh	80	80	80	80	80	80
Neches Run-of-River	Angelina	Neches	Fresh	10	10	10	10	10	10
Neches Run-of-River	Cherokee	Neches	Fresh	58	58	58	58	58	58
Neches Run-of-River	Hardin	Neches	Fresh	54	54	54	54	54	54
Neches Run-of-River	Houston	Neches	Fresh	147	147	147	147	147	147
Neches Run-of-River	Jasper	Neches	Fresh	382,526	382,526	382,526	382,526	382,526	382,526
Neches Run-of-River	Jefferson	Neches	Fresh	12,102	12,560	12,977	12,795	12,804	12,969
Neches Run-of-River	Nacogdoches	Neches	Fresh	82	82	82	82	82	82
Neches Run-of-River	Rusk	Neches	Fresh	60	60	60	60	60	60
Neches Run-of-River	Sabine	Neches	Fresh	162	162	162	162	162	162
Neches Run-of-River	Shelby	Neches	Fresh	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Neches Run-of-River	Smith	Neches	Fresh	45	45	45	45	45	45

* Salinity field indicates whether the source availability is considered ‘fresh’ (less than 1,000 mg/L), ‘brackish’ (1,000 to 10,000 mg/L), ‘saline’ (10,001 mg/L to 34,999 mg/L), or ‘seawater’ (35,000 mg/L or greater). Sources can also be labeled as ‘fresh/brackish’ or ‘brackish/saline’, if a combination of the salinity types is appropriate.
** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, ‘reservoir’ is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Neches Run-of-River	Trinity	Neches	Fresh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neches Run-of-River	Tyler	Neches	Fresh	88	88	88	88	88	88
Neches-Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	Fresh	800	800	800	800	800	800
Neches-Trinity Other Local Supply	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	Fresh	102	102	102	102	102	102
Neches-Trinity Run-of-River	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	Fresh	51,274	51,274	51,274	51,274	51,274	51,274
Palestine Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	177,110	175,040	172,970	170,950	168,930	166,910
Pinkston Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	3,612	3,600	3,587	3,575	3,562	3,550
Rusk City Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	10	10	10	10	10	10
Sabine Livestock Local Supply	Jasper	Sabine	Fresh	93	93	93	93	93	93
Sabine Livestock Local Supply	Newton	Sabine	Fresh	157	157	157	157	157	157
Sabine Livestock Local Supply	Orange	Sabine	Fresh	71	71	71	71	71	71
Sabine Livestock Local Supply	Panola	Sabine	Fresh	2,596	2,596	2,596	2,596	2,596	2,596
Sabine Livestock Local Supply	Rusk	Sabine	Fresh	424	424	424	424	424	424
Sabine Livestock Local Supply	Sabine	Sabine	Fresh	175	175	175	175	175	175
Sabine Livestock Local Supply	San Augustine	Sabine	Fresh	203	203	203	203	203	203
Sabine Livestock Local Supply	Shelby	Sabine	Fresh	8,168	8,168	8,168	8,168	8,168	8,168
Sabine Other Local Supply	Newton	Sabine	Fresh	78	78	78	78	78	78
Sabine Other Local Supply	Orange	Sabine	Fresh	161	161	161	161	161	161
Sabine Other Local Supply	Rusk	Sabine	Fresh	1,258	1,258	1,258	1,258	1,258	1,258
Sabine Run-of-River	Newton	Sabine	Fresh	130,146	130,146	130,146	130,146	130,146	130,146

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

** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, ‘reservoir’ is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Source Total Availability

				Source Availability (acre-feet per year)					
Source Name	**County**	**Basin**	**Salinity***	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Sabine Run-of-River	Orange	Sabine	Fresh	28	28	28	28	28	28
Sabine Run-of-River	Panola	Sabine	Fresh	581	581	581	581	581	581
Sabine Run-of-River	Rusk	Sabine	Fresh	137	137	137	137	137	137
Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000
San Augustine Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285	1,285
Striker Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	10,500	9,990	9,480	8,970	8,460	7,950
Timpson Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	350	350	350	350	350	350
Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Sabine	Fresh	941,900	941,583	941,230	940,949	940,632	940,315
Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Sabine-Louisiana	Fresh	941,900	941,583	941,230	940,949	940,632	940,315
Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Anderson	Trinity	Fresh	848	848	848	848	848	848
Trinity Livestock Local Supply	Houston	Trinity	Fresh	1,318	1,318	1,318	1,318	1,318	1,318
Trinity Run-of-River	Anderson	Trinity	Fresh	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290
Trinity Run-of-River	Houston	Trinity	Fresh	2,522	2,522	2,522	2,522	2,522	2,522
Tyler Lake/Reservoir	Reservoir**	Neches	Fresh	32,900	32,665	32,430	32,203	31,977	31,750
Region I Source Availability Total				**4,170,691**	**4,166,157**	**4,161,750**	**4,156,462**	**4,151,155**	**4,146,388**

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

** Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, 'reservoir' is applied to all reservoir sources.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Anderson County WUG Total			**23,150**	**23,276**	**23,409**	**23,526**	**23,647**	**23,772**
Anderson County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**8,967**	**9,046**	**9,123**	**9,207**	**9,297**	**9,392**
Berryville	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	2	2	2	2	2	2
Brushy Creek WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	288	286	282	278	275	272
Frankston	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	212	211	208	205	203	200
Frankston Rural WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	236	234	231	228	225	222
Neches WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	156	154	152	151	149	147
Norwood WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	140	139	138	136	135	133
Palestine	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	400	400	400	400	400	400
Palestine	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	3,114	3,114	3,114	3,114	3,114	3,114
Slocum WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	299	297	293	289	285	282
Walston Springs WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	334	361	391	424	460	499
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | Anderson County	87	87	87	87	87	87
County-Other	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	16	16	16	16	16	16
County-Other	I	Queen City Aquifer | Anderson County	377	377	376	377	376	376
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | Anderson County	82	82	82	82	82	82
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	1,686	1,748	1,813	1,880	1,950	2,022
Steam Electric Power		No water supply associated with WUG	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	145	145	145	145	145	145
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	333	333	333	333	333	333
Livestock	I	Queen City Aquifer | Anderson County	160	160	160	160	160	160
Livestock	I	Sparta Aquifer | Anderson County	60	60	60	60	60	60

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	400	400	400	400	400	400
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	80	80	80	80	80	80
Irrigation	I	Queen City Aquifer | Anderson County	360	360	360	360	360	360
Anderson County / Trinity Basin WUG Total			**14,183**	**14,230**	**14,286**	**14,319**	**14,350**	**14,380**
Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	114	114	112	110	109	108
B B S WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	138	137	135	133	132	130
B C Y WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	264	262	258	255	252	249
Brushy Creek WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	142	141	140	138	136	134
Elkhart	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	304	303	299	296	292	289
Four Pines WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	298	296	293	290	287	284
Norwood WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	10	10	9	9	9	9
Palestine	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	356	356	356	356	356	356
Palestine	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	2,774	2,774	2,774	2,774	2,774	2,774
Pleasant Springs WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	176	176	176	176	176	176
Pleasant Springs WSC	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	121	121	121	121	121	121
Slocum WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	26	26	25	25	25	24
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	1,741	1,738	1,738	1,738	1,738	1,738
TDCJ Coffield Michael	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	3,469	3,465	3,465	3,465	3,465	3,465
The Consolidated WSC	I	Houston County Lake/Reservoir	477	529	592	630	663	695
Tucker WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	130	130	128	126	124	122
Walston Springs WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	127	136	148	161	174	189

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | Anderson County	173	173	173	173	173	173
County-Other	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	31	31	31	31	31	31
County-Other	I	Queen City Aquifer | Anderson County	747	747	748	747	748	748
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | Anderson County	165	165	165	165	165	165
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Anderson County	34	34	34	34	34	34
Steam Electric Power		No water supply associated with WUG	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	33	33	33	33	33	33
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	848	848	848	848	848	848
Livestock	I	Queen City Aquifer | Anderson County	64	64	64	64	64	64
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	92	92	92	92	92	92
Irrigation	I	Queen City Aquifer | Anderson County	39	39	39	39	39	39
Irrigation	I	Trinity Run-of-River	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290	1,290
Angelina County WUG Total			**19,897**	**20,073**	**20,202**	**20,350**	**20,498**	**20,651**
Angelina County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**19,897**	**20,073**	**20,202**	**20,350**	**20,498**	**20,651**
Angelina WSC	I	Other Aquifer | Angelina County	355	359	361	365	368	372
Central WCID of Angelina County	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	620	631	637	643	650	656
Diboll	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	1,806	1,806	1,806	1,806	1,806	1,806
Diboll	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Angelina County	520	520	520	520	520	520
Four Way SUD	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Angelina County	435	439	443	447	451	455
Hudson WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	1,003	1,020	1,028	1,038	1,047	1,057
Huntington	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	448	448	448	448	448	448
Huntington	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Angelina County	261	264	266	269	271	274

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Lufkin	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	4,144	4,119	4,093	4,066	4,038	4,010
Lufkin	I	Kurth Lake/Reservoir	2,448	2,555	2,633	2,726	2,819	2,912
M & M WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	260	262	264	267	269	272
Pollok-Redtown WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	197	199	200	202	204	206
Redland WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	508	510	512	514	516	518
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	29	29	29	29	29	29
Woodlawn WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	242	245	246	249	251	254
Zavalla	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Angelina County	102	103	104	104	105	107
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	211	213	216	218	220	222
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | Angelina County	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | Angelina County	50	51	52	52	53	53
County-Other	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Angelina County	277	281	284	286	289	292
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	807	832	858	885	913	941
Manufacturing	I	Kurth Lake/Reservoir	449	466	483	501	519	539
Manufacturing	I	Other Aquifer | Angelina County	457	453	451	447	444	440
Manufacturing	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Angelina County	1,754	1,754	1,754	1,754	1,754	1,754
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Angelina County	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	I	Sparta Aquifer | Angelina County	291	291	291	291	291	291
Mining	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Angelina County	116	116	116	116	116	116
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	997	997	997	997	997	997
Irrigation	I	Kurth Lake/Reservoir	779	779	779	779	779	779

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Angelina County	331	331	331	331	331	331
Cherokee County WUG Total			**10,514**	**10,438**	**10,334**	**10,216**	**10,096**	**9,974**
Cherokee County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**10,514**	**10,438**	**10,334**	**10,216**	**10,096**	**9,974**
Afton Grove WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	64	66	68	69	71	74
Afton Grove WSC	I	Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	150	153	157	162	167	171
Alto	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	218	215	211	206	202	197
Alto Rural WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	817	817	817	817	817	817
Blackjack WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	102	100	98	96	94	92
Bullard	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	103	106	109	111	113	116
Bullard	I	Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	62	72	78	84	90	95
Craft Turney WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	191	188	184	180	176	172
Craft Turney WSC	I	Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	444	438	429	420	410	400
Gum Creek WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	31	30	30	29	29	28
Gum Creek WSC	I	Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	72	71	69	68	66	64
Jacksonville	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	773	763	748	733	717	702
Jacksonville	I	Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	1,803	1,778	1,746	1,709	1,673	1,636
New Summerfield	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	113	111	109	106	104	101
North Cherokee WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	142	140	137	134	131	128
North Cherokee WSC	I	Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	330	325	319	312	305	297
Pollok-Redtown WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Angelina County	8	8	8	8	8	7
Rusk	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	845	846	848	849	853	858

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Rusk	I	Rusk City Lake/Reservoir	10	10	10	10	10	10
Rusk Rural WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	331	326	321	315	310	304
South Rusk County WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	5	5	5	5	4	4
Southern Utilities*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	423	423	423	423	423	423
Southern Utilities*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	132	135	139	143	147	152
Southern Utilities*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	97	84	68	50	32	13
Troup	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	11	11	11	11	11	10
Walnut Grove WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	6	5	5	5	4	4
Walnut Grove WSC	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	6	6	5	5	5	4
Walnut Grove WSC	I	Tyler Lake/Reservoir	6	5	5	5	4	4
Wells	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	124	130	138	146	155	164
West Jacksonville WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	231	227	222	218	213	208
Wright City WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	47	46	46	45	43	43
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	238	202	160	114	63	10
County-Other	I	Queen City Aquifer | Cherokee County	160	136	108	77	43	6
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | Cherokee County	37	32	25	18	10	1
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	25	26	26	27	28	29
Manufacturing	I	Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	57	59	62	64	66	68
Mining	I	Local Surface Water Supply	58	58	58	58	58	58
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Cherokee County	129	129	129	129	129	129
Steam Electric Power	I	Striker Lake/Reservoir	431	474	521	573	630	693
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	168	168	168	168	168	168

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	853	853	853	853	853	853
Livestock	I	Queen City Aquifer | Cherokee County	210	210	210	210	210	210
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	170	170	170	170	170	170
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	58	58	58	58	58	58
Irrigation	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	41	36	32	28	25	25
Irrigation	I	Queen City Aquifer | Cherokee County	182	187	191	191	191	191
Irrigation	I	Sparta Aquifer | Cherokee County	0	0	0	4	7	7
Hardin County WUG Total			**9,669**	**10,450**	**11,186**	**11,130**	**11,080**	**11,038**
Hardin County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**9,642**	**10,423**	**11,159**	**11,104**	**11,054**	**11,012**
Hardin County WCID 1	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	130	131	134	136	139	141
Kountze	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	248	245	242	237	231	226
Lumberton MUD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	3,329	4,054	4,727	4,617	4,508	4,401
North Hardin WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	539	553	568	583	598	614
Silsbee	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	1,001	1,051	1,109	1,171	1,236	1,305
Sour Lake	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	296	293	289	282	276	269
West Hardin WSC*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	385	383	378	369	360	352
Wildwood POA	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	118	117	116	113	110	108
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	2,105	2,105	2,105	2,105	2,105	2,105
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	243	243	243	243	243	243
Mining	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	13	13	13	13	13	13
Steam Electric Power	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	1	1	1	1	1	1
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	61	61	61	61	61	61

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	184	184	184	184	184	184
Irrigation	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	935	935	935	935	935	935
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	54	54	54	54	54	54
Hardin County / Trinity Basin WUG Total			**27**	**27**	**27**	**26**	**26**	**26**
Lake Livingston WSC*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	10	10	10	9	9	9
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	16	16	16	16	16	16
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	1	1	1	1	1	1
Henderson County WUG Total			**8,636**	**8,866**	**8,512**	**8,183**	**7,876**	**7,687**
Henderson County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**8,636**	**8,866**	**8,512**	**8,183**	**7,876**	**7,687**
Athens*	I	Athens Lake/Reservoir	10	16	18	17	14	12
Athens*	C	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	16	13	10	8	6	6
Athens*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	16	13	10	8	7	6
Berryville	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	95	90	97	98	99	99
Bethel Ash WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	269	270	281	285	290	294
Brownsboro	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	246	267	263	271	279	288
Brushy Creek WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	5	5	5	5	5	5
Chandler	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	676	831	980	980	980	980
Edom WSC*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Van Zandt County	14	14	14	14	13	13
Frankston	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	7	8	8	8	9	9
Leagueville WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	229	242	242	249	255	262
Moore Station WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	382	412	408	420	433	445
Murchison	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	110	108	114	115	116	118

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
R P M WSC*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Van Zandt County	28	27	26	29	31	33
R P M WSC*	D	Queen City Aquifer | Van Zandt County	35	42	41	41	41	41
Virginia Hill WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	202	208	212	217	221	226
County-Other*	I	Other Aquifer | Henderson County	539	539	539	539	539	539
County-Other*	I	Queen City Aquifer | Henderson County	660	660	660	660	660	660
Mining*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	38	46	56	83	88	33
Mining*	I	Other Aquifer | Henderson County	120	120	120	120	120	120
Steam Electric Power*		No water supply associated with WUG	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock*	I	Athens Lake/Reservoir	3,023	3,023	2,516	2,139	1,807	1,638
Livestock*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock*	I	Local Surface Water Supply	632	632	632	632	632	632
Livestock*	I	Queen City Aquifer | Henderson County	419	419	419	419	419	419
Irrigation*	I	Athens Lake/Reservoir	85	90	79	71	63	60
Irrigation*	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	82	73	64	57	51	51
Irrigation*	I	Queen City Aquifer | Henderson County	698	698	698	698	698	698
Houston County WUG Total			**9,883**	**9,780**	**9,692**	**9,702**	**9,597**	**9,503**
Houston County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**1,769**	**1,646**	**1,516**	**1,416**	**1,301**	**1,204**
Grapeland	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	94	94	98	98	98	100
Grapeland	I	Houston County Lake/Reservoir	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennington WSC*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Houston County	12	11	9	9	8	7
Pennington WSC*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	13	11	10	9	8	8
The Consolidated WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	0	1	2	3	3	4

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
The Consolidated WSC	I	Houston County Lake/Reservoir	30	30	30	30	30	30
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	48	34	25	16	8	0
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | Houston County	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	I	Queen City Aquifer | Houston County	67	48	34	20	10	0
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | Houston County	155	110	78	48	22	0
County-Other	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Houston County	343	300	212	130	61	1
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	2	2	2	2	2	2
Manufacturing	I	Houston County Lake/Reservoir	11	11	11	12	12	13
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	0	0	11	24	24	24
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	473	473	473	473	473	473
Livestock	I	Queen City Aquifer | Houston County	38	38	38	38	38	38
Livestock	I	Sparta Aquifer | Houston County	0	0	0	21	21	21
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	26	26	26	26	26	26
Irrigation	I	Trinity Run-of-River	457	457	457	457	457	457
Houston County / Trinity Basin WUG Total			**8,114**	**8,134**	**8,176**	**8,286**	**8,296**	**8,299**
Crockett	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	210	210	210	210	210	210
Crockett	I	Houston County Lake/Reservoir	1,080	1,014	915	888	852	809
Grapeland	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	136	138	142	144	146	148
Lovelady	I	Houston County Lake/Reservoir	109	105	100	98	96	94
Lovelady	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Houston County	133	133	133	133	133	133
Pennington WSC*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Houston County	23	21	18	17	16	14

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Pennington WSC*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	23	21	17	17	15	14
TDCJ Eastham Unit	I	Sparta Aquifer | Houston County	977	977	977	977	977	977
The Consolidated WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	0	93	204	263	313	362
The Consolidated WSC	I	Houston County Lake/Reservoir	1,281	1,281	1,281	1,281	1,281	1,281
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	4	3	2	1	0	0
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | Houston County	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	I	Queen City Aquifer | Houston County	5	4	3	2	1	0
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | Houston County	12	9	6	4	2	0
County-Other	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Houston County	27	24	17	10	5	0
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	2	2	2	2	2	2
Manufacturing	I	Houston County Lake/Reservoir	190	197	205	212	220	228
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Houston County	302	302	302	302	302	302
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	0	0	42	66	66	66
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	1,318	1,318	1,318	1,318	1,318	1,318
Livestock	I	Queen City Aquifer | Houston County	96	96	96	96	96	96
Livestock	I	Sparta Aquifer | Houston County	0	0	0	59	59	59
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	121	121	121	121	121	121
Irrigation	I	Trinity Run-of-River	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065
Jasper County WUG Total			**72,591**	**72,360**	**72,100**	**71,865**	**71,637**	**71,415**
Jasper County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**66,366**	**66,198**	**65,999**	**65,816**	**65,632**	**65,445**
Brookeland FWSD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	24	22	21	20	18	17
Brookeland FWSD	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Jasper County	21	20	19	17	17	15

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Jasper	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	1,768	1,681	1,579	1,489	1,398	1,310
Rayburn Country MUD	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Jasper County	278	264	247	231	216	201
Rural WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	106	100	94	88	82	76
South Jasper County WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	55	52	48	45	42	39
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	312	295	276	259	242	224
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	622	584	535	487	437	383
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	46,485	46,485	46,485	46,485	46,485	46,485
Manufacturing	I	Neches Run-of-River	557	557	557	557	557	557
Manufacturing	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	10,171	10,171	10,171	10,171	10,171	10,171
Mining	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	28	28	28	28	28	28
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	118	118	118	118	118	118
Livestock	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	5,630	5,630	5,630	5,630	5,630	5,630
Irrigation	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	132	132	132	132	132	132
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	59	59	59	59	59	59
Jasper County / Sabine Basin WUG Total			**6,225**	**6,162**	**6,101**	**6,049**	**6,005**	**5,970**
Jasper	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	9	8	8	7	7	6
Jasper County WCID 1	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	208	206	207	209	215	225
Kirbyville	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	407	404	406	412	424	443
Mauriceville SUD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	10	10	10	10	9	9
South Jasper County WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	160	151	142	133	124	115
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	90	93	97	102	109	118

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	107	101	94	88	82	77
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	583	538	486	437	384	326
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	76	76	76	76	76	76
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	93	93	93	93	93	93
Livestock	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	4,370	4,370	4,370	4,370	4,370	4,370
Irrigation	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	78	78	78	78	78	78
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	34	34	34	34	34	34
Jefferson County WUG Total			**414,908**	**419,412**	**419,819**	**419,581**	**419,534**	**419,647**
Jefferson County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**97,726**	**99,658**	**99,839**	**99,895**	**100,019**	**100,190**
Beaumont	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	1,773	1,773	1,773	1,773	1,773	1,773
Beaumont	I	Neches Run-of-River	3,054	3,146	3,226	3,122	3,074	3,069
Beaumont	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	1,707	1,681	1,659	1,627	1,596	1,564
Bevil Oaks	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	99	100	100	98	97	96
China	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	2	2	2	2	2	2
Groves	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	71	70	70	70	70	70
Jefferson County WCID 10	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	88	88	88	87	86	85
Meeker MWD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	102	103	102	101	100	99
Meeker MWD	I	Neches Run-of-River	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nederland	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	83	83	83	82	81	80
Nome	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	101	101	101	100	99	97
Port Neches	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	794	797	795	785	775	766
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	241	241	241	241	241	241

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
County-Other	I	Neches Run-of-River	47	48	47	47	47	47
County-Other	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	5	5	5	5	5	5
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	10	10	10	10	10	10
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	136	136	136	136	136	136
Manufacturing	I	Neches Run-of-River	22,839	22,915	22,988	23,053	23,127	23,208
Manufacturing	I	Sabine Run-of-River	582	582	582	582	582	582
Manufacturing	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	52,485	54,270	54,324	54,467	54,611	54,753
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	43	43	43	43	43	43
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	64	64	64	64	64	64
Irrigation	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	53	53	53	53	53	53
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	9,800	9,800	9,800	9,800	9,800	9,800
Irrigation	I	Neches-Trinity Run-of-River	3,546	3,546	3,546	3,546	3,546	3,546
Jefferson County / Neches-Trinity Basin WUG Total			**317,182**	**319,754**	**319,980**	**319,686**	**319,515**	**319,457**
Beaumont	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	3,873	3,873	3,873	3,873	3,873	3,873
Beaumont	I	Neches Run-of-River	6,671	6,871	7,045	6,821	6,715	6,703
Beaumont	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	3,728	3,672	3,623	3,556	3,488	3,418
China	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	176	177	177	174	172	170
Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	I	Neches Run-of-River	613	610	610	610	610	610
Groves	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	2,218	2,209	2,209	2,209	2,209	2,209
Jefferson County WCID 10	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	509	512	510	504	498	492
Meeker MWD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	279	280	279	276	272	269
Meeker MWD	I	Neches Run-of-River	3	3	3	3	3	3
Nederland	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	2,339	2,350	2,344	2,315	2,287	2,260

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Nome	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	44	45	44	44	43	43
Port Arthur	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	18,309	18,454	18,405	18,183	17,964	17,748
Port Neches	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	764	767	765	756	747	738
Trinity Bay Conservation District*	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	18	17	16	15	14	13
Trinity Bay Conservation District*	H	Trinity Run-of-River	27	25	23	22	20	19
West Jefferson County MWD	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	929	928	936	948	960	972
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	1,863	1,863	1,863	1,863	1,863	1,863
County-Other	I	Neches Run-of-River	877	876	877	877	877	877
County-Other	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	105	105	105	105	105	105
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	10	10	10	10	10	10
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	28	28	28	28	28	28
Manufacturing	I	Neches Run-of-River	27,997	28,090	28,180	28,261	28,350	28,451
Manufacturing	I	Sabine Run-of-River	538	538	538	538	538	538
Manufacturing	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	64,338	66,525	66,591	66,769	66,943	67,119
Manufacturing	I	Water Recycling	1,153	1,153	1,153	1,153	1,153	1,153
Mining	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	288	288	288	288	288	288
Mining	I	Local Surface Water Supply	109	109	109	109	109	109
Mining	I	Neches-Trinity Run-of-River	34	34	34	34	34	34
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	596	596	596	596	596	596
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	736	736	736	736	736	736
Irrigation	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	702	702	702	702	702	702
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	130,200	130,200	130,200	130,200	130,200	130,200

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation	I	Neches-Trinity Run-of-River	47,108	47,108	47,108	47,108	47,108	47,108
Nacogdoches County WUG Total			**39,369**	**39,953**	**40,562**	**41,390**	**42,235**	**43,093**
Nacogdoches County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**39,369**	**39,953**	**40,562**	**41,390**	**42,235**	**43,093**
Appleby WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	1,070	1,102	1,134	1,187	1,240	1,291
Appleby WSC	I	Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir	64	63	63	62	62	61
Caro WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	372	383	394	413	431	449
Cushing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	139	144	148	155	162	168
D & M WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	876	878	879	881	882	884
D & M WSC	I	Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir	178	176	175	173	172	170
Etoile WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	337	347	357	374	391	407
Garrison	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	259	266	273	284	295	305
Lilly Grove SUD	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	500	514	529	554	578	602
Melrose WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	827	851	875	916	956	994
Melrose WSC	I	Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir	25	25	25	25	25	24
Nacogdoches	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	2,313	2,415	2,522	2,665	2,813	2,967
Nacogdoches	I	Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir	5,108	5,199	5,287	5,439	5,584	5,723
Swift WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	422	434	446	468	489	509
Woden WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	262	269	276	289	302	315
Woden WSC	I	Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	75	89	107	137	167	196
County-Other	I	Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir	46	46	45	45	45	44

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	79	79	79	79	79	79
County-Other	I	Queen City Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	221	221	221	221	221	221
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	156	156	156	156	156	156
County-Other	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	26	26	26	26	26	26
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	902	951	1,004	1,061	1,120	1,184
Manufacturing	I	Nacogdoches Lake/Reservoir	1,990	2,048	2,106	2,164	2,224	2,284
Manufacturing	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Mining	I	Local Surface Water Supply	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	974	974	974	974	974	974
Steam Electric Power	I	Striker Lake/Reservoir	1,494	1,643	1,807	1,988	2,187	2,406
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	851	851	851	851	851	851
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	8,913	8,913	8,913	8,913	8,913	8,913
Livestock	I	Other Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	78	78	78	78	78	78
Livestock	I	Queen City Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	310	310	310	310	310	310
Livestock	I	Sparta Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	156	156	156	156	156	156
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	266	266	266	266	266	266
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	79	79	79	79	79	79
Newton County WUG Total			**21,915**	**21,994**	**22,079**	**22,180**	**22,291**	**22,418**
Newton County / Sabine Basin WUG Total			**21,915**	**21,994**	**22,079**	**22,180**	**22,291**	**22,418**
Bon Wier WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	86	74	63	52	41	30
Brookeland FWSD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	61	55	49	43	37	32

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Mauriceville SUD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	31	31	30	27	23	20
Newton	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	343	311	278	247	217	189
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	12	11	10	9	7	6
South Newton WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	233	211	187	165	143	122
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	693	618	543	474	407	340
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	394	394	394	394	394	394
Manufacturing	I	Sabine Run-of-River	5,746	5,973	6,209	6,453	6,706	6,969
Mining	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	96	96	96	96	96	96
Mining	I	Local Surface Water Supply	78	78	78	78	78	78
Steam Electric Power	I	Sabine Run-of-River	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442	13,442
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	105	105	105	105	105	105
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	157	157	157	157	157	157
Irrigation	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	388	388	388	388	388	388
Irrigation	I	Sabine Run-of-River	50	50	50	50	50	50
Orange County WUG Total			**143,764**	**143,849**	**143,920**	**146,414**	**150,792**	**155,335**
Orange County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**19,769**	**19,616**	**19,555**	**19,620**	**19,732**	**19,841**
Bridge City	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	221	236	238	245	252	257
Kelly G Brewer	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	150	151	151	148	145	142
Mauriceville SUD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	69	73	76	76	76	76
Orange County WCID 1	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	1,255	1,192	1,190	1,112	1,038	967
Orangefield WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	402	457	522	598	684	782
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	2,168	2,168	2,169	2,169	2,169	2,169

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
County-Other	I	Sabine Run-of-River	228	228	228	228	228	228
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	115	115	116	116	115	116
Manufacturing	I	Sabine Run-of-River	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543
Manufacturing	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	574	574	574	621	706	793
Mining	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	101	101	101	101	101	101
Mining	I	Local Surface Water Supply	161	161	161	161	161	161
Steam Electric Power	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	1,608	1,443	1,312	1,328	1,340	1,332
Steam Electric Power	I	Sabine Run-of-River	11,079	11,079	11,079	11,079	11,079	11,079
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	69	69	69	69	69	69
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	26	26	26	26	26	26
Orange County / Neches-Trinity Basin WUG Total			**144**	**153**	**153**	**158**	**162**	**165**
Bridge City	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	139	148	149	154	158	161
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	2	2	1	1	1	1
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	1	1	1	1	1	1
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	2	2	2	2	2	2
Orange County / Sabine Basin WUG Total			**123,851**	**124,080**	**124,212**	**126,636**	**130,898**	**135,329**
Bridge City	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	911	974	983	1,010	1,036	1,061
Kelly G Brewer	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	165	166	167	163	160	156
Mauriceville SUD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	656	694	715	722	719	713
Orange	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	3,522	3,582	3,598	3,561	3,525	3,489
Orange County WCID 1	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	201	191	190	178	166	155

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Orange County WCID 2	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	456	452	452	439	425	412
Orangefield WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	515	586	671	767	877	1,004
Pinehurst	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	346	352	353	350	346	342
South Newton WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Newton County	188	192	193	191	189	187
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	3,050	3,050	3,050	3,050	3,050	3,050
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	5,750	5,750	5,749	5,749	5,750	5,749
Manufacturing	I	Sabine Run-of-River	76,821	76,821	76,821	76,821	76,821	76,821
Manufacturing	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	28,574	28,574	28,574	30,939	35,138	39,494
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	181	181	181	181	181	181
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	70	70	70	70	70	70
Irrigation	I	Direct Reuse	15	15	15	15	15	15
Irrigation	I	Sabine Run-of-River	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,430
Panola County WUG Total			**15,762**	**15,811**	**15,833**	**15,850**	**15,850**	**15,870**
Panola County / Cypress Basin WUG Total			**8**	**7**	**6**	**5**	**5**	**5**
Panola-Bethany WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	8	7	6	5	5	5
County-Other		No water supply associated with WUG	0	0	0	0	0	0
Panola County / Sabine Basin WUG Total			**15,754**	**15,804**	**15,827**	**15,845**	**15,845**	**15,865**
Beckville	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	87	77	69	62	56	51
Carthage	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	49	48	48	47	46	45
Carthage	I	Murvaul Lake/Reservoir	1,600	1,584	1,561	1,531	1,503	1,475
Clayton WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	198	222	252	266	281	296
Clayton WSC	I	Murvaul Lake/Reservoir	59	59	59	59	59	59
Deberry WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	94	82	68	59	50	40

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Elysian Fields WSC*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Harrison County	5	6	6	6	6	6
Gill WSC*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Harrison County	126	126	126	126	126	126
Gill WSC*	D	O' the Pines Lake/Reservoir	33	33	33	33	33	33
Hollands Quarter WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	71	65	58	53	48	43
Hollands Quarter WSC	I	Murvaul Lake/Reservoir	53	53	53	53	53	53
Minden Brachfield WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	13	15	19	20	22	24
Panola-Bethany WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	133	118	106	96	86	79
Rehobeth WSC	I	Murvaul Lake/Reservoir	88	79	68	61	54	47
Tatum	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	33	25	20	15	11	9
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	973	931	877	837	796	754
County-Other	I	Murvaul Lake/Reservoir	100	100	100	100	100	100
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	128	137	147	156	166	177
Manufacturing	I	Murvaul Lake/Reservoir	1,056	1,095	1,135	1,178	1,222	1,267
Manufacturing	I	Sabine Run-of-River	114	114	114	114	114	114
Mining	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	1,189	1,240	1,288	1,332	1,370	1,406
Mining	I	Murvaul Lake/Reservoir	1,368	1,386	1,386	1,386	1,368	1,368
Mining	I	Sabine Run-of-River	168	168	168	168	168	168
Mining	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	3,756	3,756	3,756	3,756	3,756	3,756
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	595	620	645	666	686	704
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	2,596	2,596	2,596	2,596	2,596	2,596
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Panola County	917	917	917	917	917	917
Irrigation	I	Sabine Run-of-River	152	152	152	152	152	152

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Polk County WUG Total			**2,374**	**2,471**	**2,557**	**2,642**	**2,725**	**2,805**
Polk County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**2,374**	**2,471**	**2,557**	**2,642**	**2,725**	**2,805**
Chester WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	49	53	55	57	59	61
Corrigan	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	238	255	264	274	283	293
Damascus-Stryker WSC	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Polk County	188	202	210	218	226	234
Lake Livingston WSC*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	75	81	84	87	90	94
Leggett WSC*	H	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	2	2	3	3	3	3
Moscow WSC*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	85	91	95	98	102	106
Soda WSC*	H	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	17	18	19	20	20	21
County-Other*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	743	797	840	882	923	957
Manufacturing*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	401	416	431	447	463	480
Mining*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	103	83	83	83	83	83
Mining*	I	Local Surface Water Supply	1	1	1	1	1	1
Livestock*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	1	1	1	1	1	1
Livestock*	I	Local Surface Water Supply	147	147	147	147	147	147
Livestock*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Polk County	11	11	11	11	11	11
Irrigation*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	313	313	313	313	313	313
Rusk County WUG Total			**64,595**	**64,466**	**64,297**	**64,123**	**63,939**	**63,773**
Rusk County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**10,305**	**10,229**	**10,138**	**10,039**	**9,938**	**9,843**
Ebenezer WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	181	175	166	156	146	137
Garrison	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gaston WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	149	144	137	128	120	112

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Goodsprings WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	230	221	210	198	185	173
Henderson	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	1,396	1,396	1,396	1,396	1,396	1,396
Henderson	D	Fork Lake/Reservoir	3,472	3,433	3,395	3,357	3,318	3,282
Henderson	I	Striker Lake/Reservoir	118	129	142	157	172	189
Jacobs WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	5	5	5	5	6	5
Minden Brachfield WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	142	138	131	124	116	108
Mt Enterprise WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	222	214	204	191	179	167
New London	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	164	158	151	142	133	124
Overton*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	42	41	39	37	34	32
South Rusk County WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	242	234	222	209	196	182
Wright City WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	23	22	21	20	18	17
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	849	849	849	849	849	849
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	244	244	244	244	244	244
Manufacturing	I	Neches Run-of-River	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mining	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	109	109	109	109	109	109
Mining	I	Local Surface Water Supply	828	828	828	828	828	828
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Rusk County	264	264	264	264	264	264
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	289	289	289	289	289	289
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	991	991	991	991	991	991
Livestock	I	Queen City Aquifer | Rusk County	33	33	33	33	33	33
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	251	251	251	251	251	251
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	59	59	59	59	59	59

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Rusk County / Sabine Basin WUG Total			**54,290**	**54,237**	**54,159**	**54,084**	**54,001**	**53,930**
Chalk Hill SUD*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	232	222	211	199	186	174
Cross Roads SUD*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	296	305	318	334	351	371
Cross Roads SUD*	D	Fork Lake/Reservoir	248	273	288	310	337	366
Crystal Farms WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	130	141	156	173	192	215
Elderville WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	69	67	65	62	60	58
Elderville WSC*	I	Cherokee Lake/Reservoir	96	96	96	95	111	111
Elderville WSC*	D	Fork Lake/Reservoir	97	97	97	97	96	96
Henderson	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	482	482	482	482	482	482
Henderson	D	Fork Lake/Reservoir	1,043	1,032	1,021	1,010	999	986
Henderson	I	Sabine Run-of-River	10	10	10	10	10	10
Henderson	I	Striker Lake/Reservoir	35	39	43	47	52	57
Jacobs WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	304	321	341	365	365	366
Kilgore*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Gregg County	356	356	355	352	347	347
Kilgore*	D	Fork Lake/Reservoir	1,297	1,228	1,151	1,073	993	940
Minden Brachfield WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	71	69	65	61	57	53
New London	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	118	115	109	102	96	90
New Prospect WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	149	143	136	128	120	112
Overton*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	404	391	372	350	330	309
Southern Utilities*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	79	76	72	68	64	59
Tatum	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	251	242	230	216	202	189
West Gregg SUD*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Gregg County	22	22	22	22	23	26
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	614	614	614	614	614	614
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | Rusk County	85	85	85	85	85	85

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Mining	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	1,974	1,983	1,992	2,001	2,001	1,986
Mining	I	Local Surface Water Supply	430	430	430	430	430	430
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Rusk County	194	194	194	194	194	194
Steam Electric Power	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,279
Steam Electric Power	I	Martin Lake/Reservoir	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Steam Electric Power	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	17,922	17,922	17,922	17,922	17,922	17,922
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	256	256	256	256	256	256
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	424	424	424	424	424	424
Irrigation	I	Other Aquifer | Rusk County	196	196	196	196	196	196
Irrigation	I	Sabine Run-of-River	127	127	127	127	127	127
Sabine County WUG Total			**3,159**	**3,212**	**3,188**	**3,171**	**3,158**	**3,142**
Sabine County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**1,077**	**1,071**	**1,053**	**1,030**	**1,018**	**1,006**
Brookeland FWSD	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Jasper County	70	63	58	54	51	47
G M WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Sabine County	25	25	25	25	25	25
G M WSC	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	114	115	114	114	113	114
G M WSC	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Sabine County	55	55	55	55	55	55
Pineland	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Sabine County	169	153	140	132	124	115
Manufacturing	I	Direct Reuse	20	20	20	20	20	20
Manufacturing	I	Neches Run-of-River	162	162	162	162	162	162
Manufacturing	I	Other Aquifer | Sabine County	336	336	336	336	336	336
Manufacturing	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Sabine County	45	45	45	45	45	45
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Sabine County	34	45	45	45	45	45

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	26	26	26	26	26	26
Livestock	I	Sparta Aquifer | Sabine County	21	26	27	16	16	16
Sabine County / Sabine Basin WUG Total			**2,082**	**2,141**	**2,135**	**2,141**	**2,140**	**2,136**
Brookeland FWSD	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Sabine County	10	9	8	8	7	7
G M WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Sabine County	95	95	95	95	95	95
G M WSC	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	430	429	428	428	429	428
G M WSC	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Sabine County	207	207	206	206	206	206
Hemphill	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	476	476	476	476	476	476
New WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	5	4	4	3	3	3
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Sabine County	74	69	66	63	61	59
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | Sabine County	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | Sabine County	11	9	9	8	8	7
County-Other	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	37	37	37	37	37	37
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Sabine County	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	334	334	334	334	334	334
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Sabine County	103	136	136	136	136	136
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	175	175	175	175	175	175
Livestock	I	Sparta Aquifer | Sabine County	13	13	13	24	25	25
Livestock	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Sabine County	112	148	148	148	148	148

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
San Augustine County WUG Total			**4,938**	**4,949**	**4,953**	**4,953**	**4,953**	**4,953**
San Augustine County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**4,535**	**4,545**	**4,545**	**4,545**	**4,545**	**4,546**
Choice WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	2	2	2	2	2	2
Denning WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	120	108	98	91	84	77
New WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	86	77	69	64	59	55
San Augustine	I	San Augustine Lake/Reservoir	642	610	593	583	583	595
San Augustine Rural WSC	I	San Augustine Lake/Reservoir	271	296	314	307	298	290
Sand Hills WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	6	7	8	8	8	8
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	1	1	1	1	1	1
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	22	25	27	27	29	31
County-Other	I	Other Aquifer | San Augustine County	196	200	199	211	218	215
County-Other	I	San Augustine Lake/Reservoir	65	65	65	65	65	65
County-Other	I	Sparta Aquifer | San Augustine County	83	83	83	83	83	83
County-Other	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | San Augustine County	230	230	230	230	230	230
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	8	8	8	8	8	8
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | San Augustine County	1,119	1,113	1,115	1,098	1,089	1,092
Mining	I	San Augustine Lake/Reservoir	292	298	296	313	322	319
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	69	87	103	115	125	133
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	1,167	1,167	1,167	1,167	1,167	1,167
Livestock	I	Other Aquifer | San Augustine County	61	73	72	77	79	79
Livestock	I	Sparta Aquifer | San Augustine County	80	80	80	80	80	80

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	15	15	15	15	15	16
San Augustine County / Sabine Basin WUG Total			**403**	**404**	**408**	**408**	**408**	**407**
G M WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Sabine County	4	4	4	4	4	4
G M WSC	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	16	16	18	18	18	18
G M WSC	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Sabine County	8	8	9	9	9	9
San Augustine Rural WSC	I	San Augustine Lake/Reservoir	15	16	17	17	17	16
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	88	88	88	88	88	88
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	139	139	139	139	139	139
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	132	132	132	132	132	132
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	1	1	1	1	1	1
Shelby County WUG Total			**23,634**	**23,592**	**23,555**	**23,519**	**23,487**	**23,457**
Shelby County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**4,003**	**4,021**	**4,027**	**4,019**	**4,000**	**3,976**
Choice WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	28	29	31	34	37	41
Sand Hills WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	153	153	152	152	152	151
Sand Hills WSC	I	Center Lake/Reservoir	19	23	27	29	31	34
Sand Hills WSC	I	Pinkston Lake/Reservoir	143	162	189	206	222	239
Timpson	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	7	7	7	8	8	8
County-Other	I	Pinkston Lake/Reservoir	764	759	733	701	661	614
County-Other	I	Timpson Lake/Reservoir	350	350	350	350	350	350
Mining	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	5	5	5	5	5	5
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	430	430	430	430	430	430
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	2,101	2,100	2,100	2,101	2,101	2,101

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	3	3	3	3	3	3
Shelby County / Sabine Basin WUG Total			**19,631**	**19,571**	**19,528**	**19,500**	**19,487**	**19,481**
Center	I	Center Lake/Reservoir	260	260	261	262	263	264
Center	I	Pinkston Lake/Reservoir	1,875	1,875	1,874	1,873	1,872	1,871
Choice WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	79	84	91	98	108	119
East Lamar WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	108	114	123	134	146	162
Five Way WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	151	152	153	152	152	151
Flat Fork WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	114	94	79	65	53	44
Huxley	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	280	280	280	280	280	280
Joaquin	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	124	99	80	63	50	39
McClelland WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	188	167	138	119	99	78
New WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | San Augustine County	4	5	6	6	7	7
Sand Hills WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	131	130	130	130	130	131
Sand Hills WSC	I	Center Lake/Reservoir	17	19	22	24	26	28
Sand Hills WSC	I	Pinkston Lake/Reservoir	121	137	160	173	188	202
Tenaha	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	250	221	182	154	126	97
Timpson	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	180	159	129	109	89	67
County-Other	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	512	512	494	474	447	413
County-Other	I	Center Lake/Reservoir	116	117	114	112	108	103
County-Other	I	Pinkston Lake/Reservoir	76	80	87	96	106	116
County-Other	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	100	95	90	82	75	68
Manufacturing	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	218	247	247	247	247	247
Manufacturing	I	Center Lake/Reservoir	88	81	76	73	72	71
Manufacturing	I	Direct Reuse	80	80	80	80	80	80

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Manufacturing	I	Pinkston Lake/Reservoir	633	587	544	526	513	508
Mining	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	1,026	1,026	1,026	1,026	1,026	1,026
Mining	I	Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	3,405	3,405	3,405	3,405	3,405	3,405
Livestock	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	1,320	1,369	1,481	1,562	1,644	1,729
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	8,168	8,169	8,169	8,168	8,168	8,168
Irrigation	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Shelby County	7	7	7	7	7	7
Smith County WUG Total			**59,274**	**63,639**	**68,491**	**71,190**	**74,103**	**77,277**
Smith County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**59,274**	**63,639**	**68,491**	**71,190**	**74,103**	**77,277**
Arp	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	155	141	132	120	108	96
Ben Wheeler WSC*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Van Zandt County	3	3	4	4	5	5
Bullard	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	299	342	371	399	426	452
Bullard	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	998	1,110	1,110	1,110	1,110	1,110
Bullard	I	Jacksonville Lake/Reservoir	699	797	866	930	993	1,054
Carroll WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	89	99	109	122	136	132
Crystal Systems Texas*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	238	238	238	238	238	238
Dean WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	723	776	815	846	875	904
Emerald Bay MUD	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	254	267	276	287	287	287
Jackson WSC*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	291	313	329	342	355	367
Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Wood County	201	224	240	251	261	270
Lindale Rural WSC*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	511	511	511	511	511	511
Lindale*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	468	474	491	485	474	474

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Overton*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	7	7	8	8	8	8
R P M WSC*	D	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Van Zandt County	11	9	8	7	6	5
Southern Utilities*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	8,736	8,749	8,701	8,669	8,974	9,095
Southern Utilities*	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	216	231	243	251	260	269
Southern Utilities*	I	Tyler Lake/Reservoir	212	225	234	241	247	253
Troup	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	388	401	410	414	418	422
Tyler*	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	17,549	19,679	22,125	23,504	24,971	26,528
Tyler*	I	Tyler Lake/Reservoir	17,169	19,117	21,342	22,512	23,745	25,045
Walnut Grove WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	727	728	728	728	729	729
Walnut Grove WSC	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	750	752	756	759	761	765
Walnut Grove WSC	I	Tyler Lake/Reservoir	733	732	729	726	725	722
Whitehouse	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	1,005	1,012	1,021	1,014	1,007	1,001
Whitehouse	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	377	379	380	382	383	384
Whitehouse	I	Tyler Lake/Reservoir	370	368	367	365	364	363
Wright City WSC	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	193	199	206	213	220	228
County-Other*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	607	607	607	607	607	607
County-Other*	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	121	121	122	122	123	123
County-Other*	I	Queen City Aquifer | Smith County	19	19	19	19	19	19
County-Other*	I	Tyler Lake/Reservoir	118	118	117	117	116	116
Manufacturing*	I	Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	888	687	616	565	257	236
Manufacturing*	I	Other Aquifer | Smith County	389	389	389	389	389	389
Manufacturing*	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	961	996	1,032	1,070	1,109	1,151
Manufacturing*	I	Queen City Aquifer | Smith County	100	100	100	100	100	100
Manufacturing*	I	Tyler Lake/Reservoir	841	870	899	930	959	992
Mining	I	Other Aquifer | Smith County	113	113	113	113	113	113
Livestock*	I	Local Surface Water Supply	313	313	313	313	313	313

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Livestock*	I	Queen City Aquifer | Smith County	500	500	500	500	500	500
Irrigation*	I	Bellwood Lake/Reservoir	400	400	400	400	400	400
Irrigation*	I	Neches Run-of-River	45	45	45	45	45	45
Irrigation*	I	Palestine Lake/Reservoir	487	478	469	462	456	456
Trinity County WUG Total			**647**	**647**	**618**	**600**	**580**	**561**
Trinity County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**647**	**647**	**618**	**600**	**580**	**561**
Centerville WSC	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	119	106	91	81	70	58
Groveton*	H	Livingston-Wallisville Lake/Reservoir System	23	22	21	20	18	16
Groveton*	H	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	23	19	13	10	7	4
Pennington WSC*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Houston County	16	13	11	9	7	6
Pennington WSC*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	16	13	10	9	7	6
County-Other*	I	Other Aquifer | Trinity County	120	117	115	114	114	114
Mining*	H	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	9	9	9	9	9	9
Livestock*	I	Local Surface Water Supply	187	187	187	187	187	187
Livestock*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	71	98	98	98	98	98
Irrigation*	I	Neches Run-of-River	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation*	H	Trinity Run-of-River	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation*	I	Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	63	63	63	63	63	63
Tyler County WUG Total			**9,725**	**9,569**	**9,441**	**9,351**	**9,266**	**9,187**
Tyler County / Neches Basin WUG Total			**9,725**	**9,569**	**9,441**	**9,351**	**9,266**	**9,187**
Chester WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	101	88	74	64	54	43
Colmesneil	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	163	156	151	147	143	140
Cypress Creek WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	101	89	79	71	63	57

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

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

WUG Name	Source Region	Source Description	Existing Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Moscow WSC*	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Polk County	3	4	5	6	7	8
Seneca WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	123	116	110	106	102	98
Tyler County SUD	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	632	602	579	563	548	535
Warren WSC	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	273	272	272	272	272	272
Wildwood POA	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	76	69	63	58	53	48
Woodville	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	880	920	970	1,024	1,088	1,162
Woodville	I	Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
County-Other	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	790	670	555	457	353	241
Manufacturing	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	40	40	40	40	40	40
Mining	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	39	39	39	39	39	39
Mining	I	Local Surface Water Supply	3	3	3	3	3	3
Steam Electric Power	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	191	191	191	191	191	191
Livestock	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	85	85	85	85	85	85
Livestock	I	Local Surface Water Supply	183	183	183	183	183	183
Irrigation	I	Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	354	354	354	354	354	354
Irrigation	I	Neches Run-of-River	88	88	88	88	88	88
Region I WUG Existing Water Supply Total			**958,404**	**968,807**	**974,748**	**979,936**	**987,344**	**995,558**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

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

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Berryville	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brushy Creek WSC*	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frankston	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frankston Rural WSC	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neches WSC	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norwood WSC	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palestine	Anderson	Neches	490	500	537	573	608	645
Slocum WSC	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walston Springs WSC	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Anderson	Neches	354	363	369	380	392	405
Manufacturing	Anderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	Anderson	Neches	(888)	(888)	(888)	(888)	(888)	(888)
Livestock	Anderson	Neches	256	256	256	256	256	256
Irrigation	Anderson	Neches	443	443	443	443	443	443
Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
B B S WSC*	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
B C Y WSC	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brushy Creek WSC*	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elkhart	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Four Pines WSC	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norwood WSC	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palestine	Anderson	Trinity	437	445	478	510	542	574
Pleasant Springs WSC	Anderson	Trinity	103	103	106	108	110	113
Slocum WSC	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
TDCJ Coffield Michael	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Consolidated WSC	Anderson	Trinity	0	47	103	133	158	183

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Tucker WSC	Anderson	Trinity	0	1	1	0	0	0
Walston Springs WSC	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Anderson	Trinity	704	722	735	756	781	807
Mining	Anderson	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	Anderson	Trinity	(1,408)	(1,408)	(1,408)	(1,408)	(1,408)	(1,408)
Livestock	Anderson	Trinity	66	66	66	66	66	66
Irrigation	Anderson	Trinity	913	913	913	913	913	913
Angelina WSC	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central WCID of Angelina County	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diboll	Angelina	Neches	1,643	1,633	1,626	1,619	1,612	1,605
Four Way SUD	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hudson WSC	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huntington	Angelina	Neches	448	448	448	448	448	448
Lufkin	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
M & M WSC	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pollok-Redtown WSC	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Redland WSC	Angelina	Neches	307	307	307	307	307	307
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woodlawn WSC	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zavalla	Angelina	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Angelina	Neches	0	0	1	0	0	0
Manufacturing	Angelina	Neches	(2,145)	(2,314)	(2,488)	(2,671)	(2,859)	(3,055)
Mining	Angelina	Neches	(373)	(412)	(448)	(480)	(508)	(533)
Livestock	Angelina	Neches	313	313	313	313	313	313
Irrigation	Angelina	Neches	331	331	331	331	331	331
Afton Grove WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alto	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alto Rural WSC	Cherokee	Neches	(124)	(209)	(306)	(414)	(533)	(665)
Blackjack WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bullard	Cherokee	Neches	75	89	100	110	120	130
Craft Turney WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gum Creek WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jacksonville	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
New Summerfield	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Cherokee WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pollok-Redtown WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rusk	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rusk Rural WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Rusk County WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Utilities*	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Troup	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walnut Grove WSC	Cherokee	Neches	8	6	6	6	4	3
Wells	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Jacksonville WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wright City WSC	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	1	0	0
Manufacturing	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	Cherokee	Neches	121	164	211	263	320	383
Livestock	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	Cherokee	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hardin County WCID 1	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kountze	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lumberton MUD	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Hardin WSC	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Silsbee	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sour Lake	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Hardin WSC*	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wildwood POA	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Hardin	Neches	1,012	1,113	1,228	1,377	1,528	1,683
Manufacturing	Hardin	Neches	179	177	175	172	169	166
Mining	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	Hardin	Neches	45	45	45	45	45	45
Irrigation	Hardin	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Lake Livingston WSC*	Hardin	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Hardin	Trinity	11	11	12	12	13	14
Livestock	Hardin	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Athens*	Henderson	Neches	0	0	(4)	(9)	(15)	(18)
Berryville	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bethel Ash WSC*	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brownsboro	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brushy Creek WSC*	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chandler	Henderson	Neches	0	0	(43)	(281)	(573)	(934)
Edom WSC*	Henderson	Neches	(21)	(24)	(23)	(24)	(26)	(27)
Frankston	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leagueville WSC	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moore Station WSC	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Murchison	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
R P M WSC*	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia Hill WSC*	Henderson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other*	Henderson	Neches	410	463	535	636	766	932
Mining*	Henderson	Neches	(15)	(16)	(17)	(19)	(47)	(143)
Steam Electric Power*	Henderson	Neches	(2,061)	(2,061)	(2,061)	(2,061)	(2,061)	(2,061)
Livestock*	Henderson	Neches	895	895	388	11	(321)	(490)
Irrigation*	Henderson	Neches	406	402	382	367	353	350
Grapeland	Houston	Neches	3	2	3	2	1	2
Pennington WSC*	Houston	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Consolidated WSC	Houston	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Houston	Neches	193	192	137	84	40	0
Manufacturing	Houston	Neches	2	2	2	2	2	2
Livestock	Houston	Neches	71	32	0	(12)	(72)	(72)
Irrigation	Houston	Neches	111	111	111	111	111	111
Crockett	Houston	Trinity	210	210	210	210	210	210
Grapeland	Houston	Trinity	2	2	2	3	3	3
Lovelady	Houston	Trinity	133	133	133	133	133	133
Pennington WSC*	Houston	Trinity	0	0	0	1	0	0
TDCJ Eastham Unit	Houston	Trinity	(113)	(111)	(111)	(111)	(111)	(111)
The Consolidated WSC	Houston	Trinity	0	47	103	133	158	183
County-Other	Houston	Trinity	15	16	11	7	3	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Manufacturing	Houston	Trinity	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mining	Houston	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	Houston	Trinity	188	78	0	(47)	(213)	(213)
Irrigation	Houston	Trinity	421	421	421	421	421	421
Brookeland FWSD	Jasper	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jasper	Jasper	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rayburn Country MUD	Jasper	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rural WSC	Jasper	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Jasper County WSC	Jasper	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	Jasper	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Jasper	Neches	68	73	73	73	73	73
Manufacturing	Jasper	Neches	(455)	(2,589)	(4,802)	(7,097)	(9,476)	(11,943)
Mining	Jasper	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	Jasper	Neches	7	7	7	7	7	7
Irrigation	Jasper	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jasper	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jasper County WCID 1	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kirbyville	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauriceville SUD	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Jasper County WSC	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	Jasper	Sabine	7	7	7	7	7	7
Irrigation	Jasper	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beaumont	Jefferson	Neches	(2,704)	(2,862)	(3,066)	(3,075)	(3,029)	(2,943)
Bevil Oaks	Jefferson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
China	Jefferson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Groves	Jefferson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson County WCID 10	Jefferson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Meeker MWD	Jefferson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nederland	Jefferson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nome	Jefferson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Port Neches	Jefferson	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Jefferson	Neches	186	203	235	240	245	250
Manufacturing	Jefferson	Neches	(2,570)	(16,433)	(32,030)	(47,547)	(63,053)	(78,554)
Livestock	Jefferson	Neches	53	53	53	53	53	53
Irrigation	Jefferson	Neches	7,202	7,202	7,202	7,202	7,202	7,202
Beaumont	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	(5,909)	(6,256)	(6,702)	(6,718)	(6,619)	(6,431)
China	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Groves	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson County WCID 10	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meeker MWD	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nederland	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nome	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Port Arthur	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Port Neches	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinity Bay Conservation District*	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	9	6	3	1	(1)	(3)
West Jefferson County MWD	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	860	1,166	1,768	1,862	1,954	2,049
Manufacturing	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	(2,314)	(19,310)	(38,430)	(57,446)	(76,459)	(95,458)
Mining	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	137	119	99	77	52	25
Livestock	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	587	587	587	587	587	587

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Irrigation	Jefferson	Neches-Trinity	95,671	95,671	95,671	95,671	95,671	95,671
Appleby WSC	Nacogdoches	Neches	90	89	90	89	90	89
Caro WSC	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cushing	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
D & M WSC	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	(30)	(62)	(115)	(167)	(218)
Etoile WSC	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrison	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lilly Grove SUD	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Melrose WSC	Nacogdoches	Neches	37	37	37	37	37	33
Nacogdoches	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swift WSC	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woden WSC	Nacogdoches	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Nacogdoches	Neches	3	3	2	2	2	1
Manufacturing	Nacogdoches	Neches	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Mining	Nacogdoches	Neches	84	84	84	84	84	84
Steam Electric Power	Nacogdoches	Neches	1,094	1,243	1,407	1,588	1,787	2,006
Livestock	Nacogdoches	Neches	7,683	7,554	7,404	7,234	6,979	6,979
Irrigation	Nacogdoches	Neches	79	79	79	79	79	79
Bon Wier WSC	Newton	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brookeland FWSD	Newton	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauriceville SUD	Newton	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newton	Newton	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	Newton	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Newton WSC	Newton	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Newton	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	Newton	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	Newton	Sabine	171	171	171	171	171	171
Steam Electric Power	Newton	Sabine	6,634	6,634	6,634	6,634	6,634	6,634
Livestock	Newton	Sabine	148	148	148	148	148	148
Irrigation	Newton	Sabine	337	337	337	337	337	337
Bridge City	Orange	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kelly G Brewer	Orange	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauriceville SUD	Orange	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange County WCID 1	Orange	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Orangefield WSC	Orange	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Orange	Neches	1,476	1,540	1,617	1,722	1,830	1,946
Manufacturing	Orange	Neches	188	112	34	0	0	0
Mining	Orange	Neches	251	251	251	251	251	251
Steam Electric Power	Orange	Neches	2,190	2,025	1,894	1,910	1,922	1,914
Livestock	Orange	Neches	44	44	44	44	44	44
Bridge City	Orange	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Orange	Neches-Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	Orange	Neches-Trinity	2	2	2	2	2	2
Bridge City	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kelly G Brewer	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauriceville SUD	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange County WCID 1	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange County WCID 2	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orangefield WSC	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pinehurst	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Newton WSC	Orange	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Orange	Sabine	2,065	2,134	2,215	2,327	2,443	2,568
Manufacturing	Orange	Sabine	9,357	5,591	1,686	0	0	0
Livestock	Orange	Sabine	116	116	116	116	116	116
Irrigation	Orange	Sabine	621	621	621	621	621	621
Panola-Bethany WSC*	Panola	Cypress	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Panola	Cypress	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beckville	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carthage	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clayton WSC	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deberry WSC	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elysian Fields WSC*	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gill WSC*	Panola	Sabine	68	75	82	88	93	98
Hollands Quarter WSC	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Minden Brachfield WSC	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Panola-Bethany WSC*	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rehobeth WSC	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tatum	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	Panola	Sabine	4,201	4,270	4,318	4,362	4,382	4,418
Livestock	Panola	Sabine	2,049	2,074	2,099	2,120	2,140	2,158
Irrigation	Panola	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chester WSC	Polk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrigan	Polk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Damascus-Stryker WSC	Polk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Livingston WSC*	Polk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leggett WSC*	Polk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moscow WSC*	Polk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soda WSC*	Polk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other*	Polk	Neches	337	361	388	413	436	453
Manufacturing*	Polk	Neches	9	9	9	9	9	9
Mining*	Polk	Neches	78	57	56	55	54	54
Livestock*	Polk	Neches	45	45	45	45	45	45
Irrigation*	Polk	Neches	83	83	83	83	83	83
Ebenezer WSC	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrison	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gaston WSC	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goodsprings WSC	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson	Rusk	Neches	2,633	2,635	2,625	2,604	2,573	2,535
Jacobs WSC	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
Minden Brachfield WSC	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mt Enterprise WSC	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
New London	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overton*	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Rusk County WSC	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wright City WSC	Rusk	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
County-Other	Rusk	Neches	369	419	492	580	674	774
Manufacturing	Rusk	Neches	219	218	217	216	215	214
Mining	Rusk	Neches	879	879	879	879	879	879
Livestock	Rusk	Neches	391	374	357	339	339	339
Irrigation	Rusk	Neches	155	155	155	155	155	155
Chalk Hill SUD*	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cross Roads SUD*	Rusk	Sabine	248	273	288	310	337	366
Crystal Farms WSC	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elderville WSC*	Rusk	Sabine	101	104	110	115	136	143
Henderson	Rusk	Sabine	863	865	862	855	847	834
Jacobs WSC	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	(26)	(57)
Kilgore*	Rusk	Sabine	564	530	503	480	452	457
Minden Brachfield WSC	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
New London	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Prospect WSC	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overton*	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Utilities*	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tatum	Rusk	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Gregg SUD*	Rusk	Sabine	13	11	9	5	2	0
County-Other	Rusk	Sabine	216	266	339	428	522	624
Mining	Rusk	Sabine	2,431	2,440	2,449	2,458	2,458	2,443
Steam Electric Power	Rusk	Sabine	24,795	24,795	24,795	24,795	24,795	24,795
Livestock	Rusk	Sabine	286	279	272	265	265	265
Irrigation	Rusk	Sabine	202	202	202	202	202	202
Brookeland FWSD	Sabine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
G M WSC	Sabine	Neches	65	77	87	93	99	106
Pineland	Sabine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	Sabine	Neches	114	97	80	62	43	24
Livestock	Sabine	Neches	39	42	27	0	0	0
Brookeland FWSD	Sabine	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
G M WSC	Sabine	Sabine	245	287	325	349	374	397
Hemphill	Sabine	Sabine	5	44	79	99	119	138
New WSC	Sabine	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	Sabine	Sabine	19	22	27	28	31	32
Mining	Sabine	Sabine	131	131	131	131	131	131
Livestock	Sabine	Sabine	122	103	3	(97)	(96)	(96)

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	County	Basin	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Choice WSC	San Augustine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denning WSC	San Augustine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
New WSC	San Augustine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Augustine	San Augustine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Augustine Rural WSC	San Augustine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sand Hills WSC	San Augustine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	San Augustine	Neches	418	466	504	534	564	584
Manufacturing	San Augustine	Neches	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mining	San Augustine	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	San Augustine	Neches	903	881	836	785	797	805
Irrigation	San Augustine	Neches	2	2	2	2	2	3
G M WSC	San Augustine	Sabine	10	11	14	15	16	17
San Augustine Rural WSC	San Augustine	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	San Augustine	Sabine	60	67	72	75	78	82
Livestock	San Augustine	Sabine	212	205	197	189	189	189
Irrigation	San Augustine	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Choice WSC	Shelby	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sand Hills WSC	Shelby	Neches	156	157	157	157	156	156
Timpson	Shelby	Neches	4	5	5	6	7	7
County-Other	Shelby	Neches	962	957	934	906	872	831
Mining	Shelby	Neches	2	2	2	2	2	2
Livestock	Shelby	Neches	1,848	1,714	1,551	1,353	1,353	1,353
Irrigation	Shelby	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Center	Shelby	Sabine	0	36	88	140	191	241
Choice WSC	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Lamar WSC	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Five Way WSC	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flat Fork WSC	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huxley	Shelby	Sabine	9	50	81	107	128	145
Joaquin	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
McClelland WSC	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
New WSC	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sand Hills WSC	Shelby	Sabine	134	133	133	133	134	134
Tenaha	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Timpson	Shelby	Sabine	3	2	2	2	1	1
County-Other	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Manufacturing	Shelby	Sabine	(841)	(934)	(1,053)	(1,148)	(1,239)	(1,325)
Mining	Shelby	Sabine	2,364	2,364	2,364	2,364	2,364	2,364
Livestock	Shelby	Sabine	6,833	6,363	5,841	5,149	5,231	5,316
Irrigation	Shelby	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arp	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben Wheeler WSC*	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bullard	Smith	Neches	998	1,096	1,085	1,075	1,065	1,055
Carroll WSC*	Smith	Neches	14	16	20	28	37	28
Crystal Systems Texas*	Smith	Neches	103	80	64	49	34	20
Dean WSC	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emerald Bay MUD	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson WSC*	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water*	Smith	Neches	28	18	11	1	(10)	(22)
Lindale Rural WSC*	Smith	Neches	114	85	64	48	32	16
Lindale*	Smith	Neches	86	81	88	79	64	60
Overton*	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
R P M WSC*	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Utilities*	Smith	Neches	1,328	794	343	0	0	(178)
Troup	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyler*	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walnut Grove WSC	Smith	Neches	957	876	814	767	722	678
Whitehouse	Smith	Neches	747	747	747	747	747	747
Wright City WSC	Smith	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other*	Smith	Neches	(273)	(143)	(33)	64	151	229
Manufacturing*	Smith	Neches	322	79	(36)	(132)	(490)	(558)
Mining	Smith	Neches	(314)	(333)	(353)	(374)	(397)	(421)
Livestock*	Smith	Neches	313	313	313	313	313	313
Irrigation*	Smith	Neches	484	475	466	459	453	453
Centerville WSC	Trinity	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Groveton*	Trinity	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennington WSC*	Trinity	Neches	1	1	0	1	0	0
County-Other*	Trinity	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining*	Trinity	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock*	Trinity	Neches	71	98	98	98	98	98
Irrigation*	Trinity	Neches	(215)	(215)	(215)	(215)	(215)	(215)
Chester WSC	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Needs or Surplus

			Water Supply Needs or Surplus (acre-feet per year)					
WUG Name	**County**	**Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Colmesneil	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cypress Creek WSC	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moscow WSC*	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seneca WSC	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyler County SUD	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warren WSC	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wildwood POA	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woodville	Tyler	Neches	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
County-Other	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	Tyler	Neches	(78)	(82)	(87)	(92)	(97)	(102)
Mining	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	Tyler	Neches	188	188	188	188	188	188
Livestock	Tyler	Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	Tyler	Neches	88	88	88	88	88	88

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

Second-tier needs are WUG split needs adjusted to include the implementation of recommended conservation and direct reuse water management strategies.

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Anderson County WUG Total	**2,296**	**2,296**	**2,296**	**2,296**	**2,296**	**2,296**
Anderson County / Neches Basin WUG	**888**	**888**	**888**	**888**	**888**	**888**
Berryville	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brushy Creek WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frankston	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frankston Rural WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neches WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norwood WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palestine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slocum WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walston Springs WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	888	888	888	888	888	888
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anderson County / Trinity Basin WUG	**1,408**	**1,408**	**1,408**	**1,408**	**1,408**	**1,408**
Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
B B S WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
B C Y WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brushy Creek WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elkhart	0	0	0	0	0	0
Four Pines WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norwood WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Anderson County / Trinity Basin WUG	**1,408**	**1,408**	**1,408**	**1,408**	**1,408**	**1,408**
Palestine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pleasant Springs WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slocum WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	0	0	0	0	0	0
TDCJ Coffield Michael	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Consolidated WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tucker WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walston Springs WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408	1,408
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Angelina County WUG Total	**2,518**	**2,726**	**2,936**	**3,151**	**3,367**	**3,588**
Angelina County / Neches Basin WUG	**2,518**	**2,726**	**2,936**	**3,151**	**3,367**	**3,588**
Angelina WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central WCID of Angelina County	0	0	0	0	0	0
Diboll	0	0	0	0	0	0
Four Way SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hudson WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huntington	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lufkin	0	0	0	0	0	0
M & M WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pollok-Redtown WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Redland WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Angelina County / Neches Basin WUG	**2,518**	**2,726**	**2,936**	**3,151**	**3,367**	**3,588**
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woodlawn WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zavalla	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	2,145	2,314	2,488	2,671	2,859	3,055
Mining	373	412	448	480	508	533
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cherokee County WUG Total	**106**	**180**	**272**	**376**	**488**	**614**
Cherokee County / Neches Basin WUG	**106**	**180**	**272**	**376**	**488**	**614**
Afton Grove WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alto	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alto Rural WSC	106	180	272	376	488	614
Blackjack WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bullard	0	0	0	0	0	0
Craft Turney WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gum Creek WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jacksonville	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Summerfield	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Cherokee WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pollok-Redtown WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rusk	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rusk Rural WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Rusk County WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Utilities*	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Cherokee County / Neches Basin WUG	**106**	**180**	**272**	**376**	**488**	**614**
Troup	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walnut Grove WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wells	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Jacksonville WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wright City WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hardin County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Hardin County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Hardin County WCID 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kountze	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lumberton MUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Hardin WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Silsbee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sour Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Hardin WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wildwood POA	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Hardin County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hardin County / Trinity Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Lake Livingston WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson County WUG Total	**2,097**	**2,101**	**2,118**	**2,354**	**2,991**	**3,596**
Henderson County / Neches Basin WUG	**2,097**	**2,101**	**2,118**	**2,354**	**2,991**	**3,596**
Athens*	0	0	4	9	15	18
Berryville	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bethel Ash WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brownsboro	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brushy Creek WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chandler	0	0	13	241	521	857
Edom WSC*	21	24	23	24	26	27
Frankston	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leagueville WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moore Station WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Murchison	0	0	0	0	0	0
R P M WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia Hill WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining*	15	16	17	19	47	143
Steam Electric Power*	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061
Livestock*	0	0	0	0	321	490

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Henderson County / Neches Basin WUG	**2,097**	**2,101**	**2,118**	**2,354**	**2,991**	**3,596**
Irrigation*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston County WUG Total	**93**	**81**	**79**	**136**	**360**	**359**
Houston County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**72**	**72**
Grapeland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennington WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Consolidated WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	12	72	72
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston County / Trinity Basin WUG	**93**	**81**	**79**	**124**	**288**	**287**
Crockett	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grapeland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lovelady	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennington WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
TDCJ Eastham Unit	93	81	79	77	75	74
The Consolidated WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	47	213	213
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jasper County WUG Total	**455**	**2,589**	**4,802**	**7,097**	**9,476**	**11,943**
Jasper County / Neches Basin WUG	**455**	**2,589**	**4,802**	**7,097**	**9,476**	**11,943**
Brookeland FWSD	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Jasper County / Neches Basin WUG	**455**	**2,589**	**4,802**	**7,097**	**9,476**	**11,943**
Jasper	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rayburn Country MUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rural WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Jasper County WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	455	2,589	4,802	7,097	9,476	11,943
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jasper County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Jasper	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jasper County WCID 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kirbyville	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauriceville SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Jasper County WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson County WUG Total	**11,403**	**39,355**	**72,908**	**107,459**	**141,828**	**176,050**
Jefferson County / Neches Basin WUG	**4,617**	**17,566**	**32,798**	**48,321**	**63,780**	**79,193**
Beaumont	2,047	1,133	768	774	727	639
Bevil Oaks	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Jefferson County / Neches Basin WUG	**4,617**	**17,566**	**32,798**	**48,321**	**63,780**	**79,193**
China	0	0	0	0	0	0
Groves	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson County WCID 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meeker MWD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nederland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nome	0	0	0	0	0	0
Port Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	2,570	16,433	32,030	47,547	63,053	78,554
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson County / Neches-Trinity Basin WUG	**6,786**	**21,789**	**40,110**	**59,138**	**78,048**	**96,857**
Beaumont	4,472	2,479	1,680	1,692	1,589	1,399
China	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	0	0	0	0	0	0
Groves	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson County WCID 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meeker MWD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nederland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nome	0	0	0	0	0	0
Port Arthur	0	0	0	0	0	0
Port Neches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinity Bay Conservation District*	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Jefferson County MWD	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Jefferson County / Neches-Trinity Basin WUG	**6,786**	**21,789**	**40,110**	**59,138**	**78,048**	**96,857**
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	2,314	19,310	38,430	57,446	76,459	95,458
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**28**	**77**	**127**	**174**
Nacogdoches County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**28**	**77**	**127**	**174**
Appleby WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caro WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cushing	0	0	0	0	0	0
D & M WSC	0	0	28	77	127	174
Etoile WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrison	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lilly Grove SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Melrose WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swift WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woden WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Newton County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Newton County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Bon Wier WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brookeland FWSD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauriceville SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newton	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Newton WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Orange County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Bridge City	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kelly G Brewer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauriceville SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange County WCID 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orangefield WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Orange County / Neches-Trinity Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Bridge City	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Bridge City	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kelly G Brewer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauriceville SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange County WCID 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange County WCID 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orangefield WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pinehurst	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Newton WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Panola County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Panola County / Cypress Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Panola-Bethany WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Panola County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Beckville	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carthage	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clayton WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Panola County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Deberry WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elysian Fields WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gill WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hollands Quarter WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minden Brachfield WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Panola-Bethany WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rehobeth WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tatum	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Polk County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Polk County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Chester WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrigan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Damascus-Stryker WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Livingston WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leggett WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moscow WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soda WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining*	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Polk County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Livestock*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rusk County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**	**56**
Rusk County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Ebenezer WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrison	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gaston WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goodsprings WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jacobs WSC	0	0	0	0	0	1
Minden Brachfield WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mt Enterprise WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
New London	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overton*	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Rusk County WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wright City WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rusk County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**	**55**
Chalk Hill SUD*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cross Roads SUD*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crystal Farms WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Rusk County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24**	**55**
Elderville WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jacobs WSC	0	0	0	0	24	55
Kilgore*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minden Brachfield WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
New London	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Prospect WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overton*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Utilities*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tatum	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Gregg SUD*	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sabine County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**97**	**96**	**96**
Sabine County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Brookeland FWSD	0	0	0	0	0	0
G M WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pineland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sabine County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**97**	**96**	**96**
Brookeland FWSD	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Sabine County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**97**	**96**	**96**
G M WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hemphill	0	0	0	0	0	0
New WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	97	96	96
San Augustine County WUG Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
San Augustine County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Choice WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denning WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
New WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Augustine	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Augustine Rural WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sand Hills WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Augustine County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
G M WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Augustine Rural WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
San Augustine County / Sabine Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby County WUG Total	**841**	**934**	**1,053**	**1,148**	**1,239**	**1,325**
Shelby County / Neches Basin WUG	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Choice WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sand Hills WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Timpson	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby County / Sabine Basin WUG	**841**	**934**	**1,053**	**1,148**	**1,239**	**1,325**
Center	0	0	0	0	0	0
Choice WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Lamar WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Five Way WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flat Fork WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huxley	0	0	0	0	0	0
Joaquin	0	0	0	0	0	0
McClelland WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
New WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sand Hills WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tenaha	0	0	0	0	0	0
Timpson	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	841	934	1,053	1,148	1,239	1,325

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Shelby County / Sabine Basin WUG	**841**	**934**	**1,053**	**1,148**	**1,239**	**1,325**
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smith County WUG Total	**581**	**471**	**417**	**506**	**887**	**979**
Smith County / Neches Basin WUG	**581**	**471**	**417**	**506**	**887**	**979**
Arp	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben Wheeler WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bullard	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crystal Systems Texas*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dean WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emerald Bay MUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lindale Rural WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lindale*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overton*	0	0	0	0	0	0
R P M WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Utilities*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Troup	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyler*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walnut Grove WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whitehouse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wright City WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other*	267	138	28	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG)
Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Smith County / Neches Basin WUG	**581**	**471**	**417**	**506**	**887**	**979**
Manufacturing*	0	0	36	132	490	558
Mining	314	333	353	374	397	421
Livestock*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinity County WUG Total	**215**	**215**	**215**	**215**	**215**	**215**
Trinity County / Neches Basin WUG	**215**	**215**	**215**	**215**	**215**	**215**
Centerville WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Groveton*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennington WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mining*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation*	215	215	215	215	215	215
Tyler County WUG Total	**78**	**82**	**87**	**92**	**97**	**102**
Tyler County / Neches Basin WUG	**78**	**82**	**87**	**92**	**97**	**102**
Chester WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colmesneil	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cypress Creek WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moscow WSC*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seneca WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyler County SUD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warren WSC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wildwood POA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woodville	0	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Second-Tier Identified Water Needs

	WUG Second-Tier Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Tyler County / Neches Basin WUG	**78**	**82**	**87**	**92**	**97**	**102**
Manufacturing	78	82	87	92	97	102
Mining	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steam Electric Power	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrigation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region I Second-Tier Needs Total	**20,683**	**51,030**	**87,211**	**125,004**	**163,491**	**201,393**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Anderson County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	14,107	17,526	24.2%	13,947	17,759	27.3%
Projected demand total	13,359	15,438	15.6%	13,169	15,168	15.2%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Anderson County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	0	1,686	100.0%	0	1,950	100.0%
Projected demand total	0	1,686	100.0%	0	1,950	100.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Anderson County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	210	34	-83.8%	164	34	-79.3%
Projected demand total	177	34	-80.8%	75	34	-54.7%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Anderson County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,408	0	-100.0%	1,408	0	-100.0%
Projected demand total	1,408	2,296	63.1%	1,408	2,296	63.1%
Water supply needs total**	0	2,296	100.0%	0	2,296	100.0%
Anderson County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,488	1,643	10.4%	1,488	1,643	10.4%
Projected demand total	1,026	1,321	28.8%	1,026	1,321	28.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Anderson County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	2,113	2,261	7.0%	2,113	2,261	7.0%
Projected demand total	657	905	37.7%	657	905	37.7%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Angelina County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	17,798	13,916	-21.8%	19,143	14,354	-25.0%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Projected demand total	12,100	11,518	-4.8%	13,923	11,987	-13.9%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Angelina County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	2,253	3,467	53.9%	2,253	3,630	61.1%
Projected demand total	3,878	5,612	44.7%	3,878	6,489	67.3%
Water supply needs total**	1,625	2,145	32.0%	1,625	2,859	75.9%
Angelina County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	13	407	3030.8%	13	407	3030.8%
Projected demand total	585	780	33.3%	180	915	408.3%
Water supply needs total**	572	373	-34.8%	167	508	204.2%
Angelina County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	16,802	0	-100.0%	16,802	0	-100.0%
Projected demand total	3,520	0	-100.0%	3,520	0	-100.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Angelina County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,028	997	-3.0%	1,028	997	-3.0%
Projected demand total	1,028	684	-33.5%	1,028	684	-33.5%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Angelina County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,110	1,110	0.0%	1,110	1,110	0.0%
Projected demand total	779	779	0.0%	779	779	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Cherokee County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	10,378	8,132	-21.6%	12,721	7,503	-41.0%
Projected demand total	8,856	8,173	-7.7%	12,095	7,912	-34.6%
Water supply needs total**	0	124	100.0%	436	533	22.2%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Cherokee County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	140	82	-41.4%	140	94	-32.9%
Projected demand total	129	82	-36.4%	129	94	-27.1%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Cherokee County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	57	187	228.1%	57	187	228.1%
Projected demand total	304	187	-38.5%	97	187	92.8%
Water supply needs total**	247	0	-100.0%	40	0	-100.0%
Cherokee County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	5,000	431	-91.4%	5,000	630	-87.4%
Projected demand total	3,211	310	-90.3%	3,211	310	-90.3%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Cherokee County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,883	1,231	-34.6%	1,883	1,231	-34.6%
Projected demand total	1,874	1,231	-34.3%	1,874	1,231	-34.3%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Cherokee County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	507	451	-11.0%	496	451	-9.1%
Projected demand total	451	451	0.0%	451	451	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Hardin County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	6,954	8,177	17.6%	7,441	9,588	28.9%
Projected demand total	6,065	7,154	18.0%	6,572	8,047	22.4%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Hardin County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	51	243	376.5%	51	243	376.5%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Projected demand total	45	64	42.2%	45	74	64.4%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Hardin County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	12	13	8.3%	12	13	8.3%
Projected demand total	12	13	8.3%	12	13	8.3%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Hardin County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1	1	0.0%	1	1	0.0%
Projected demand total	1	1	0.0%	1	1	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Hardin County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	216	246	13.9%	216	246	13.9%
Projected demand total	198	201	1.5%	198	201	1.5%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Hardin County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	989	989	0.0%	989	989	0.0%
Projected demand total	989	989	0.0%	989	989	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Henderson County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	3,427	3,539	3.3%	4,087	3,998	-2.2%
Projected demand total	3,028	3,150	4.0%	3,953	3,846	-2.7%
Water supply needs total**	23	21	-8.7%	326	614	88.3%
Henderson County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	65	158	143.1%	67	208	210.4%
Projected demand total	86	173	101.2%	28	255	810.7%
Water supply needs total**	21	15	-28.6%	0	47	100.0%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Henderson County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Projected demand total	0	2,061	100.0%	0	2,061	100.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	2,061	100.0%	0	2,061	100.0%
Henderson County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	3,793	4,074	7.4%	2,275	2,858	25.6%
Projected demand total	1,006	3,179	216.0%	1,006	3,179	216.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	321	100.0%
Henderson County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	303	865	185.5%	253	812	220.9%
Projected demand total	303	459	51.5%	303	459	51.5%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	50	0	-100.0%
Houston County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	6,025	4,782	-20.6%	5,999	4,295	-28.4%
Projected demand total	4,073	4,339	6.5%	3,936	3,858	-2.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	113	100.0%	0	111	100.0%
Houston County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	254	205	-19.3%	254	236	-7.1%
Projected demand total	232	201	-13.4%	232	232	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Houston County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	254	302	18.9%	22	302	1272.7%
Projected demand total	254	302	18.9%	22	302	1272.7%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Houston County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	2,238	1,925	-14.0%	2,238	2,095	-6.4%
Projected demand total	1,707	1,666	-2.4%	2,439	2,380	-2.4%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	201	285	41.8%
Houston County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	2,899	2,669	-7.9%	2,899	2,669	-7.9%
Projected demand total	2,137	2,137	0.0%	2,137	2,137	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Jasper County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	5,877	4,760	-19.0%	5,650	3,806	-32.6%
Projected demand total	4,882	4,692	-3.9%	4,711	3,733	-20.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Jasper County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	89,232	57,213	-35.9%	89,232	57,213	-35.9%
Projected demand total	57,364	57,668	0.5%	57,364	66,689	16.3%
Water supply needs total**	0	455	100.0%	0	9,476	100.0%
Jasper County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	118	28	-76.3%	16	28	75.0%
Projected demand total	118	28	-76.3%	14	28	100.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Jasper County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,068	10,287	863.2%	1,068	10,287	863.2%
Projected demand total	10,000	10,273	2.7%	10,000	10,273	2.7%
Water supply needs total**	8,932	0	-100.0%	8,932	0	-100.0%
Jasper County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	151	303	100.7%	151	303	100.7%
Projected demand total	151	303	100.7%	151	303	100.7%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Jefferson County| Municipal WUG Type						

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Existing WUG supply total	62,573	51,513	-17.7%	64,962	50,767	-21.9%
Projected demand total	62,112	59,071	-4.9%	76,127	58,217	-23.5%
Water supply needs total**	0	8,613	100.0%	11,168	9,649	-13.6%
Jefferson County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	90,389	170,116	88.2%	90,456	175,488	94.0%
Projected demand total	233,902	175,000	-25.2%	233,902	315,000	34.7%
Water supply needs total**	143,513	4,884	-96.6%	143,446	139,512	-2.7%
Jefferson County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	216	431	99.5%	368	431	17.1%
Projected demand total	216	294	36.1%	368	379	3.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Jefferson County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	900	0	-100.0%	900	0	-100.0%
Projected demand total	3,291	0	-100.0%	3,291	0	-100.0%
Water supply needs total**	2,391	0	-100.0%	2,391	0	-100.0%
Jefferson County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,006	1,439	43.0%	1,006	1,439	43.0%
Projected demand total	837	799	-4.5%	837	799	-4.5%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Jefferson County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	204,341	191,409	-6.3%	204,341	191,409	-6.3%
Projected demand total	88,536	88,536	0.0%	88,536	88,536	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Nacogdoches County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	14,498	13,355	-7.9%	18,383	15,076	-18.0%
Projected demand total	12,663	13,225	4.4%	18,102	15,114	-16.5%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	404	167	-58.7%
Nacogdoches County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	12,530	12,892	2.9%	12,530	13,344	6.5%
Projected demand total	2,529	2,892	14.4%	2,529	3,344	32.2%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Nacogdoches County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,525	975	-36.1%	1,525	975	-36.1%
Projected demand total	4,500	891	-80.2%	707	891	26.0%
Water supply needs total**	2,975	0	-100.0%	0	0	0.0%
Nacogdoches County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	0	1,494	100.0%	0	2,187	100.0%
Projected demand total	0	400	100.0%	0	400	100.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Nacogdoches County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	3,723	10,308	176.9%	3,723	10,308	176.9%
Projected demand total	10,122	2,625	-74.1%	12,836	3,329	-74.1%
Water supply needs total**	6,399	0	-100.0%	9,113	0	-100.0%
Nacogdoches County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	440	345	-21.6%	440	345	-21.6%
Projected demand total	266	266	0.0%	266	266	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Newton County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,837	1,459	-20.6%	1,783	875	-50.9%
Projected demand total	1,573	1,459	-7.2%	1,510	875	-42.1%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Newton County| Manufacturing WUG Type						

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs
**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Existing WUG supply total	644	6,140	853.4%	931	7,100	662.6%
Projected demand total	56	6,140	10864.3%	56	7,100	12578.6%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Newton County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	314	174	-44.6%	314	174	-44.6%
Projected demand total	373	3	-99.2%	107	3	-97.2%
Water supply needs total**	59	0	-100.0%	0	0	0.0%
Newton County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	13,442	13,442	0.0%	13,442	13,442	0.0%
Projected demand total	5,778	6,808	17.8%	5,778	6,808	17.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Newton County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	259	262	1.2%	259	262	1.2%
Projected demand total	168	114	-32.1%	168	114	-32.1%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Newton County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	380	438	15.3%	380	438	15.3%
Projected demand total	101	101	0.0%	101	101	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Orange County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	11,009	14,644	33.0%	11,221	15,244	35.9%
Projected demand total	9,734	11,103	14.1%	10,186	10,971	7.7%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Orange County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	55,991	113,377	102.5%	55,991	120,073	114.5%
Projected demand total	48,193	103,832	115.5%	48,193	120,073	149.2%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Orange County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	327	262	-19.9%	327	262	-19.9%
Projected demand total	314	11	-96.5%	327	11	-96.6%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Orange County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	5,791	12,687	119.1%	5,791	12,419	114.5%
Projected demand total	4,298	10,497	144.2%	4,298	10,497	144.2%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Orange County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	272	349	28.3%	272	349	28.3%
Projected demand total	255	187	-26.7%	255	187	-26.7%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Orange County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,298	2,445	88.4%	1,298	2,445	88.4%
Projected demand total	1,824	1,824	0.0%	1,824	1,824	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	526	0	-100.0%	526	0	-100.0%
Panola County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	4,309	3,723	-13.6%	4,352	3,335	-23.4%
Projected demand total	3,597	3,655	1.6%	3,737	3,242	-13.2%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Panola County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,298	1,298	0.0%	1,468	1,502	2.3%
Projected demand total	1,272	1,298	2.0%	1,272	1,502	18.1%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Panola County| Mining WUG Type						

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Existing WUG supply total	9,372	6,481	-30.8%	9,520	6,662	-30.0%
Projected demand total	5,859	2,280	-61.1%	3,938	2,280	-42.1%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Panola County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,670	3,191	91.1%	1,670	3,282	96.5%
Projected demand total	2,652	1,142	-56.9%	2,652	1,142	-56.9%
Water supply needs total**	982	0	-100.0%	982	0	-100.0%
Panola County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	602	1,069	77.6%	602	1,069	77.6%
Projected demand total	574	1,069	86.2%	574	1,069	86.2%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Polk County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,453	1,397	-3.9%	1,747	1,706	-2.3%
Projected demand total	1,070	1,060	-0.9%	1,282	1,270	-0.9%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Polk County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	475	401	-15.6%	475	463	-2.5%
Projected demand total	466	392	-15.9%	466	454	-2.6%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Polk County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	103	104	1.0%	103	84	-18.4%
Projected demand total	97	26	-73.2%	9	30	233.3%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Polk County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	403	159	-60.5%	403	159	-60.5%
Projected demand total	174	114	-34.5%	174	114	-34.5%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Polk County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	313	313	0.0%	313	313	0.0%
Projected demand total	230	230	0.0%	230	230	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Rusk County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	14,262	13,724	-3.8%	16,242	13,041	-19.7%
Projected demand total	10,496	8,717	-16.9%	14,610	7,524	-48.5%
Water supply needs total**	122	0	-100.0%	427	26	-93.9%
Rusk County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	373	245	-34.3%	470	245	-47.9%
Projected demand total	34	26	-23.5%	34	30	-11.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Rusk County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	3,702	3,799	2.6%	3,702	3,826	3.3%
Projected demand total	4,007	489	-87.8%	3,592	489	-86.4%
Water supply needs total**	305	0	-100.0%	0	0	0.0%
Rusk County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	44,201	44,201	0.0%	44,201	44,201	0.0%
Projected demand total	45,304	19,406	-57.2%	45,304	19,406	-57.2%
Water supply needs total**	1,103	0	-100.0%	1,103	0	-100.0%
Rusk County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,683	1,993	18.4%	1,694	1,993	17.7%
Projected demand total	1,683	1,316	-21.8%	1,777	1,389	-21.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	83	0	-100.0%
Rusk County| Irrigation WUG Type						

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs
**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Existing WUG supply total	592	633	6.9%	592	633	6.9%
Projected demand total	276	276	0.0%	276	276	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Sabine County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	2,265	1,778	-21.5%	2,257	1,690	-25.1%
Projected demand total	1,043	1,444	38.4%	1,020	1,067	4.6%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Sabine County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	310	563	81.6%	310	563	81.6%
Projected demand total	265	449	69.4%	265	520	96.2%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Sabine County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	2,234	334	-85.0%	2,234	334	-85.0%
Projected demand total	1,365	203	-85.1%	776	203	-73.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Sabine County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	732	484	-33.9%	732	571	-22.0%
Projected demand total	176	323	83.5%	363	667	83.7%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	96	100.0%
San Augustine County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,649	1,855	12.5%	1,649	1,796	8.9%
Projected demand total	1,121	1,367	21.9%	1,078	1,138	5.6%
Water supply needs total**	105	0	-100.0%	89	0	-100.0%
San Augustine County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	17	8	-52.9%	17	8	-52.9%
Projected demand total	6	4	-33.3%	6	4	-33.3%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
San Augustine County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,898	1,411	-25.7%	1,898	1,411	-25.7%
Projected demand total	3,000	1,411	-53.0%	662	1,411	113.1%
Water supply needs total**	1,102	0	-100.0%	0	0	0.0%
San Augustine County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	680	1,648	142.4%	717	1,722	140.2%
Projected demand total	2,219	533	-76.0%	3,066	736	-76.0%
Water supply needs total**	1,539	0	-100.0%	2,349	0	-100.0%
San Augustine County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	62	16	-74.2%	62	16	-74.2%
Projected demand total	4	14	250.0%	4	14	250.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Shelby County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	5,519	6,150	11.4%	6,292	5,786	-8.0%
Projected demand total	4,863	4,882	0.4%	5,773	4,297	-25.6%
Water supply needs total**	76	0	-100.0%	117	0	-100.0%
Shelby County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	2,035	1,019	-49.9%	2,088	912	-56.3%
Projected demand total	1,696	1,860	9.7%	1,696	2,151	26.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	841	100.0%	0	1,239	100.0%
Shelby County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	3,025	4,436	46.6%	1,725	4,436	157.2%
Projected demand total	2,938	2,070	-29.5%	1,087	2,070	90.4%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Shelby County| Livestock WUG Type						

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Existing WUG supply total	5,367	12,019	123.9%	5,367	12,343	130.0%
Projected demand total	14,128	3,338	-76.4%	24,373	5,759	-76.4%
Water supply needs total**	8,761	0	-100.0%	19,006	0	-100.0%
Shelby County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	98	10	-89.8%	98	10	-89.8%
Projected demand total	10	10	0.0%	10	10	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Smith County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	36,319	54,237	49.3%	46,738	69,462	48.6%
Projected demand total	35,444	50,135	41.4%	48,150	66,620	38.4%
Water supply needs total**	551	273	-50.5%	2,573	10	-99.6%
Smith County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	3,264	3,179	-2.6%	3,264	2,814	-13.8%
Projected demand total	3,348	2,857	-14.7%	3,348	3,304	-1.3%
Water supply needs total**	84	0	-100.0%	84	490	483.3%
Smith County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	142	113	-20.4%	98	113	15.3%
Projected demand total	139	427	207.2%	58	510	779.3%
Water supply needs total**	0	314	100.0%	0	397	100.0%
Smith County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,115	813	-27.1%	1,115	813	-27.1%
Projected demand total	580	500	-13.8%	580	500	-13.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Smith County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	928	932	0.4%	906	901	-0.6%
Projected demand total	448	448	0.0%	448	448	0.0%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Trinity County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	795	317	-60.1%	798	223	-72.1%
Projected demand total	355	316	-11.0%	369	223	-39.6%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Trinity County| Mining WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	5	9	80.0%	5	9	80.0%
Projected demand total	5	9	80.0%	5	9	80.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Trinity County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	478	258	-46.0%	478	285	-40.4%
Projected demand total	202	187	-7.4%	202	187	-7.4%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Trinity County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	303	63	-79.2%	303	63	-79.2%
Projected demand total	278	278	0.0%	278	278	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	215	100.0%	0	215	100.0%
Tyler County| Municipal WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	8,740	8,742	0.0%	8,657	8,283	-4.3%
Projected demand total	3,436	3,142	-8.6%	3,308	2,683	-18.9%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Tyler County| Manufacturing WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	0	40	100.0%	0	40	100.0%
Projected demand total	0	118	100.0%	0	137	100.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	78	100.0%	0	97	100.0%
Tyler County| Mining WUG Type						

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Water User Group (WUG) Data Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Existing WUG supply total	198	42	-78.8%	29	42	44.8%
Projected demand total	198	42	-78.8%	29	42	44.8%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Tyler County| Steam Electric Power WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	1,029	191	-81.4%	1,029	191	-81.4%
Projected demand total	200	3	-98.5%	200	3	-98.5%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Tyler County| Livestock WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	314	268	-14.6%	314	268	-14.6%
Projected demand total	249	268	7.6%	249	268	7.6%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Tyler County| Irrigation WUG Type						
Existing WUG supply total	647	442	-31.7%	647	442	-31.7%
Projected demand total	354	354	0.0%	354	354	0.0%
Water supply needs total**	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Region I Total						
Existing WUG supply total	848,906	958,404	12.9%	870,711	987,344	13.4%
Projected demand total	793,495	755,106	-4.8%	839,601	942,672	12.3%
Water supply needs total**	182,013	22,821	-87.5%	205,638	171,009	-16.8%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs

**WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The needs shown in the WUG Data Comparison to 2021 RWP report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from its total existing water supply volume. If the WUG split has a greater existing supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. Before aggregating the difference between supplies and demands to the WUG county and category level, calculated surpluses are updated to zero so that only the WUGs with needs in the decade are included with the water supply needs totals.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Source Availability Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Anderson County						
Groundwater availability total	49,104	44,220	-9.9%	49,104	44,219	-9.9%
Surface Water availability total	2,469	2,645	7.1%	2,469	2,645	7.1%
Angelina County						
Groundwater availability total	46,757	46,798	0.1%	46,374	46,415	0.1%
Surface Water availability total	675	1,007	49.2%	675	1,007	49.2%
Cherokee County						
Groundwater availability total	44,771	24,673	-44.9%	43,963	24,673	-43.9%
Surface Water availability total	1,682	1,810	7.6%	1,682	1,810	7.6%
Hardin County						
Groundwater availability total	34,927	37,721	8.0%	34,927	37,721	8.0%
Surface Water availability total	212	503	137.3%	212	503	137.3%
Henderson County						
Groundwater availability total	18,788	15,197	-19.1%	18,788	15,197	-19.1%
Surface Water availability total	770	770	0.0%	770	770	0.0%
Houston County						
Groundwater availability total	36,700	12,784	-65.2%	36,700	12,784	-65.2%
Surface Water availability total	4,520	4,460	-1.3%	4,520	4,460	-1.3%
Jasper County						
Groundwater availability total	67,484	73,965	9.6%	67,484	73,965	9.6%
Surface Water availability total	382,977	382,737	-0.1%	382,977	382,737	-0.1%
Jefferson County						
Groundwater availability total	2,525	15,424	510.9%	2,525	15,424	510.9%
Reuse availability total	13,687	1,333	-90.3%	13,687	1,333	-90.3%
Surface Water availability total	822,068	64,285	-92.2%	826,924	64,987	-92.1%
Nacogdoches County						
Groundwater availability total	28,897	25,533	-11.6%	28,897	25,533	-11.6%
Surface Water availability total	2,949	9,415	219.3%	2,949	9,415	219.3%
Newton County						
Groundwater availability total	34,219	37,508	9.6%	34,219	37,508	9.6%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs.

**Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, 'reservoir' is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Source Availability Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Surface Water availability total	133,441	130,381	-2.3%	133,441	130,381	-2.3%
Orange County						
Groundwater availability total	19,364	25,205	30.2%	19,364	25,205	30.2%
Reuse availability total	15	15	0.0%	15	15	0.0%
Surface Water availability total	284,614	287	-99.9%	284,614	287	-99.9%
Panola County						
Groundwater availability total	8,218	4,999	-39.2%	8,068	4,999	-38.0%
Surface Water availability total	1,828	3,177	73.8%	1,828	3,177	73.8%
Polk County						
Groundwater availability total	16,527	18,395	11.3%	16,527	18,395	11.3%
Surface Water availability total	416	148	-64.4%	416	148	-64.4%
Reservoir County**						
Surface Water availability total	2,210,756	3,061,456	38.5%	2,192,379	3,041,551	38.7%
Rusk County						
Groundwater availability total	21,634	14,816	-31.5%	21,615	14,816	-31.5%
Surface Water availability total	2,565	2,870	11.9%	2,565	2,870	11.9%
Sabine County						
Groundwater availability total	8,437	6,072	-28.0%	8,437	6,072	-28.0%
Reuse availability total	20	20	0.0%	20	20	0.0%
Surface Water availability total	883	363	-58.9%	883	363	-58.9%
San Augustine County						
Groundwater availability total	5,111	4,259	-16.7%	5,111	4,259	-16.7%
Surface Water availability total	536	1,835	242.4%	536	1,835	242.4%
Shelby County						
Groundwater availability total	10,442	6,319	-39.5%	9,099	6,319	-30.6%
Reuse availability total	246	233	-5.3%	299	284	-5.0%
Surface Water availability total	4,332	11,269	160.1%	4,332	11,269	160.1%
Smith County						
Groundwater availability total	54,319	38,650	-28.8%	54,307	38,650	-28.8%
Surface Water availability total	655	358	-45.3%	655	358	-45.3%
Trinity County						

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs.

**Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, 'reservoir' is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I 2026 Regional Water Plan (RWP)
Source Availability Comparison to 2021 RWP

Water Volumes Shown in Acre-Feet per year

	2030 Planning Decade*			2070 Planning Decade*		
	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)	2021 RWP	2026 RWP	Difference (%)
Groundwater availability total	1,823	1,818	-0.3%	1,823	1,818	-0.3%
Surface Water availability total	452	233	-48.5%	452	233	-48.5%
Tyler County						
Groundwater availability total	38,211	34,390	-10.0%	38,211	34,390	-10.0%
Surface Water availability total	335	335	0.0%	335	335	0.0%
Region I Total						
Groundwater availability total	548,258	488,746	-10.9%	545,543	488,362	-10.5%
Reuse availability total	13,968	1,601	-88.5%	14,021	1,652	-88.2%
Surface Water availability total	3,859,135	3,680,344	-4.6%	3,845,614	3,661,141	-4.8%

*The 2030 and 2070 planning decades are used in this comparison because they represent the earliest and latest planning decades in both the 2021 and 2026 RWPs.

**Since reservoir sources can exist across multiple counties, the county field value, 'reservoir' is applied to all reservoir sources.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Unmet Needs

WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. The unmet needs shown in the WUG Unmet Needs report are calculated by first deducting the WUG split's projected demand from the sum of its total existing water supply volume and all associated recommended water management strategy water volumes. If the WUG split has a greater future supply volume than projected demand in any given decade, this amount is considered a surplus volume. In order to display only unmet needs associated with the WUG split, these surplus volumes are updated to a zero and the unmet needs water volumes are shown as absolute values.

	WUG Unmet Needs (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Henderson County WUG Total	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**
Henderson County / Neches Basin WUG Total	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**
Steam Electric Power*	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061	2,061
Region I Unmet Needs Total	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**	**2,061**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Afton Grove WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Afton Grove WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1163	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Afton Grove WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$250	3	5	5	6	7	8
Afton Grove WSC Total					**4**	**6**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**

WUG Name: Alto					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Alto - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$333	$167	3	5	5	5	6	6
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	428	428	428	428	428
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Alto	I	Demand Reduction	$1567	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Alto Total					**4**	**434**	**434**	**434**	**435**	**435**

WUG Name: Alto Rural WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Alto Rural WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$462	$227	13	24	28	32	38	44
Alto Rural WSC - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Cherokee County	$1448	$649	670	670	670	670	670	670
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Alto Rural WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1756	$300	5	5	6	6	7	7
Alto Rural WSC Total					**688**	**699**	**704**	**708**	**715**	**721**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1378	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	2	3	3	3	3	4
Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC Total					**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**5**

WUG Name: Angelina WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Angelina WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1203	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Angelina WSC Total					**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Appleby WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Appleby WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$333	$184	15	25	28	31	34	38
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Appleby WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$5712	$300	5	5	6	6	6	6
Appleby WSC Total					**20**	**30**	**34**	**37**	**40**	**44**

WUG Name: Arp					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	428	428	428	428	428
Arp - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$500	2	3	3	3	3	2

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Arp	I	Demand Reduction	$531	$458	11	30	38	34	31	27
Arp Total					**13**	**461**	**469**	**465**	**462**	**457**

WUG Name: Athens*					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Athens MWA - WTP Booster Pump Station Expansion	I	I | Athens Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$19	0	0	0	1	3	4
Athens MWA - WTP Booster Pump Station Expansion	I	I | Neches Indirect Reuse	N/A	$0	0	0	4	8	12	14
Athens* Total					**0**	**0**	**4**	**9**	**15**	**18**

WUG Name: B B S WSC*					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - B B S WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1364	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - B B S WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1000	$500	2	3	3	4	4	4
B B S WSC* Total					**3**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: B C Y WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
B C Y WSC - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	N/A	$1329	0	170	170	170	170	170
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - B C Y WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$16814	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - B C Y WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	4	6	7	7	7	8
B C Y WSC Total					**5**	**177**	**178**	**178**	**178**	**179**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Beaumont					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Beaumont - Contract Amendment with LNVA	I	I | Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	$326	$326	6,685	7,398	8,273	8,513	8,565	8,466
Beaumont - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$98	$45	613	954	1,084	1,171	1,257	1,340
Beaumont - Well Field Infrastructure Improvements	I	I | Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Hardin County	$2860	$118	2,823	2,823	2,823	2,823	2,823	2,823
Conservation, Water Loss Control - Beaumont	I	Demand Reduction	$539	$459	1,481	4,552	6,236	6,156	6,075	5,996
Beaumont Total					**11,602**	**15,727**	**18,416**	**18,663**	**18,720**	**18,625**

WUG Name: Beckville					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Beckville	I	Demand Reduction	$1243	N/A	1	0	0	0	0	0
Beckville Total					**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

WUG Name: Berryville					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Berryville	I	Demand Reduction	N/A	$300	0	0	0	1	1	1
Berryville Total					**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Bethel Ash WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bethel Ash WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$4654	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Bethel Ash WSC* Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Bevil Oaks					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bevil Oaks	I	Demand Reduction	N/A	N/A	0	1	1	0	0	0
Bevil Oaks Total					**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**

WUG Name: Blackjack WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Blackjack WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$500	2	3	2	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Blackjack WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	N/A	1	1	0	0	0	0
Blackjack WSC Total					**3**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Bon Wier WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bon Wier WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1292	N/A	1	0	0	0	0	0
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Bon Wier WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	N/A	2	2	2	2	2	0
Bon Wier WSC Total					**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**0**

WUG Name: Bridge City					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bridge City	I	Demand Reduction	$1086	$300	6	7	7	7	7	7
Bridge City Total					**6**	**7**	**7**	**7**	**7**	**7**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Brookeland FWSD					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Brookeland FWSD	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Brookeland FWSD	I	Demand Reduction	$1000	$250	2	4	4	4	4	4
Brookeland FWSD Total					**3**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Brownsboro					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Brownsboro - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	4	6	7	7	8	8
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Brownsboro	I	Demand Reduction	$792	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Brownsboro Total					**5**	**7**	**8**	**8**	**9**	**9**

WUG Name: Brushy Creek WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Brushy Creek WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$15981	$300	2	4	5	5	5	5
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Brushy Creek WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$625	$313	6	10	10	11	12	12
Brushy Creek WSC* Total					**8**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**17**

WUG Name: Bullard					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Bullard - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$467	$200	15	29	33	39	44	50

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bullard	I	Demand Reduction	$1880	$300	5	6	7	7	8	8
Tyler-Lake Palestine	I	I | Palestine Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$896	0	322	511	718	928	1,145
Bullard Total					**20**	**357**	**551**	**764**	**980**	**1,203**

WUG Name: Caro WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Caro WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1495	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Caro WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$800	$357	5	9	10	11	12	14
Caro WSC Total					**7**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**16**

WUG Name: Carthage					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Carthage - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$391	$196	23	38	40	42	44	46
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Carthage	I	Demand Reduction	$1777	$300	8	8	8	8	8	8
Carthage Total					**31**	**46**	**48**	**50**	**52**	**54**

WUG Name: Center					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Center - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$233	$107	30	48	51	53	55	56
Center - Reuse Pipeline to Industrial Customer	I	I | Sabine Indirect Reuse	N/A	$583	0	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Center	I	Demand Reduction	$651	$473	50	146	190	185	181	176
Center Total					**80**	**1,315**	**1,362**	**1,359**	**1,357**	**1,353**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Centerville WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Centerville WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$474	$319	4	12	13	12	10	8
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Centerville WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	2	3	2	2	2	2
Centerville WSC Total					**6**	**15**	**15**	**14**	**12**	**10**

WUG Name: Central WCID of Angelina County					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Central WCID of Angelina County	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	$300	3	3	3	3	3	3
Central WCID of Angelina County Total					**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**

WUG Name: Chalk Hill SUD*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Chalk Hill SUD	I	Demand Reduction	$1175	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chalk Hill SUD* Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Chandler					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Chandler - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$600	$254	10	19	25	34	44	67
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Chandler	I	Demand Reduction	$1082	$300	3	4	5	6	8	10
Tyler-Lake Palestine	I	I | Palestine Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$1827	0	0	50	290	580	940
Chandler Total					**13**	**23**	**80**	**330**	**632**	**1,017**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Chester WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Chester WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	2	3	3	3	4	4
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Chester WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chester WSC Total					**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: China					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
China - New Well(s) in Gulf Coast Aquifer System	I	I | Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jefferson County	N/A	$1224	0	250	250	250	250	250
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - China	I	Demand Reduction	$1348	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - China	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$167	2	4	5	5	5	6
China Total					**3**	**255**	**256**	**256**	**256**	**257**

WUG Name: Choice WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Choice WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1292	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Choice WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Clayton WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Clayton WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$2030	$300	1	1	2	2	2	2

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Clayton WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	4	6	8	9	10	10
Clayton WSC Total					**5**	**7**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**12**

WUG Name: Colmesneil					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Colmesneil - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	2	3	4	4	4	4
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Colmesneil	I	Demand Reduction	$1495	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Colmesneil Total					**3**	**4**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Corrigan					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Corrigan	I	Demand Reduction	$503	$366	9	30	41	43	44	46
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Corrigan	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$375	4	6	7	7	8	8
Corrigan Total					**13**	**36**	**48**	**50**	**52**	**54**

WUG Name: County-Other, Anderson					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Anderson	I	Demand Reduction	$1880	$300	3	3	3	3	3	2
County-Other, Anderson Total					**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**2**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: County-Other, Angelina					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Angelina	I	Demand Reduction	$1700	$300	3	3	3	3	3	3
County-Other, Angelina Total					**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**

WUG Name: County-Other, Cherokee					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	3,848	3,848	3,848	3,848	3,848
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Cherokee	I	Demand Reduction	$1700	N/A	2	2	1	1	1	0
County-Other, Cherokee Total					**2**	**3,850**	**3,849**	**3,849**	**3,849**	**3,848**

WUG Name: County-Other, Hardin					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Hardin	I	Demand Reduction	$1842	$300	5	5	4	4	3	2
County-Other, Hardin Total					**5**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**3**	**2**

WUG Name: County-Other, Henderson*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Integrated Pipeline	C	C | Trinity Indirect Reuse	$1	$1	17	23	21	13	14	9
TRWD - Reuse from Mary's Creek WRF	C	C | Trinity Indirect Reuse	$1	$1	3	6	5	4	5	4
County-Other, Henderson* Total					**20**	**29**	**26**	**17**	**19**	**13**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: County-Other, Houston					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
County-Other, Houston - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$667	N/A	6	8	5	4	2	0
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Houston	I	Demand Reduction	$1953	N/A	2	2	1	1	0	0
County-Other, Houston Total					**8**	**10**	**6**	**5**	**2**	**0**

WUG Name: County-Other, Jasper					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Jasper	I	Demand Reduction	$1722	$300	6	5	5	4	4	3
County-Other, Jasper Total					**6**	**5**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**3**

WUG Name: County-Other, Jefferson					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Jefferson	I	Demand Reduction	$1984	$300	10	9	6	5	5	4
County-Other, Jefferson Total					**10**	**9**	**6**	**5**	**5**	**4**

WUG Name: County-Other, Nacogdoches					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	428	428	428	428	428
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Nacogdoches	I	Demand Reduction	$1675	$300	3	3	3	3	3	4
County-Other, Nacogdoches Total					**3**	**431**	**431**	**431**	**431**	**432**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: County-Other, Newton					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Newton	I	Demand Reduction	$1700	$300	3	3	3	2	2	2
County-Other, Newton Total					**3**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: County-Other, Orange					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Orange	I	Demand Reduction	$1756	$300	10	9	8	7	6	5
County-Other, Orange Total					**10**	**9**	**8**	**7**	**6**	**5**

WUG Name: County-Other, Panola					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Panola	I	Demand Reduction	$1700	$300	5	5	5	5	4	4
County-Other, Panola Total					**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**4**	**4**

WUG Name: County-Other, Polk*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Water Loss Reduction, County-Other, Polk	H	Demand Reduction	$761	$726	3	11	17	24	31	37
County-Other, Polk* Total					**3**	**11**	**17**	**24**	**31**	**37**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: County-Other, Rusk					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Rusk	I	Demand Reduction	$1722	$300	5	4	4	3	2	1
County-Other, Rusk Total					**5**	**4**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

WUG Name: County-Other, Sabine					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Sabine	I	Demand Reduction	$1495	N/A	1	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other, Sabine Total					**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

WUG Name: County-Other, San Augustine					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, San Augustine	I	Demand Reduction	$1567	N/A	1	1	1	0	0	0
County-Other, San Augustine Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**

WUG Name: County-Other, Shelby					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Shelby	I	Demand Reduction	$1722	$300	5	5	5	5	4	4
County-Other, Shelby Total					**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**4**	**4**

WUG Name: County-Other, Smith*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
County-Other, Smith - Purchase from the City of Tyler	I	I | Tyler Lake/Reservoir	$5768	N/A	280	150	40	0	0	0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Smith	I	Demand Reduction	$2401	$300	6	5	5	4	4	3
County-Other, Smith* Total					**286**	**155**	**45**	**4**	**4**	**3**

WUG Name: County-Other, Trinity*					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Trinity	I	Demand Reduction	$3336	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
County-Other, Trinity* Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: County-Other, Tyler					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Tyler	I	Demand Reduction	$1850	$300	4	3	3	2	2	1
County-Other, Tyler Total					**4**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**1**

WUG Name: Craft Turney WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Craft Turney WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$386	$321	48	141	184	180	176	172
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Craft Turney WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$778	$333	9	14	15	16	17	18
Craft Turney WSC Total					**57**	**155**	**199**	**196**	**193**	**190**

WUG Name: Crockett					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Crockett - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$600	$292	15	23	23	23	24	24

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Crockett	I	Demand Reduction	$467	$437	81	228	275	266	256	243
Crockett Total					**96**	**251**	**298**	**289**	**280**	**267**

WUG Name: Cross Roads SUD*					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Cross Roads SUD	I	Demand Reduction	$1587	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cross Roads SUD* Total					**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Crystal Farms WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Crystal Farms WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1168	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Crystal Farms WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Crystal Systems Texas*					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Drill New Wells (Crystal Systems Inc, Carrizo, Neches)	D	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyler-Lake Palestine	I	I | Palestine Lake/Reservoir	$896	$896	34	74	124	179	224	224
Crystal Systems Texas* Total					**34**	**74**	**124**	**179**	**224**	**224**

WUG Name: Cushing					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation - Cushing	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$167	2	3	3	4	4	6

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Cushing	I	Demand Reduction	$1739	$300	1	3	4	5	5	5
Cushing Total					**3**	**6**	**7**	**9**	**9**	**11**

WUG Name: Cypress Creek WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Cypress Creek WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Cypress Creek WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$2648	$300	1	2	2	2	2	1
Cypress Creek WSC Total					**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**3**

WUG Name: D & M WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
D & M WSC - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Nacogdoches County	N/A	$1191	0	220	220	220	220	220
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - D & M WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$2045	$300	5	5	6	6	6	6
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - D & M WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$733	$368	15	25	28	32	34	38
D & M WSC Total					**20**	**250**	**254**	**258**	**260**	**264**

WUG Name: Damascus-Stryker WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Damascus-Stryker WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1239	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Damascus-Stryker WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1000	$375	2	5	5	6	6	8
Damascus-Stryker WSC Total					**3**	**6**	**6**	**7**	**7**	**9**

WUG Name: Dean WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Dean WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$700	$321	10	18	20	23	25	28
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Dean WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1567	$300	4	4	4	4	4	5
Dean WSC Total					**14**	**22**	**24**	**27**	**29**	**33**

WUG Name: Deberry WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Deberry WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1292	N/A	1	0	0	0	0	0
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Deberry WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Deberry WSC Total					**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Denning WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Denning WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$373	$362	9	24	29	27	25	23
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Denning WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	2	3	2	2	2	2
Denning WSC Total					**11**	**27**	**31**	**29**	**27**	**25**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Diboll					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Diboll	I	Demand Reduction	$1527	$300	3	3	4	4	4	4
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Diboll	I	Demand Reduction	$700	$318	10	16	18	19	21	22
Diboll Total					**13**	**19**	**22**	**23**	**25**	**26**

WUG Name: East Lamar WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - East Lamar WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1292	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
East Lamar WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Ebenezer WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Ebenezer WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1527	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Ebenezer WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	2	4	4	4	4	4
Ebenezer WSC Total					**3**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Edom WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Drill New Wells (Edom WSC, Van Zandt, Carrizo, Neches)	D	D | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Van Zandt County	$2931	$1046	27	27	27	27	27	27
Edom WSC* Total					**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Elkhart					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Elkhart - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$750	$375	4	8	7	7	8	8
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Elkhart	I	Demand Reduction	$1336	$300	2	2	1	1	1	1
Elkhart Total					**6**	**10**	**8**	**8**	**9**	**9**

WUG Name: Emerald Bay MUD					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Emerald Bay MUD	I	Demand Reduction	$615	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Emerald Bay MUD	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	4	6	7	7	8	8
Emerald Bay MUD Total					**5**	**7**	**8**	**8**	**9**	**9**

WUG Name: Etoile WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Etoile WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1613	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Etoile WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$400	$250	5	8	9	10	11	12
Etoile WSC Total					**7**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**

WUG Name: Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	I	Demand Reduction	$1472	$300	3	3	3	3	3	3

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	I	Demand Reduction	$778	$389	9	14	15	16	17	18
Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont Total					**12**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**

WUG Name: Five Way WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Five Way WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1292	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Five Way WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1000	$500	2	3	4	4	4	4
Five Way WSC Total					**3**	**4**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Flat Fork WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Flat Fork WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	N/A	1	0	0	0	0	0
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Flat Fork WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Flat Fork WSC Total					**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Four Pines WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Four Pines WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1510	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Four Pines WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Four Way SUD					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Four Way SUD	I	Demand Reduction	$4527	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Four Way SUD Total					**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Frankston					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Frankston - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$167	3	5	5	5	6	6
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Frankston	I	Demand Reduction	$1527	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Frankston Total					**4**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**7**	**7**

WUG Name: Frankston Rural WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Frankston Rural WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1417	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Frankston Rural WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$333	4	6	5	6	6	6
Frankston Rural WSC Total					**5**	**7**	**6**	**7**	**7**	**7**

WUG Name: G M WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - G M WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$515	$420	35	97	118	111	104	97
G M WSC Total					**35**	**97**	**118**	**111**	**104**	**97**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Garrison					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Garrison - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$250	$200	4	6	7	7	8	10
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Garrison	I	Demand Reduction	$430	$409	20	60	82	86	89	92
Garrison Total					**24**	**66**	**89**	**93**	**97**	**102**

WUG Name: Gaston WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Gaston WSC - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	N/A	$1492	0	130	130	130	130	130
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Gaston WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1243	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gaston WSC Total					**1**	**131**	**131**	**131**	**131**	**131**

WUG Name: Goodsprings WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Goodsprings WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1477	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Goodsprings WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Grapeland					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Grapeland	I	Demand Reduction	$1472	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Grapeland	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	4	5	6	7	7	8
Grapeland Total					**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**8**	**9**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Groves					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Groves	I	Demand Reduction	$467	$403	130	388	518	518	518	518
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Groves	I	Demand Reduction	$676	$313	37	59	64	69	75	80
Groves Total					**167**	**447**	**582**	**587**	**593**	**598**

WUG Name: Groveton*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Water Loss Reduction, Groveton	H	Demand Reduction	$761	$726	1	2	2	3	3	3
Groveton* Total					**1**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**3**

WUG Name: Gum Creek WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Gum Creek WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1816	N/A	1	1	0	0	0	0
Gum Creek WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

WUG Name: Hardin County WCID 1					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Hardin County WCID 1	I	Demand Reduction	$1396	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Hardin County WCID 1 Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Hemphill					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Hemphill - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$143	$100	7	10	10	10	10	10

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Hemphill	I	Demand Reduction	$1953	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Hemphill Total					**9**	**12**	**12**	**12**	**12**	**12**

WUG Name: Henderson					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina-Nacogdoches WCID #1 - Hydraulic Dredging of Lake Striker	I	I | Striker Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$476	0	0	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
Municipal Conservation - Henderson	I	Demand Reduction	$380	$179	50	79	85	92	98	106
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Henderson	I	Demand Reduction	$701	$300	15	15	15	15	15	15
Sabine River Authority Strategy - Wood County GW	D	D | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Wood County	$12492	$7921	483	483	483	483	483	483
Henderson Total					**548**	**577**	**6,183**	**6,190**	**6,196**	**6,204**

WUG Name: Hollands Quarter WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Hollands Quarter WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$5386	N/A	1	1	1	1	1	0
Hollands Quarter WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**

WUG Name: Hudson WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Hudson WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1576	$300	5	5	5	5	5	5
Hudson WSC Total					**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Huntington					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Huntington	I	Demand Reduction	$805	$373	8	25	33	33	34	34
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Huntington	I	Demand Reduction	$750	$375	4	6	7	7	8	8
Huntington Total					**12**	**31**	**40**	**40**	**42**	**42**

WUG Name: Huxley					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Huxley	I	Demand Reduction	$1182	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Huxley	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	4	5	5	5	4	4
Huxley Total					**5**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Irrigation, Henderson*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Athens MWA - WTP Booster Pump Station Expansion	I	I | Neches Indirect Reuse	N/A	$0	0	0	16	29	42	50
Non-Municipal Conservation, Irrigation, Henderson	C	Demand Reduction	N/A	$305	0	2	3	3	4	5
Irrigation, Henderson* Total					**0**	**2**	**19**	**32**	**46**	**55**

WUG Name: Irrigation, Trinity*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Irrigation, Trinity County - New Well(s) in Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	I	I | Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Trinity County	$236	$32	220	220	220	220	220	220
Irrigation, Trinity* Total					**220**	**220**	**220**	**220**	**220**	**220**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Jackson WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	855	855	855	855	855
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jackson WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$2991	$300	1	2	2	2	2	2
Jackson WSC* Total					**1**	**857**	**857**	**857**	**857**	**857**

WUG Name: Jacksonville					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$1001	0	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275
Jacksonville - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$476	$220	42	66	70	75	78	82
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jacksonville	I	Demand Reduction	$676	$425	72	213	279	273	267	261
Jacksonville Total					**114**	**4,554**	**4,624**	**4,623**	**4,620**	**4,618**

WUG Name: Jacobs WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Jacobs WSC - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Rusk County	N/A	$12300	0	0	0	0	26	58
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jacobs WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Jacobs WSC Total					**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**28**	**60**

WUG Name: Jasper					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation - Jasper	I	Demand Reduction	$440	$200	25	39	40	39	40	40

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jasper	I	Demand Reduction	$4936	$300	9	8	8	7	7	7
Jasper Total					**34**	**47**	**48**	**46**	**47**	**47**

WUG Name: Jasper County WCID 1					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jasper County WCID 1	I	Demand Reduction	$1155	$300	4	11	15	15	15	16
Jasper County WCID 1 Total					**4**	**11**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**16**

WUG Name: Jefferson County WCID 10					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jefferson County WCID 10	I	Demand Reduction	$4362	$300	3	3	3	3	3	3
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Jefferson County WCID 10	I	Demand Reduction	$750	$333	8	14	15	16	17	18
Jefferson County WCID 10 Total					**11**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**

WUG Name: Joaquin					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Joaquin	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	N/A	1	0	0	0	0	0
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Joaquin	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Joaquin Total					**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Kelly G Brewer					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Kelly G Brewer	I	Demand Reduction	$1683	$300	2	2	2	2	2	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Kelly G Brewer	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	4	8	8	9	9	8
Kelly G Brewer Total					**6**	**10**	**10**	**11**	**11**	**9**

WUG Name: Kilgore*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Sabine River Authority Strategy - Wood County GW	D	D | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Wood County	$12492	$7921	123	119	116	112	108	104
Water Loss Reduction - Kilgore	D	Demand Reduction	$605	$301	76	74	70	66	62	58
Kilgore* Total					**199**	**193**	**186**	**178**	**170**	**162**

WUG Name: Kirbyville					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Kirbyville - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$214	6	9	10	11	12	14
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Kirbyville	I	Demand Reduction	$756	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Kirbyville Total					**8**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**16**

WUG Name: Kountze					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Kountze	I	Demand Reduction	$1774	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Kountze Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Lake Livingston WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Water Loss Reduction, Lake Livingston WSC	H	Demand Reduction	$761	$726	3	9	16	21	26	33
Lake Livingston WSC* Total					**3**	**9**	**16**	**21**	**26**	**33**

WUG Name: Leagueville WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Leagueville WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1783	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Leagueville WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Advanced Water Conservation (Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water)	D	Demand Reduction	$684	$684	17	40	68	99	110	119
Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water* Total					**17**	**40**	**68**	**99**	**110**	**119**

WUG Name: Lilly Grove SUD					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lilly Grove SUD	I	Demand Reduction	$952	$386	19	57	78	82	86	89
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Lilly Grove SUD	I	Demand Reduction	$571	$222	7	12	13	14	17	18
Lilly Grove SUD Total					**26**	**69**	**91**	**96**	**103**	**107**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Lindale Rural WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Water Loss Reduction - Lindale Rural WSC	D	Demand Reduction	$1349	$404	67	72	76	79	81	84
Lindale Rural WSC* Total					**67**	**72**	**76**	**79**	**81**	**84**

WUG Name: Lindale*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Drill New Wells (Lindale, Carrizo, Neches)	D	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Smith County	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lindale* Total					**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

WUG Name: Livestock, Henderson*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Athens MWA - WTP Booster Pump Station Expansion	I	I | Neches Indirect Reuse	N/A	$0	0	0	507	884	1,216	1,385
Livestock, Henderson* Total					**0**	**0**	**507**	**884**	**1,216**	**1,385**

WUG Name: Livestock, Houston					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Livestock, Houston County - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	N/A	$66	0	0	0	290	290	290
Livestock, Houston Total					**0**	**0**	**0**	**290**	**290**	**290**

WUG Name: Livestock, Sabine					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Livestock, Sabine County - New Well(s) in Yegua-Jackson Aquifer	I	I | Yegua-Jackson Aquifer | Sabine County	N/A	$50	0	0	0	100	100	100
Livestock, Sabine Total					**0**	**0**	**0**	**100**	**100**	**100**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Lovelady					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Lovelady - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	2	3	3	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lovelady	I	Demand Reduction	$3362	N/A	1	1	1	0	0	0
Lovelady Total					**3**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Lufkin					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Lufkin - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$438	$192	137	211	236	260	286	312
Lufkin - Transfer from Sam Rayburn to Lake Kurth	I	I | Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	N/A	$729	0	11,637	22,946	28,000	28,000	28,000
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lufkin	I	Demand Reduction	$1033	$300	71	216	290	293	296	298
Lufkin Total					**208**	**12,064**	**23,472**	**28,553**	**28,582**	**28,610**

WUG Name: Lumberton MUD					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lumberton MUD	I	Demand Reduction	$73146	$300	1	5	8	8	8	8
Lumberton MUD Total					**1**	**5**	**8**	**8**	**8**	**8**

WUG Name: M & M WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - M & M WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1168	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
M & M WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Manufacturing, Angelina					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Manufacturing, Angelina County - Purchase from Lufkin (Lake Kurth)	I	I | Kurth Lake/Reservoir	$1379	$697	2,150	2,320	2,490	2,680	2,860	3,060
Manufacturing, Angelina Total					**2,150**	**2,320**	**2,490**	**2,680**	**2,860**	**3,060**

WUG Name: Manufacturing, Jasper					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Manufacturing, Jasper County - Purchase from LNVA (Sam Rayburn)	I	I | Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	$3008	$870	460	2,590	4,810	7,100	9,480	11,950
Manufacturing, Jasper Total					**460**	**2,590**	**4,810**	**7,100**	**9,480**	**11,950**

WUG Name: Manufacturing, Jefferson					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Manufacturing, Jefferson County - Purchase from LNVA (Sam Rayburn)	I	I | Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	$963	$497	6,100	36,900	71,700	106,200	140,700	175,200
Manufacturing, Jefferson Total					**6,100**	**36,900**	**71,700**	**106,200**	**140,700**	**175,200**

WUG Name: Manufacturing, Shelby					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Manufacturing, Shelby County - Purchase from Center (Toledo Bend)	I	I | Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	$2440	$1032	850	940	1,060	1,150	1,240	1,330
Manufacturing, Shelby Total					**850**	**940**	**1,060**	**1,150**	**1,240**	**1,330**

WUG Name: Manufacturing, Smith*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Manufacturing, Smith County - Purchase from the City of Tyler	I	I | Tyler Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$1363	0	0	43	412	493	561

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Tyler-Lake Palestine	I	I | Palestine Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$1310	0	84	84	84	84	84
Manufacturing, Smith* Total					**0**	**84**	**127**	**496**	**577**	**645**

WUG Name: Manufacturing, Tyler					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Manufacturing, Tyler County - New Well(s) in Gulf Coast Aquifer	I	I | Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Tyler County	$445	$55	110	110	110	110	110	110
Manufacturing, Tyler Total					**110**	**110**	**110**	**110**	**110**	**110**

WUG Name: Mauriceville SUD					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Mauriceville SUD	I	Demand Reduction	$6958	$300	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mauriceville SUD Total					**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**

WUG Name: McClelland WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - McClelland WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$554	$411	13	35	39	33	28	22
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - McClelland WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$500	2	4	3	3	2	2
McClelland WSC Total					**15**	**39**	**42**	**36**	**30**	**24**

WUG Name: Meeker MWD					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Meeker MWD	I	Demand Reduction	$10285	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Meeker MWD	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$333	6	9	10	10	11	12
Meeker MWD Total					**8**	**11**	**12**	**12**	**13**	**14**

WUG Name: Melrose WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Melrose WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1940	$300	4	4	4	5	5	5
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Melrose WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$364	$167	11	20	22	25	27	30
Melrose WSC Total					**15**	**24**	**26**	**30**	**32**	**35**

WUG Name: Minden Brachfield WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Minden Brachfield WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$3684	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Minden Brachfield WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Mining, Angelina					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Mining, Angelina County - Purchase from the City of Lufkin	I	I | Kurth Lake/Reservoir	$3152	$1339	380	420	450	480	510	540
Mining, Angelina Total					**380**	**420**	**450**	**480**	**510**	**540**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Mining, Henderson*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Mining, Henderson County - New Well(s) in Queen City Aquifer	I	I | Queen City Aquifer | Henderson County	$267	$47	150	150	150	150	150	150
Mining, Henderson* Total					**150**	**150**	**150**	**150**	**150**	**150**

WUG Name: Mining, Smith					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Mining, Smith County - Purchase from the City of Tyler	I	I | Tyler Lake/Reservoir	$4395	$1451	320	340	360	380	400	430
Tyler-Lake Palestine	I	I | Palestine Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$896	0	113	114	83	54	32
Mining, Smith Total					**320**	**453**	**474**	**463**	**454**	**462**

WUG Name: Moore Station WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Moore Station WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1613	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Moore Station WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$286	6	9	10	11	12	14
Moore Station WSC Total					**8**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**16**

WUG Name: Moscow WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Moscow WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1902	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Moscow WSC* Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Mt Enterprise WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Mt Enterprise WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$333	3	5	5	5	5	6
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Mt Enterprise WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$2976	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mt Enterprise WSC Total					**4**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**7**

WUG Name: Murchison					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Murchison	I	Demand Reduction	$1378	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Murchison	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	2	3	3	3	4	4
Murchison Total					**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Nacogdoches					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$407	0	8,551	8,551	8,551	8,551	8,551
Municipal Conservation - Nacogdoches	I	Demand Reduction	$355	$153	155	241	273	311	350	391
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Nacogdoches	I	Demand Reduction	$637	$417	209	643	879	912	945	978
Nacogdoches Total					**364**	**9,435**	**9,703**	**9,774**	**9,846**	**9,920**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Neches WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Neches WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1354	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Neches WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1000	$500	2	3	4	4	4	4
Neches WSC Total					**3**	**4**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Nederland					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Nederland	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$428	114	343	456	450	445	439
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Nederland	I	Demand Reduction	$725	$341	40	63	68	73	78	82
Nederland Total					**154**	**406**	**524**	**523**	**523**	**521**

WUG Name: New London					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	855	855	855	855	855
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - New London	I	Demand Reduction	$1772	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
New London - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$250	$167	4	6	7	7	6	6
New London Total					**5**	**862**	**863**	**863**	**862**	**862**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: New Prospect WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - New Prospect WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - New Prospect WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$500	2	0	0	0	0	2
New Prospect WSC Total					**3**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**3**

WUG Name: New Summerfield					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	2,565	2,565	2,565	2,565	2,565
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - New Summerfield	I	Demand Reduction	$3526	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
New Summerfield Total					**1**	**2,566**	**2,566**	**2,566**	**2,566**	**2,566**

WUG Name: New WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - New WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$550	$366	7	19	24	22	21	20
New WSC Total					**7**	**19**	**24**	**22**	**21**	**20**

WUG Name: Newton					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Newton	I	Demand Reduction	$568	$446	18	49	59	52	46	40
Newton - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$400	$167	5	8	7	7	6	6
Newton Total					**23**	**57**	**66**	**59**	**52**	**46**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Nome					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Nome	I	Demand Reduction	$602	$477	7	22	29	29	28	28
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Nome	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	2	3	3	4	4	4
Nome Total					**9**	**25**	**32**	**33**	**32**	**32**

WUG Name: North Cherokee WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - North Cherokee WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$4196	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - North Cherokee WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$857	$417	7	11	12	12	13	12
North Cherokee WSC Total					**9**	**4,288**	**4,289**	**4,289**	**4,290**	**4,289**

WUG Name: North Hardin WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - North Hardin WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1984	$300	3	3	3	3	3	3
North Hardin WSC Total					**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**

WUG Name: Norwood WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Norwood WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$9991	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Norwood WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Orange					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Orange	I	Demand Reduction	$474	$442	264	806	1,079	1,068	1,058	1,047
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Orange	I	Demand Reduction	$462	$246	65	104	114	122	131	122
Orange Total					**329**	**910**	**1,193**	**1,190**	**1,189**	**1,169**

WUG Name: Orange County WCID 1					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Orange County WCID 1	I	Demand Reduction	$820	$300	29	82	109	102	95	88
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Orange County WCID 1	I	Demand Reduction	$750	$412	24	36	39	39	39	34
Orange County WCID 1 - New Well(s) in Gulf Coast Aquifer System	I	I | Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Orange County	$939	$530	1,610	1,610	1,610	1,610	1,610	1,610
Orange County WCID 1 Total					**1,663**	**1,728**	**1,758**	**1,751**	**1,744**	**1,732**

WUG Name: Orange County WCID 2					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Orange County WCID 2	I	Demand Reduction	$506	$414	23	70	93	90	87	85
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Orange County WCID 2	I	Demand Reduction	$833	$333	6	11	12	12	12	12
Orange County WCID 2 Total					**29**	**81**	**105**	**102**	**99**	**97**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Orangefield WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Orangefield WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1495	$300	5	5	6	7	8	9
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Orangefield WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$846	$349	13	25	30	41	51	63
Orangefield WSC Total					**18**	**30**	**36**	**48**	**59**	**72**

WUG Name: Overton*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Overton	I	Demand Reduction	$1700	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Overton - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$429	$250	7	11	12	11	11	12
Overton* Total					**9**	**13**	**14**	**13**	**13**	**14**

WUG Name: Palestine					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Palestine	I	Demand Reduction	$1731	$300	51	151	199	197	194	192
Palestine - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$277	$132	94	148	159	170	180	190
Palestine Total					**145**	**299**	**358**	**367**	**374**	**382**

WUG Name: Panola-Bethany WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Drill New Wells (Panola Bethany, Queen City, Sabine)	D	D | Queen City Aquifer | Harrison County	N/A	$77	0	4	0	14	4	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Panola-Bethany WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$553	$391	7	18	22	21	18	16

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Panola-Bethany WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$250	3	5	4	4	4	4
Panola-Bethany WSC* Total					**10**	**27**	**26**	**39**	**26**	**21**

WUG Name: Pennington WSC*					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Pennington WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$250	1	2	2	2	2	2
Pennington WSC* Total					**1**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Pinehurst					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pinehurst	I	Demand Reduction	$932	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Pinehurst	I	Demand Reduction	$600	$300	5	8	9	9	10	10
Pinehurst Total					**7**	**10**	**11**	**11**	**12**	**12**

WUG Name: Pineland					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pineland	I	Demand Reduction	$680	$300	3	8	10	9	9	8
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Pineland	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	2	3	3	4	4	4
Pineland Total					**5**	**11**	**13**	**13**	**13**	**12**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Pleasant Springs WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pleasant Springs WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$991	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Pleasant Springs WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$167	2	5	5	5	5	6
Pleasant Springs WSC Total					**3**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**7**

WUG Name: Pollok-Redtown WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pollok-Redtown WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$3527	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Pollok-Redtown WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Port Arthur					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Conservation, Water Loss Control - Port Arthur	I	Demand Reduction	$1467	$300	92	92	92	91	90	89
Port Arthur - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$411	$411	473	677	736	788	838	887
Port Arthur Total					**565**	**769**	**828**	**879**	**928**	**976**

WUG Name: Port Neches					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Port Neches	I	Demand Reduction	$6226	$300	7	21	27	27	27	26
Port Neches Total					**7**	**21**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**26**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Rayburn Country MUD					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rayburn Country MUD	I	Demand Reduction	$588	$389	9	25	31	29	27	25
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Rayburn Country MUD	I	Demand Reduction	$250	$167	4	6	6	6	6	6
Rayburn Country MUD Total					**13**	**31**	**37**	**35**	**33**	**31**

WUG Name: Redland WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Redland WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1072	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Redland WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Rehobeth WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rehobeth WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1243	N/A	1	0	0	0	0	0
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Rehobeth WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Rehobeth WSC Total					**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Rural WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rural WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1072	N/A	1	1	0	0	0	0
Rural WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Rusk					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rusk	I	Demand Reduction	$930	$300	4	4	4	4	4	4
Rusk - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$308	12	20	22	23	25	26
Rusk Total					**16**	**4,299**	**4,301**	**4,302**	**4,304**	**4,305**

WUG Name: Rusk Rural WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	855	855	855	855	855
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rusk Rural WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$4522	$300	6	17	23	22	22	21
Rusk Rural WSC Total					**6**	**872**	**878**	**877**	**877**	**876**

WUG Name: San Augustine					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation - San Augustine	I	Demand Reduction	$333	$167	9	14	15	16	17	18
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - San Augustine	I	Demand Reduction	$829	$300	3	3	3	3	3	3
San Augustine Total					**12**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**

WUG Name: San Augustine Rural WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - San Augustine Rural WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$2080	$342	13	43	60	59	57	56

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - San Augustine Rural WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$300	4	8	8	9	9	10
San Augustine Rural WSC Total					**17**	**51**	**68**	**68**	**66**	**66**

WUG Name: Sand Hills WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Sand Hills WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$432	$409	23	77	119	130	140	151
Sand Hills WSC - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$750	$313	4	8	10	11	13	16
Sand Hills WSC Total					**27**	**85**	**129**	**141**	**153**	**167**

WUG Name: Seneca WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Seneca WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1348	N/A	1	1	1	1	1	0
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Seneca WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$500	2	3	3	3	3	2
Seneca WSC Total					**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**2**

WUG Name: Silsbee					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Silsbee	I	Demand Reduction	$1512	$300	15	47	66	70	74	78
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Silsbee	I	Demand Reduction	$800	$326	15	25	28	32	35	46
Silsbee Total					**30**	**72**	**94**	**102**	**109**	**124**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Slocum WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Slocum WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1392	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Slocum WSC Total					**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Soda WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Water Loss Reduction, Soda WSC	H	Demand Reduction	N/A	$726	0	1	1	2	2	3
Soda WSC* Total					**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**3**

WUG Name: Sour Lake					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Sour Lake	I	Demand Reduction	$1527	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Sour Lake	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	4	6	7	7	8	8
Sour Lake Total					**5**	**7**	**8**	**8**	**9**	**9**

WUG Name: South Jasper County WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - South Jasper County WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1243	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
South Jasper WSC - New Well(s) in Gulf Coast Aquifer System	I	I | Gulf Coast Aquifer System | Jasper County	N/A	$1064	0	330	330	330	330	330
South Jasper County WSC Total					**1**	**331**	**331**	**331**	**331**	**331**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: South Kirbyville Rural WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - South Kirbyville Rural WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1072	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
South Kirbyville Rural WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: South Newton WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - South Newton WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$3223	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - South Newton WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$300	6	9	10	9	9	10
South Newton WSC Total					**8**	**11**	**12**	**11**	**11**	**12**

WUG Name: South Rusk County WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - South Rusk County WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$548	$446	16	46	58	55	51	48
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - South Rusk County WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$333	4	6	5	5	6	6
South Rusk County WSC Total					**20**	**52**	**63**	**60**	**57**	**54**

WUG Name: Southern Utilities*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation - Southern Utilities	I	Demand Reduction	$268	$103	224	363	418	471	527	585

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Southern Utilities	I	Demand Reduction	$556	$412	363	1,159	1,615	1,667	1,718	1,768
Southern Utilities - Contract Amendment with Tyler	I	I | Tyler Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$1634	0	0	0	0	70	410
Southern Utilities* Total					**587**	**1,522**	**2,033**	**2,138**	**2,315**	**2,763**

WUG Name: Steam-Electric Power, Anderson					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Steam Electric Power, Anderson - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Anderson County	$797	$127	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300
Steam-Electric Power, Anderson Total					**2,300**	**2,300**	**2,300**	**2,300**	**2,300**	**2,300**

WUG Name: Swift WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Swift WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$995	$300	2	2	2	2	2	3
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Swift WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$667	$313	6	11	11	12	14	16
Swift WSC Total					**8**	**13**	**13**	**14**	**16**	**19**

WUG Name: Tatum					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tatum	I	Demand Reduction	$1495	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tatum - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$333	4	6	7	6	6	6
Tatum Total					**5**	**7**	**8**	**7**	**7**	**7**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	I	Demand Reduction	$2030	$300	9	9	9	9	9	9
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$240	$115	25	40	43	46	49	52
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units Total					**34**	**49**	**52**	**55**	**58**	**61**

WUG Name: TDCJ Coffield Michael					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - TDCJ Coffield Michael	I	Demand Reduction	$2000	$300	17	17	17	17	17	17
TDCJ Coffield Michael - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$184	$87	49	81	87	92	98	104
TDCJ Coffield Michael Total					**66**	**98**	**104**	**109**	**115**	**121**

WUG Name: TDCJ Eastham Unit					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - TDCJ Eastham Unit	I	Demand Reduction	$2030	$300	5	5	5	5	5	5
TDCJ Eastham Unit - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$267	$125	15	25	27	29	31	32
TDCJ Eastham Unit - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	$4858	$1917	120	120	120	120	120	120
TDCJ Eastham Unit Total					**140**	**150**	**152**	**154**	**156**	**157**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Tenaha					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tenaha	I	Demand Reduction	$543	$443	19	50	55	46	38	29
Tenaha - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$250	$0	4	5	5	4	4	2
Tenaha Total					**23**	**55**	**60**	**50**	**42**	**31**

WUG Name: The Consolidated WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - The Consolidated WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1613	$300	9	9	10	10	10	10
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - The Consolidated WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$552	$257	29	48	54	59	65	70
The Consolidated WSC Total					**38**	**57**	**64**	**69**	**75**	**80**

WUG Name: Timpson					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Timpson	I	Demand Reduction	$1472	N/A	1	1	1	1	0	0
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Timpson	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$0	2	3	3	3	2	2
Timpson Total					**3**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**2**

WUG Name: Trinity Bay Conservation District*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Water Loss Reduction, Trinity Bay Conservation District	H	Demand Reduction	$761	$726	1	2	3	4	5	5
Trinity Bay Conservation District* Total					**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**5**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Troup					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Troup	I	Demand Reduction	$3003	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
Troup - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$250	6	9	10	11	12	12
Troup Total					**8**	**4,286**	**4,287**	**4,288**	**4,289**	**4,289**

WUG Name: Tucker WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tucker WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1292	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tucker WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Tyler County SUD					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tyler County SUD	I	Demand Reduction	$1411	$300	13	38	48	47	46	44
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Tyler County SUD	I	Demand Reduction	$556	$250	9	14	15	15	15	16
Tyler County SUD Total					**22**	**52**	**63**	**62**	**61**	**60**

WUG Name: Tyler*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tyler	I	Demand Reduction	$2103	$302	261	875	1,308	1,385	1,466	1,552

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation -Tyler	I	Demand Reduction	$82	$26	728	1,235	1,528	1,771	2,036	2,327
Tyler* Total					**989**	**2,110**	**2,836**	**3,156**	**3,502**	**3,879**

WUG Name: Upper Jasper County Water Authority					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Upper Jasper County Water Authority	I	Demand Reduction	$760	$300	16	46	57	54	51	47
Upper Jasper County Water Authority Total					**16**	**46**	**57**	**54**	**51**	**47**

WUG Name: Virginia Hill WSC*					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Virginia Hill WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$3006	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Virginia Hill WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$833	$417	3	5	5	6	6	6
Virginia Hill WSC* Total					**4**	**6**	**6**	**7**	**7**	**7**

WUG Name: Walnut Grove WSC					**Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)**					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Walnut Grove WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$7331	$300	6	7	7	7	8	8
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Walnut Grove WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$800	$352	20	35	40	45	50	54
Walnut Grove WSC Total					**26**	**42**	**47**	**52**	**58**	**62**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Walston Springs WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Walston Springs WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1010	$300	2	2	3	3	3	3
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Walston Springs WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$833	$350	6	11	13	16	18	20
Walston Springs WSC Total					**8**	**13**	**16**	**19**	**21**	**23**

WUG Name: Warren WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Warren WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1417	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Warren WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$750	$375	4	6	7	7	8	8
Warren WSC Total					**5**	**7**	**8**	**8**	**9**	**9**

WUG Name: Wells					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Wells	I	Demand Reduction	$3404	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wells Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: West Hardin WSC*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - West Hardin WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$3287	$300	2	2	2	2	2	2
West Hardin WSC* Total					**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: West Jacksonville WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - West Jacksonville WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$628	$411	17	51	67	65	64	62
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - West Jacksonville WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$500	$333	4	5	5	6	6	6
West Jacksonville WSC Total					**21**	**56**	**72**	**71**	**70**	**68**

WUG Name: West Jefferson County MWD					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - West Jefferson County MWD	I	Demand Reduction	$1417	$300	5	5	5	5	5	5
West Jefferson County MWD Total					**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Whitehouse					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	I	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$2348	0	8,551	8,551	8,551	8,551	8,551
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Whitehouse	I	Demand Reduction	$1026	$300	5	5	5	5	5	5
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Whitehouse	I	Demand Reduction	$733	$367	15	23	25	27	28	30
Whitehouse Total					**20**	**8,579**	**8,581**	**8,583**	**8,584**	**8,586**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Wildwood POA					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Wildwood POA	I	Demand Reduction	$1419	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wildwood POA - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$1000	$250	2	5	5	5	4	4
Wildwood POA Total					**3**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Woden WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Woden WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$624	$300	6	18	24	26	27	28
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Woden WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$750	$400	4	6	7	7	9	10
Woden WSC Total					**10**	**24**	**31**	**33**	**36**	**38**

WUG Name: Woodlawn WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Woodlawn WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$1348	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Woodlawn WSC Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

WUG Name: Woodville					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Woodville	I	Demand Reduction	$1613	$300	4	5	5	5	5	6
Woodville - Municipal Conservation	I	Demand Reduction	$462	$235	13	22	25	27	31	34
Woodville Total					**17**	**27**	**30**	**32**	**36**	**40**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Wright City WSC					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Wright City WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$10811	$300	1	3	5	5	5	5
Municipal Conservation, Water Use Reduction - Wright City WSC	I	Demand Reduction	$750	$375	4	6	7	7	8	8
Wright City WSC Total					**5**	**9**	**12**	**12**	**13**	**13**

WUG Name: Zavalla					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Zavalla	I	Demand Reduction	$1292	$300	1	1	1	1	1	1
Zavalla Total					**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Region I Recommended WMS Supply Total	**33,521**	**135,713**	**196,367**	**241,048**	**280,034**	**319,134**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Alto Rural WSC	Yes	2030	Alto Rural WSC - New Wells Carrizo-Wilcox	New conventional well	$7,612,000
Angelina & Neches River Authority	Yes	2040	Angelina Neches River Authority - Treatment Plant and Distribution System	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; New conventional WTP	$455,353,000
Angelina & Neches River Authority	Yes	2040	Angelina Neches River Authority-Lake Columbia	New water supply reservoir	$486,368,000
Angelina Nacogdoches WCID 1	Yes	2040	Angelina-Nacogdoches WCID #1 - Hydraulic Dredging Lake Striker	Dredge to recover capacity	$27,980,000
Athens Municipal Water Authority	Yes	2050	Athens MWA - WTP Booster Pump Station Expansion	Pump station; Transmission pipeline	$3,121,000
B C Y WSC	No	2040	B C Y WSC - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$4,254,000
Beaumont	Yes	2030	Beaumont - Bunn's Canal Rehabilitation	Dredge to recover capacity	$1,139,000
Beaumont	Yes	2040	Beaumont - New Westside Surface Water Treatment Plant	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; New conventional WTP	$202,160,000
Beaumont	Yes	2030	Beaumont - Well Field Infrastructure Improvements	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$97,980,000
Center	Yes	2030	Center - Reuse Pipeline	Transmission pipeline; Pump station	$25,824,000
Chandler	No	2050	Chandler - Purchase from City of Tyler	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir	$15,028,000
China	No	2040	China - New Well(s) in Gulf Coast Aquifer System	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$6,182,000
Beaumont	Yes	2030	Conservation, Water Loss Control - Beaumont	Transmission water loss mitigation	$1,679,000
Port Arthur	Yes	2030	Conservation, Water Loss Control - Port Arthur	Transmission water loss mitigation	$1,518,000
County-Other, Nacogdoches	Yes	2030	County-Other, Nacogdoches - Lake Naconiche Infrastructure	New or amended water right NO IBT or exempt IBT; New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; New conventional WTP	$42,117,000
County-Other, Smith	No	2030	County-Other, Smith - Purchase from Tyler	New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir	$16,362,000
D & M WSC	No	2040	D & M WSC - New Wells Carrizo-Wilcox	New conventional well	$5,542,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Crystal Systems Texas	No	2040	Drill New Wells (Crystal Systems Inc, Carrizo, Sabine)	New conventional well	$2,531,000
Gaston WSC	No	2040	Gaston WSC - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$3,700,000
Houston County WCID 1	Yes	2030	Houston Co. WCID #1 - New Well (s) Carrizo-Wilcox	New conventional well	$16,528,000
Irrigation, Trinity	No	2030	Irrigation, Trinity County - New Well(s) Yegua-Jackson	New conventional well	$646,000
Jacksonville	Yes	2040	Jacksonville - Supply from Lake Columbia (Conveyance)	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir	$29,390,000
Jacobs WSC	No	2070	Jacobs WSC - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$5,975,000
Livestock, Houston	No	2060	Livestock, Houston County - New Wells Carrizo-Wilcox	New conventional well	$969,000
Livestock, Sabine	No	2060	Livestock, Sabine County - New Well(s) Yegua-Jackson	New conventional well	$601,000
Lower Neches Valley Authority	Yes	2030	LNVA - Neches Pump Station Upgrades and Fuel Diversification	Diversion and control structure; Surface water intake modification; Pump station	$66,948,000
Sabine River Authority	Yes	2050	LNVA - Purchase from Sabine River Authority (Toledo Bend)	New or amended bed and banks permit; New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Amended water right non-exempt IBT	$0
Lower Neches Valley Authority	Yes	2050	LNVA - Purchase from Sabine River Authority (Toledo Bend)	New or amended bed and banks permit; New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Amended water right non-exempt IBT	$451,797,000
Lower Neches Valley Authority	Yes	2030	LNVA - West Beaumont Reservoir	New water supply reservoir; Diversion and control structure	$110,438,000
Lufkin	Yes	2050	Lufkin - Conveyance from Sam Rayburn to Kurth Lake - Phase 1	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; New conventional WTP	$136,547,000
Lufkin	Yes	2060	Lufkin - Conveyance from Sam Rayburn to Kurth Lake - Phase 2	New conventional WTP; Pump station	$125,310,000
Lufkin	Yes	2070	Lufkin - Conveyance from Sam Rayburn to Kurth Lake - Phase 3	Pump station	$24,037,000
Manufacturing, Angelina	No	2030	Manufacturing, Angelina County - Purchase from Lufkin	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir	$90,393,000
Manufacturing, Jasper	No	2030	Manufacturing, Jasper County - Purchase from LNVA (Sam Rayburn)	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; New surface water intake	$159,597,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Manufacturing, Jefferson	No	2030	Manufacturing, Jefferson County - Purchase from LNVA (Sam Rayburn)	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; New surface water intake	$698,898,000
Manufacturing, Shelby	No	2030	Manufacturing, Shelby County - Purchase from Center	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; New surface water intake	$79,104,000
Manufacturing, Smith	No	2050	Manufacturing, Smith County - Purchase from Tyler	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; New surface water intake	$50,202,000
Manufacturing, Tyler	No	2030	Manufacturing, Tyler County - New Well(s) Gulf Coast	New conventional well	$607,000
Mining, Angelina	No	2030	Mining, Angelina - Purchase from Lufkin	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; New surface water intake	$13,921,000
Mining, Henderson	No	2030	Mining, Henderson County - New Well(s) in Queen City Aquifer	New conventional well	$471,000
Mining, Smith	No	2030	Mining, Smith County - Purchase from Tyler	New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir	$17,996,000
Tyler	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation - Water Loss Mitigation - Tyler	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,731,000
Afton Grove WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Afton Grove WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$13,000
Alto	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Alto	Transmission water loss mitigation	$20,000
Alto Rural WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Alto Rural WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$97,000
Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$9,000
Angelina WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Angelina WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$23,000
Appleby WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Appleby WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$401,000
Arp	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Arp	Transmission water loss mitigation	$11,000
B B S WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - B B S WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$11,000
B C Y WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - B C Y WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$310,000
Beckville	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Beckville	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
Berryville	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Berryville	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
Bethel Ash WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bethel Ash WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$228,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Bevil Oaks	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bevil Oaks	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
Blackjack WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Blackjack WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$8,000
Bon Wier WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bon Wier WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
Bridge City	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bridge City	Transmission water loss mitigation	$71,000
Brookeland FWSD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Brookeland FWSD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$14,000
Brownsboro	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Brownsboro	Transmission water loss mitigation	$9,000
Brushy Creek WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Brushy Creek WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$351,000
Bullard	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Bullard	Transmission water loss mitigation	$122,000
Caro WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Caro WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$32,000
Carthage	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Carthage	Transmission water loss mitigation	$173,000
Center	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Center	Transmission water loss mitigation	$125,000
Centerville WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Centerville WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$10,000
Central WCID of Angelina County	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Central WCID of Angelina County	Transmission water loss mitigation	$48,000
Chalk Hill SUD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Chalk Hill SUD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$15,000
Chandler	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Chandler	Transmission water loss mitigation	$38,000
Chester WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Chester WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$12,000
China	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - China	Transmission water loss mitigation	$13,000
Choice WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Choice WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$8,000
Clayton WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Clayton WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$32,000
Colmesneil	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Colmesneil	Transmission water loss mitigation	$14,000
Corrigan	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Corrigan	Transmission water loss mitigation	$18,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
County-Other, Anderson	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Anderson	Transmission water loss mitigation	$70,000
County-Other, Angelina	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Angelina	Transmission water loss mitigation	$54,000
County-Other, Cherokee	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Cherokee	Transmission water loss mitigation	$43,000
County-Other, Hardin	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Hardin	Transmission water loss mitigation	$120,000
County-Other, Houston	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Houston	Transmission water loss mitigation	$53,000
County-Other, Jasper	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Jasper	Transmission water loss mitigation	$115,000
County-Other, Jefferson	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Jefferson	Transmission water loss mitigation	$250,000
County-Other, Nacogdoches	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Nacogdoches	Transmission water loss mitigation	$59,000
County-Other, Newton	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Newton	Transmission water loss mitigation	$69,000
County-Other, Orange	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Orange	Transmission water loss mitigation	$197,000
County-Other, Panola	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Panola	Transmission water loss mitigation	$107,000
County-Other, Rusk	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Rusk	Transmission water loss mitigation	$97,000
County-Other, Sabine	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Sabine	Transmission water loss mitigation	$9,000
County-Other, San Augustine	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, San Augustine	Transmission water loss mitigation	$19,000
County-Other, Shelby	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Shelby	Transmission water loss mitigation	$97,000
County-Other, Smith	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Smith	Transmission water loss mitigation	$216,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
County-Other, Trinity	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Trinity	Transmission water loss mitigation	$51,000
County-Other, Tyler	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - County-Other, Tyler	Transmission water loss mitigation	$87,000
Craft Turney WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Craft Turney WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$44,000
Crockett	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Crockett	Transmission water loss mitigation	$35,000
Cross Roads SUD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Cross Roads SUD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$31,000
Crystal Farms WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Crystal Farms WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$8,000
Cushing	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Cushing	Transmission water loss mitigation	$21,000
Cypress Creek WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Cypress Creek WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$20,000
D & M WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - D & M WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$131,000
Damascus-Stryker WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Damascus-Stryker WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$13,000
Dean WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Dean WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$65,000
Deberry WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Deberry WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$7,000
Denning WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Denning WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$1,000
Diboll	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Diboll	Transmission water loss mitigation	$60,000
East Lamar WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - East Lamar WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$8,000
Ebenezer WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Ebenezer WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$16,000
Elkhart	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Elkhart	Transmission water loss mitigation	$22,000
Emerald Bay MUD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Emerald Bay MUD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
Etoile WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Etoile WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$31,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	Transmission water loss mitigation	$51,000
Five Way WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Five Way WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$11,000
Flat Fork WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Flat Fork WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$9,000
Four Pines WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Four Pines WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$26,000
Four Way SUD	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Four Way SUD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$131,000
Frankston	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Frankston	Transmission water loss mitigation	$19,000
Frankston Rural WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Frankston Rural WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$19,000
G M WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - G M WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$48,000
Garrison	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Garrison	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
Gaston WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Gaston WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$10,000
Goodsprings WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Goodsprings WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$19,000
Grapeland	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Grapeland	Transmission water loss mitigation	$19,000
Groves	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Groves	Transmission water loss mitigation	$118,000
Gum Creek WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Gum Creek WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$11,000
Hardin County WCID 1	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Hardin County WCID 1	Transmission water loss mitigation	$10,000
Hemphill	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Hemphill	Transmission water loss mitigation	$55,000
Henderson	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Henderson	Transmission water loss mitigation	$87,000
Hollands Quarter WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Hollands Quarter WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$45,000
Hudson WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Hudson WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$91,000
Huntington	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Huntington	Transmission water loss mitigation	$50,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Huxley	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Huxley	Transmission water loss mitigation	$17,000
Jackson WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jackson WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$89,000
Jacksonville	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jacksonville	Transmission water loss mitigation	$257,000
Jacobs WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jacobs WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$24,000
Jasper	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jasper	Transmission water loss mitigation	$585,000
Jasper County WCID 1	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jasper County WCID 1	Transmission water loss mitigation	$45,000
Jefferson County WCID 10	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jefferson County WCID 10	Transmission water loss mitigation	$172,000
Joaquin	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Joaquin	Transmission water loss mitigation	$10,000
Kelly G Brewer	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Kelly G Brewer	Transmission water loss mitigation	$31,000
Kirbyville	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Kirbyville	Transmission water loss mitigation	$13,000
Kountze	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Kountze	Transmission water loss mitigation	$26,000
Leagueville WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Leagueville WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$24,000
Lilly Grove SUD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lilly Grove SUD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$149,000
Lovelady	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lovelady	Transmission water loss mitigation	$24,000
Lufkin	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lufkin	Transmission water loss mitigation	$740,000
Lumberton MUD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lumberton MUD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$1,516,000
M & M WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - M & M WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$16,000
Mauriceville SUD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Mauriceville SUD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$362,000
McClelland WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - McClelland WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$27,000
Meeker MWD	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Meeker MWD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$273,000
Melrose WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Melrose WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$95,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Minden Brachfield WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Minden Brachfield WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$54,000
Moore Station WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Moore Station WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$36,000
Moscow WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Moscow WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$13,000
Mt Enterprise WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Mt Enterprise WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$42,000
Murchison	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Murchison	Transmission water loss mitigation	$8,000
Nacogdoches	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Nacogdoches	Transmission water loss mitigation	$652,000
Neches WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Neches WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$12,000
Nederland	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Nederland	Transmission water loss mitigation	$115,000
New London	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - New London	Transmission water loss mitigation	$28,000
New Prospect WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - New Prospect WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$12,000
New Summerfield	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - New Summerfield	Transmission water loss mitigation	$26,000
New WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - New WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$19,000
Newton	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Newton	Transmission water loss mitigation	$31,000
Nome	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Nome	Transmission water loss mitigation	$16,000
North Cherokee WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - North Cherokee WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$131,000
North Hardin WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - North Hardin WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$65,000
Norwood WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Norwood WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$103,000
Orange	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Orange	Transmission water loss mitigation	$120,000
Orange County WCID 1	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Orange County WCID 1	Transmission water loss mitigation	$212,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Orange County WCID 2	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Orange County WCID 2	Transmission water loss mitigation	$31,000
Orangefield WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Orangefield WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$78,000
Overton	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Overton	Transmission water loss mitigation	$48,000
Palestine	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Palestine	Transmission water loss mitigation	$1,029,000
Panola-Bethany WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Panola-Bethany WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$22,000
Pennington WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pennington WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$43,000
Pinehurst	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pinehurst	Transmission water loss mitigation	$16,000
Pineland	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pineland	Transmission water loss mitigation	$16,000
Pleasant Springs WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pleasant Springs WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$10,000
Pollok-Redtown WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Pollok-Redtown WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$47,000
Port Neches	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Port Neches	Transmission water loss mitigation	$577,000
Rayburn Country MUD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rayburn Country MUD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$25,000
Redland WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Redland WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$11,000
Rehobeth WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rehobeth WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
Rural WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rural WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
Rusk	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rusk	Transmission water loss mitigation	$38,000
Rusk Rural WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Rusk Rural WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$351,000
San Augustine	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - San Augustine	Transmission water loss mitigation	$24,000
San Augustine Rural WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - San Augustine Rural WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$322,000
Sand Hills WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Sand Hills WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$7,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Seneca WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Seneca WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$9,000
Silsbee	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Silsbee	Transmission water loss mitigation	$257,000
Slocum WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Slocum WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$25,000
Sour Lake	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Sour Lake	Transmission water loss mitigation	$26,000
South Jasper County WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - South Jasper County WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$14,000
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - South Kirbyville Rural WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,000
South Newton WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - South Newton WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$87,000
South Rusk County WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - South Rusk County WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$23,000
Southern Utilities	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Southern Utilities	Transmission water loss mitigation	$931,000
Swift WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Swift WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$20,000
Tatum	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tatum	Transmission water loss mitigation	$24,000
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	Transmission water loss mitigation	$214,000
TDCJ Coffield Michael	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - TDCJ Coffield Michael	Transmission water loss mitigation	$419,000
TDCJ Eastham Unit	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - TDCJ Eastham Unit	Transmission water loss mitigation	$134,000
Tenaha	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tenaha	Transmission water loss mitigation	$27,000
The Consolidated WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - The Consolidated WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$167,000
Timpson	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Timpson	Transmission water loss mitigation	$15,000
Troup	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Troup	Transmission water loss mitigation	$77,000
Tucker WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tucker WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$9,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Tyler	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tyler	Transmission water loss mitigation	$6,731,000
Tyler County SUD	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tyler County SU	Transmission water loss mitigation	$207,000
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Upper Jasper County Water Authority	Transmission water loss mitigation	$105,000
Virginia Hill WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Virginia Hill WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$74,000
Walnut Grove WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Walnut Grove WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$631,000
Walston Springs WSC	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Walston Springs WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$23,000
Warren WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Warren WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$22,000
Wells	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Wells	Transmission water loss mitigation	$27,000
West Hardin WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - West Hardin WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$91,000
West Jacksonville WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - West Jacksonville WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$53,000
West Jefferson County MWD	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - West Jefferson County MWD	Transmission water loss mitigation	$74,000
Whitehouse	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Whitehouse	Transmission water loss mitigation	$52,000
Wildwood POA	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Wildwood POA	Transmission water loss mitigation	$15,000
Woden WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Woden WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$27,000
Woodlawn WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Woodlawn WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$18,000
Woodville	Yes	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Woodville	Transmission water loss mitigation	$82,000
Wright City WSC	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Wright City WSC	Transmission water loss mitigation	$170,000
Zavalla	No	2030	Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Zavalla	Transmission water loss mitigation	$7,000
Nacogdoches	Yes	2040	Nacogdoches - Supply from Lake Columbia (Conveyance)	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir	$82,440,000

DRAFT Region I Recommended Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Orange County WCID 1	No	2030	Orange County WCID 1 - New Well(s) in Gulf Coast Aquifer System	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$9,364,000
South Jasper County WSC	No	2040	South Jasper WSC - New Well(s) in Gulf Coast Aquifer System	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$6,553,000
Steam-Electric Power, Anderson	No	2030	Steam Electric Power, Anderson County - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir	$21,908,000
TDCJ Eastham Unit	No	2030	TDCJ Eastham Unit - New Well(s) Carrizo-Wilcox	New conventional well	$5,018,000
Tyler	Yes	2040	Tyler - Lake Palestine Expansion	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$289,320,000
Upper Neches River Municipal Water Authority	Yes	2070	Upper Neches River MWA - Neches Run of River with Lake Palestine	Diversion and control structure; New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir	$719,027,000
				Region I Recommended Capital Cost Total	**$4,652,303,000**

DRAFT Region I Alternative Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Alternative Water User Group (WUG) Water Management Strategies (WMS)

WUG Name: Athens*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Athens MWA - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer (Alternative)	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	N/A	$1786	0	0	0	0	5	5
Athens* Total					**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**5**

WUG Name: Center					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Center - Pipeline from Toledo Bend Reservoir	I	I | Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	N/A	$671	0	0	2,242	2,242	2,242	2,242
Center Total					**0**	**0**	**2,242**	**2,242**	**2,242**	**2,242**

WUG Name: Chandler					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Chandler - New Well (s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer (Alternative)	I	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Henderson County	N/A	$1476	0	0	0	0	970	970
Chandler Total					**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**970**	**970**

WUG Name: Henderson					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Alternative Sabine River Authority Strategy - Wood County GW	D	D | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Wood County	$979	$621	6,166	6,166	6,166	6,166	6,166	6,166
Henderson Total					**6,166**	**6,166**	**6,166**	**6,166**	**6,166**	**6,166**

WUG Name: Kilgore*					Water Management Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**WMS Sponsor Region**	**Source Name**	**Unit Cost 2030**	**Unit Cost 2080**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Alternative Sabine River Authority Strategy - Wood County GW	D	D | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Wood County	$979	$621	1,571	1,525	1,476	1,428	1,378	1,324
Kilgore* Total					**1,571**	**1,525**	**1,476**	**1,428**	**1,378**	**1,324**

Region I Alternative WMS Supply Total					**7,737**	**7,691**	**9,884**	**9,836**	**10,761**	**10,707**

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by two or more planning regions.

DRAFT Region I Alternative Projects Associated with Water Management Strategies

Sponsor Name	Sponsor is WWP?	Online Decade	Project Name	Project Description	Capital Cost
Athens Municipal Water Authority	Yes	2070	Athens MWA - New Well(s) in Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$10,270,000
Center	Yes	2050	Center - Pipeline from Toledo Bend Reservoir	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; New conventional WTP	$70,786,000
Chandler	No	2070	Chandler - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity	$10,727,000
				Region I Alternative Capital Cost Total	**$91,783,000**

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

WUG supplies and projected demands are entered for each of a WUG's region-county-basin divisions. To calculate the Management Supply Factor for each WUG as a whole, not split by region-county-basin, the combined total of existing and future supply is divided by the total projected demand. If a WUG is split by more than one planning region, the whole WUG's management supply factor will show up in each of its planning region's management supply factor reports.

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Afton Grove WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Alto	1.0	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.2
Alto Rural WSC	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.0
Anderson County Cedar Creek WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Angelina WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Appleby WSC	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Arp	1.1	4.3	4.6	4.9	5.3	5.8
Athens*	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1
B B S WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
B C Y WSC	1.0	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
Beaumont	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Beckville	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Ben Wheeler WSC*	1.0	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.0
Berryville	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Bethel Ash WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Bevil Oaks	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Blackjack WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Bon Wier WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Bridge City	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Brookeland FWSD	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Brownsboro	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Brushy Creek WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Bullard	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.5
Caro WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Carroll WSC*	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Carthage	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Center	1.0	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8
Centerville WSC	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Central WCID of Angelina County	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Chalk Hill SUD*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Chandler	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Chester WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
China	1.0	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5
Choice WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Clayton WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Colmesneil	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Corrigan	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Craft Turney WSC	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Crockett	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Cross Roads SUD*	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Crystal Farms WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Crystal Systems Texas*	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4
Cushing	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1
Cypress Creek WSC	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
D & M WSC	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0
Damascus-Stryker WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Dean WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Deberry WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
Denning WSC	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Diboll	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3
East Lamar WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Ebenezer WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Edom WSC*	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Elderville WSC*	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4
Elkhart	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Elysian Fields WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Emerald Bay MUD	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Etoile WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Five Way WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Flat Fork WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Four Pines WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Four Way SUD	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Frankston	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Frankston Rural WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
G M WSC	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.4
Garrison	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Gaston WSC	1.0	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.2
Gill WSC*	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.0
Goodsprings WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Grapeland	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Groves	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Groveton*	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2
Gum Creek WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Hardin County WCID 1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Hemphill	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4
Henderson	2.3	2.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Hollands Quarter WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Hudson WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Huntington	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8
Huxley	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.7	1.9	2.1
Jackson WSC*	1.0	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Jacksonville	1.0	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.0
Jacobs WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Jasper	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Jasper County WCID 1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Jefferson County WCID 10	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Joaquin	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
Kelly G Brewer	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Kilgore*	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
Kirbyville	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Kountze	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Lake Livingston WSC*	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1
Leagueville WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Leggett WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Liberty Utilities Silverleaf Water*	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.3
Lilly Grove SUD	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Lindale Rural WSC*	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0
Lindale*	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Lovelady	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4
Lufkin	1.0	2.8	4.5	5.2	5.2	5.1
Lumberton MUD	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
M & M WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Mauriceville SUD	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
McClelland WSC	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Meeker MWD	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Melrose WSC	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Minden Brachfield WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Moore Station WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Moscow WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mt Enterprise WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Murchison	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Nacogdoches	1.0	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.1
Neches WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Nederland	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
New London	1.0	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.8	5.0
New Prospect WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
New Summerfield	1.0	24.1	24.5	25.2	25.7	26.4
New WSC	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Newton	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Nome	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
North Cherokee WSC	1.0	10.2	10.4	10.6	10.8	11.1
North Hardin WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Norwood WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Orange	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Orange County WCID 1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.5
Orange County WCID 2	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Orangefield WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Overton*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Palestine	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3
Panola-Bethany WSC*	1.1	1.5	1.9	2.8	3.4	4.2
Pennington WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Pinehurst	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Pineland	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Pleasant Springs WSC	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7
Pollok-Redtown WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Port Arthur	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1
Port Neches	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
R P M WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Rayburn Country MUD	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2
Redland WSC	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Rehobeth WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Rural WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Rusk	1.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Rusk Rural WSC	1.0	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
San Augustine	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
San Augustine Rural WSC	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Sand Hills WSC	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.9
Seneca WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Silsbee	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Slocum WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Soda WSC*	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2
Sour Lake	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
South Jasper County WSC	1.0	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.1
South Kirbyville Rural WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
South Newton WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
South Rusk County WSC	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Southern Utilities*	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Swift WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Tatum	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
TDCJ Beto Gurney & Powledge Units	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
TDCJ Coffield Michael	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
TDCJ Eastham Unit	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Tenaha	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
The Consolidated WSC	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2
Timpson	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Trinity Bay Conservation District*	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Troup	1.0	11.4	11.2	11.1	11.0	10.9
Tucker WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Tyler County SUD	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Tyler*	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Upper Jasper County Water Authority	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Virginia Hill WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Walnut Grove WSC	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5
Walston Springs WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Warren WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Wells	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
West Gregg SUD*	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.1
West Hardin WSC*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
West Jacksonville WSC	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
West Jefferson County MWD	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Whitehouse	1.8	10.2	10.1	10.2	10.3	10.3
Wildwood POA	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Woden WSC	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Woodlawn WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Woodville	7.4	7.1	6.8	6.5	6.2	5.9
Wright City WSC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Zavalla	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
County-Other, Anderson	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.6
County-Other, Angelina	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
County-Other, Cherokee	1.0	11.4	14.1	19.5	34.2	227.4
County-Other, Hardin	1.9	2.1	2.4	2.9	3.7	5.0
County-Other, Henderson*	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.8
County-Other, Houston	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.0
County-Other, Jasper	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
County-Other, Jefferson	1.5	1.8	2.8	3.0	3.3	3.7
County-Other, Nacogdoches	1.0	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6
County-Other, Newton	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
County-Other, Orange	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.9	4.6	5.8
County-Other, Panola	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
County-Other, Polk*	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
County-Other, Rusk	1.6	1.8	2.2	2.9	4.4	10.3
County-Other, Sabine	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5
County-Other, San Augustine	3.3	4.4	5.9	7.3	9.9	15.2
County-Other, Shelby	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
County-Other, Smith*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3
County-Other, Trinity*	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6
County-Other, Tyler	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Manufacturing, Anderson	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Angelina	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Cherokee	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Hardin	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.2
Manufacturing, Houston	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Jasper	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Jefferson	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Nacogdoches	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9
Manufacturing, Newton	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Orange	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Panola	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Polk*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Rusk	9.4	9.1	8.8	8.4	8.2	7.9
Manufacturing, Sabine	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0
Manufacturing, San Augustine	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Manufacturing, Shelby	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Smith*	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0
Manufacturing, Tyler	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1
Mining, Anderson	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mining, Angelina	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mining, Cherokee	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Mining, Hardin	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mining, Henderson*	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.0
Mining, Houston	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mining, Jasper	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mining, Jefferson	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.1
Mining, Nacogdoches	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Mining, Newton	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0
Mining, Orange	23.8	23.8	23.8	23.8	23.8	23.8
Mining, Panola	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9
Mining, Polk*	3.9	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.1
Mining, Rusk	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8
Mining, Sabine	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Mining, San Augustine	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mining, Shelby	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Mining, Smith	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.1
Mining, Trinity*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Mining, Tyler	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Steam-Electric Power, Anderson	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Steam-Electric Power, Cherokee	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.2
Steam-Electric Power, Hardin	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Steam-Electric Power, Henderson*	1.3	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Steam-Electric Power, Nacogdoches	3.7	4.1	4.5	5.0	5.5	6.0
Steam-Electric Power, Newton	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Steam-Electric Power, Orange	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Steam-Electric Power, Rusk	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Steam-Electric Power, Tyler	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7	63.7
Livestock, Anderson	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Livestock, Angelina	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Livestock, Cherokee	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Livestock, Hardin	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Livestock, Henderson*	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Livestock, Houston	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0
Livestock, Jasper	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Livestock, Jefferson	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Livestock, Nacogdoches	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.1
Livestock, Newton	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Livestock, Orange	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
Livestock, Panola	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9
Livestock, Polk*	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Livestock, Rusk	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4
Livestock, Sabine	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0
Livestock, San Augustine	3.1	2.8	2.6	2.3	2.3	2.4

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Livestock, Shelby	3.6	3.0	2.5	2.1	2.1	2.2
Livestock, Smith*	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Livestock, Trinity*	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Livestock, Tyler	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Irrigation, Anderson	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Irrigation, Angelina	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Irrigation, Cherokee	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Irrigation, Hardin	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Irrigation, Henderson*	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Irrigation, Houston	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Irrigation, Jasper	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Irrigation, Jefferson	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
Irrigation, Nacogdoches	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Irrigation, Newton	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Irrigation, Orange	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Irrigation, Panola	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Irrigation, Polk*	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Irrigation, Rusk	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Irrigation, San Augustine	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2
Irrigation, Shelby	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Irrigation, Smith*	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Water User Group (WUG) Management Supply Factor

	WUG Management Supply Factor					
WUG Name	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Irrigation, Trinity*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Irrigation, Tyler	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2

*A single asterisk next to a WUG's name denotes that the WUG is split by more than one planning region.

DRAFT Region I Recommended Water Management Strategy (WMS) Supply Associated with a New or Amended Inter-Basin Transfer (IBT) Permit

IBT WMS supply is the portion of the total WMS benefitting WUGs that will require a new or amended IBT permit that is not considered exempt under the Texas Water Code § 11.085.

			IBT WMS Supply (acre-feet per year)					
WMS Name	**Source Basin**	**Recipient WUG Basin**	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	Neches	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	Neches	Sulphur	0	0	0	0	0	0
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	Neches	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Neches River MWA - Neches Run of River with Lake Palestine	Neches	Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Neches River MWA - Neches Run of River with Lake Palestine	Neches	Sulphur	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Neches River MWA - Neches Run of River with Lake Palestine	Neches	Trinity	0	0	0	0	17,949	18,311

DRAFT Region I Water User Groups (WUGs) Recommended Water Management Strategy (WMS) Supply Associated with a New or Amended Inter-Basin Transfer (IBT) Permit and Total Recommended Conservation WMS Supply

IBT WMS supply is the portion of the total WMS benefitting the WUG basin split listed that will require a new or amended IBT permit that is not considered exempt under the Texas Water Code § 11.085. Total conservation supply represents all conservation WMS volumes recommended within the WUG's region-basin geographic split.

The planning region selected produces no results for this report.

DRAFT Region I Sponsored Recommended Water Management Strategy (WMS) Supplies Unallocated to Water User Groups (WUG)

Strategy supplies created through the WMS that have not been assigned to a WUG will be allocated to the entity responsible for the water through an 'unassigned water volumes' entity. Only strategy supplies associated with an 'unassigned water volume' entity are shown in this report, and may not represent all strategy supplies associated with the listed WMS.

WMS Name	WMS Sponsor	Source Name	Unallocated Strategy Supply (acre-feet per year)					
			2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia	Angelina & Neches River Authority	I | Columbia Lake/Reservoir	0	31,256	31,176	31,096	31,016	30,936
Angelina-Nacogdoches WCID #1 - Hydraulic Dredging of Lake Striker	Angelina Nacogdoches WCID 1	I | Striker Lake/Reservoir	0	5,600	0	0	0	0
Athens MWA - Fish Hatchery Reuse	Athens Municipal Water Authority	I | Neches Indirect Reuse	2,872	2,872	1,982	900	0	0
Center - Reuse Pipeline to Industrial Customer	Center	I | Sabine Indirect Reuse	1,121	0	0	0	0	0
County-Other, Nacogdoches - Lake Naconiche Infrastructure	County-Other, Nacogdoches	I | Lake Naconiche Lake/Reservoir	0	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700
Houston Co. WCID #1 - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer	Houston County WCID 1	I | Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer | Houston County	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
LNVA - Neches Pump Station Upgrades and Fuel Diversification	Lower Neches Valley Authority	I | Sam Rayburn-Steinhagen Lake/Reservoir System	161,420	161,420	161,420	161,420	161,420	161,420
LNVA - Purchase From Sabine River Authority (Toledo Bend)	Lower Neches Valley Authority	I | Toledo Bend Lake/Reservoir	0	0	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
LNVA - West Beaumont Reservoir	Lower Neches Valley Authority	I | Beaumont West Regional Lake/Reservoir	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700
Upper Neches River MWA - Neches Run of River with Lake Palestine	Dallas	I | Neches Run-of-River	0	0	0	0	32,787	32,943
Upper Neches River MWA - Neches Run of River with Lake Palestine	Upper Neches River Municipal Water Authority	I | Neches Run-of-River	0	0	0	0	29,092	29,092
Total Unallocated Strategy Supplies			**174,113**	**211,548**	**404,978**	**403,816**	**464,715**	**464,791**

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Existing Sales and Transfers

Major Water Providers are entities of particular significance to a region's water supply as defined by the Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG), and may be a Water User Group (WUG) entity, Wholesale Water Provider (WWP) entity , or both (WUG/WWP). Retail denotes WUG projected demands and existing water supplies used by the WUG. Wholesale denotes a WWP or WUG/WWP selling water to another entity.

Angelina & Neches River Authority - WWP	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	44,534	44,534	44,534	44,534	44,534	44,534
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**44,534**	**44,534**	**44,534**	**44,534**	**44,534**	**44,534**
Groundwater Sales to Wholesale Customers	70	70	70	70	70	70
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**70**	**70**	**70**	**70**	**70**	**70**

Angelina Nacogdoches WCID 1 - WWP	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	2,078	2,285	2,513	2,765	3,041	3,345
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**2,078**	**2,285**	**2,513**	**2,765**	**3,041**	**3,345**
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	2,078	2,285	2,513	2,765	3,041	3,345
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**2,078**	**2,285**	**2,513**	**2,765**	**3,041**	**3,345**

Athens Municipal Water Authority - WWP	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	5,270	5,803	6,797	7,650	8,680	9,311
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**5,270**	**5,803**	**6,797**	**7,650**	**8,680**	**9,311**
Groundwater Sales to Wholesale Customers	1,487	1,487	1,487	1,487	1,487	1,487
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	3,783	4,316	4,420	4,191	3,851	3,679
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**5,270**	**5,803**	**5,907**	**5,678**	**5,338**	**5,166**

Beaumont - WUG/WWP	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Retail WUG Demands	29,419	30,134	30,967	30,565	30,167	29,774
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	3,837	4,293	4,752	5,212	5,671	6,130
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**33,256**	**34,427**	**35,719**	**35,777**	**35,838**	**35,904**
Groundwater Sales to Retail Customers	5,646	5,646	5,646	5,646	5,646	5,646
Surface Water Sales to Retail Customers	15,160	15,370	15,553	15,126	14,873	14,754
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	2,942	3,190	3,424	3,669	3,931	4,215
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**23,748**	**24,206**	**24,623**	**24,441**	**24,450**	**24,615**

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP)
Existing Sales and Transfers

Carthage - WUG/WWP	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Retail WUG Demands	1,649	1,632	1,609	1,578	1,549	1,520
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	1,388	1,419	1,450	1,487	1,525	1,565
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**3,037**	**3,051**	**3,059**	**3,065**	**3,074**	**3,085**
Groundwater Sales to Retail Customers	49	48	48	47	46	45
Surface Water Sales to Retail Customers	1,600	1,584	1,561	1,531	1,503	1,475
Groundwater Sales to Wholesale Customers	32	33	35	36	37	39
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	1,356	1,386	1,415	1,451	1,488	1,526
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**3,037**	**3,051**	**3,059**	**3,065**	**3,074**	**3,085**

Center - WUG/WWP	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Retail WUG Demands	2,135	2,099	2,047	1,995	1,944	1,894
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	3,116	3,226	3,332	3,415	3,493	3,567
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**5,251**	**5,325**	**5,379**	**5,410**	**5,437**	**5,461**
Surface Water Sales to Retail Customers	2,135	2,135	2,135	2,135	2,135	2,135
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	1,977	1,965	1,952	1,940	1,927	1,915
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**4,112**	**4,100**	**4,087**	**4,075**	**4,062**	**4,050**

Houston County WCID 1 - WWP	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	3,178	3,167	3,134	3,151	3,154	3,150
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**3,178**	**3,167**	**3,134**	**3,151**	**3,154**	**3,150**
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	3,178	3,167	3,134	3,151	3,154	3,150
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**3,178**	**3,167**	**3,134**	**3,151**	**3,154**	**3,150**

Jacksonville - WUG/WWP	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Retail WUG Demands	2,576	2,541	2,494	2,442	2,390	2,338
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	2,594	2,738	2,830	2,914	2,996	3,073
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**5,170**	**5,279**	**5,324**	**5,356**	**5,386**	**5,411**
Groundwater Sales to Retail Customers	773	763	748	733	717	702
Surface Water Sales to Retail Customers	1,803	1,778	1,746	1,709	1,673	1,636
Groundwater Sales to Wholesale Customers	780	823	850	874	899	924

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP)
Existing Sales and Transfers

Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	1,814	1,915	1,980	2,040	2,097	2,149
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**5,170**	**5,279**	**5,324**	**5,356**	**5,386**	**5,411**

Lower Neches Valley Authority - WWP	**Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)**					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	454,149	454,159	454,154	454,109	454,064	454,021
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**454,149**	**454,159**	**454,154**	**454,109**	**454,064**	**454,021**
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	443,298	447,343	447,338	447,293	447,248	447,205
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**443,298**	**447,343**	**447,338**	**447,293**	**447,248**	**447,205**

Lufkin - WUG/WWP	**Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)**					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Retail WUG Demands	6,592	6,674	6,726	6,792	6,857	6,922
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	4,670	4,712	4,755	4,800	4,846	4,894
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**11,262**	**11,386**	**11,481**	**11,592**	**11,703**	**11,816**
Groundwater Sales to Retail Customers	4,144	4,119	4,093	4,066	4,038	4,010
Surface Water Sales to Retail Customers	2,448	2,555	2,633	2,726	2,819	2,912
Groundwater Sales to Wholesale Customers	3,442	3,467	3,493	3,520	3,548	3,576
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	1,228	1,245	1,262	1,280	1,298	1,318
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**11,262**	**11,386**	**11,481**	**11,592**	**11,703**	**11,816**

Nacogdoches - WUG/WWP	**Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)**					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Retail WUG Demands	7,421	7,614	7,809	8,104	8,397	8,690
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	3,609	3,723	3,841	3,969	4,101	4,238
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**11,030**	**11,337**	**11,650**	**12,073**	**12,498**	**12,928**
Groundwater Sales to Retail Customers	2,313	2,415	2,522	2,665	2,813	2,967
Surface Water Sales to Retail Customers	5,108	5,199	5,287	5,439	5,584	5,723
Groundwater Sales to Wholesale Customers	1,126	1,181	1,240	1,306	1,372	1,448
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	2,483	2,542	2,601	2,663	2,729	2,790
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**11,030**	**11,337**	**11,650**	**12,073**	**12,498**	**12,928**

Panola County FWSD 1 - WWP	**Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)**					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	14,820	14,838	14,838	14,838	14,820	14,820
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**14,820**	**14,838**	**14,838**	**14,838**	**14,820**	**14,820**

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP)
Existing Sales and Transfers

Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	14,820	14,838	14,838	14,838	14,820	14,820
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**14,820**	**14,838**	**14,838**	**14,838**	**14,820**	**14,820**

Port Arthur - WUG/WWP	**Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)**					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Retail WUG Demands	18,309	18,454	18,405	18,183	17,964	17,748
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	15,646	19,536	19,585	19,807	20,026	20,242
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**33,955**	**37,990**	**37,990**	**37,990**	**37,990**	**37,990**
Surface Water Sales to Retail Customers	18,309	18,454	18,405	18,183	17,964	17,748
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	15,646	19,536	19,585	19,807	20,026	20,242
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**33,955**	**37,990**	**37,990**	**37,990**	**37,990**	**37,990**

Sabine River Authority - WWP	**Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)**					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	576,776	577,003	577,239	579,895	584,432	589,138
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**576,776**	**577,003**	**577,239**	**579,895**	**584,432**	**589,138**
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	547,040	543,895	540,766	540,051	541,220	542,558
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**547,040**	**543,895**	**540,766**	**540,051**	**541,220**	**542,558**

Tyler - WUG/WWP	**Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)**					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Retail WUG Demands	34,951	39,005	43,661	46,189	48,869	51,706
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	5,023	5,115	5,201	5,285	5,370	5,459
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**39,974**	**44,120**	**48,862**	**51,474**	**54,239**	**57,165**
Surface Water Sales to Retail Customers	34,951	39,005	43,661	46,189	48,869	51,706
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	5,023	5,115	5,201	5,285	5,370	5,459
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**39,974**	**44,120**	**48,862**	**51,474**	**54,239**	**57,165**

Upper Neches River Municipal Water Authority - WWP	**Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)**					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Projected Wholesale Contract Demands	210,247	210,224	210,202	210,184	210,169	210,169
Total Projected Wholesale Contract and Retail Demands	**210,247**	**210,224**	**210,202**	**210,184**	**210,169**	**210,169**
Surface Water Sales to Wholesale Customers	154,131	152,717	151,303	149,924	148,546	147,172
Total Wholesale and Retail Sales to Customers	**154,131**	**152,717**	**151,303**	**149,924**	**148,546**	**147,172**

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

MWPs are entities of significance to a region's water supply as defined by the Regional Water Planning Group (RWPG) and may be a Water User Group (WUG) entity, Wholesale Water Provider (WWP) entity, or both (WUG/WWP). 'MWP Retail Customers' denotes recommended WMS supply used by the WUG. 'Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers' denotes a WWP or WUG/WWP selling or transferring recommended WMS supply to another entity. Supply associated with the MWP's wholesale transfers will only display if it is listed as the main seller in the State Water Planning database, even if multiple sellers are involved with the sale of water to WUGs. Unallocated water volumes represent MWP recommended WMS supply not currently allocated to a customer of the MWP. 'Total MWP Related WMS Supply' will display if the MWP's WMS is related to more than one WMS supply type (retail, wholesale, and/or unallocated). Associated WMS Projects are listed when the MWP is one of the project's sponsors.

Angelina & Neches River Authority | Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	44,464	44,464	44,464	44,464	44,464
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	0	31,256	31,176	31,096	31,016	30,936
Total MWP Related WMS Supply	0	75,720	75,640	75,560	75,480	75,400
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Angelina Neches River Authority - Treatment Plant and Distribution System	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; New conventional WTP					
Angelina Neches River Authority-Lake Columbia	New water supply reservoir					

Angelina Nacogdoches WCID 1 | Angelina-Nacogdoches WCID #1 - Hydraulic Dredging of Lake Striker

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	0	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	0	5,600	0	0	0	0
Total MWP Related WMS Supply	0	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Angelina-Nacogdoches WCID #1 - Hydraulic Dredging Lake Striker	Dredge to recover capacity					

Athens Municipal Water Authority | Athens MWA - WTP Booster Pump Station Expansion

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	0	890	2,141	3,321	3,433
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	2,872	2,872	1,982	900	0	0
Total MWP Related WMS Supply	2,872	2,872	2,872	3,041	3,321	3,433
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Athens MWA - WTP Booster Pump Station Expansion	Pump station; Transmission pipeline					

Beaumont | Beaumont - Contract Amendment with LNVA

	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	6,685	7,398	8,273	8,513	8,565	8,466
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Beaumont - Bunn's Canal Rehabilitation	Dredge to recover capacity					
Beaumont - New Westside Surface Water Treatment Plant	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; New conventional WTP					

Beaumont | Beaumont - Municipal Conservation						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
MWP Retail Customers	613	954	1,084	1,171	1,257	1,340

Beaumont | Beaumont - Well Field Infrastructure Improvements						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
MWP Retail Customers	2,823	2,823	2,823	2,823	2,823	2,823
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Beaumont - Well Field Infrastructure Improvements	New conventional well; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity					

Beaumont | Conservation, Water Loss Control - Beaumont						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
MWP Retail Customers	1,481	4,552	6,236	6,156	6,075	5,996
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Conservation, Water Loss Control - Beaumont	Transmission water loss mitigation					

Carthage | Carthage - Municipal Conservation						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
MWP Retail Customers	23	38	40	42	44	46

Carthage | Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Carthage						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
MWP Retail Customers	8	8	8	8	8	8
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Carthage	Transmission water loss mitigation					

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

Center | Center - Municipal Conservation						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	30	48	51	53	55	56

Center | Center - Reuse Pipeline to Industrial Customer						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	0	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	1,121	0	0	0	0	0
Total MWP Related WMS Supply	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121	1,121
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Center - Reuse Pipeline	Transmission pipeline; Pump station					

Center | Manufacturing, Shelby County - Purchase from Center (Toledo Bend)						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	850	940	1,060	1,150	1,240	1,330

Center | Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Center						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	50	146	190	185	181	176
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Center	Transmission water loss mitigation					

Houston County WCID 1 | Houston Co. WCID #1 - New Well(s) in Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Houston Co. WCID #1 - New Well(s) Carrizo-Wilcox	New conventional well					

Jacksonville | Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

MWP Retail Customers	0	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275	4,275
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Jacksonville - Supply from Lake Columbia (Conveyance)	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir					

Jacksonville | Jacksonville - Municipal Conservation						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
MWP Retail Customers	42	66	70	75	78	82

Jacksonville | Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jacksonville						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
MWP Retail Customers	72	213	279	273	267	261
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Jacksonville	Transmission water loss mitigation					

Lower Neches Valley Authority | Beaumont - Contract Amendment with LNVA						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	6,685	7,398	8,273	8,513	8,565	8,466

Lower Neches Valley Authority | LNVA - Neches Pump Station Upgrades and Fuel Diversification						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	161,420	161,420	161,420	161,420	161,420	161,420
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
LNVA - Neches Pump Station Upgrades and Fuel Diversification	Diversion and control structure; Surface water intake modification; Pump station					

Lower Neches Valley Authority | LNVA - Purchase From Sabine River Authority (Toledo Bend)						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	**2030**	**2040**	**2050**	**2060**	**2070**	**2080**
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	0	0	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
LNVA - Purchase from Sabine River Authority (Toledo Bend)	New or amended bed and banks permit; New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Amended water right non-exempt IBT					

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

Lower Neches Valley Authority | LNVA - West Beaumont Reservoir						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
LNVA - West Beaumont Reservoir	New water supply reservoir; Diversion and control structure					

Lower Neches Valley Authority | LNVA Devers Pump Station Relocation						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	9,086	9,086	9,086	9,086	9,086	9,086
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
LNVA Devers Pump Station Relocation	Pump station					

Lower Neches Valley Authority | LNVA Neches-Trinity Basin Interconnect						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	67,000	67,000	67,000	67,000	67,000
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
LNVA Neches-Trinity Basin Interconnect	Transmission pipeline; Pump station					

Lower Neches Valley Authority | Manufacturing, Jasper County - Purchase from LNVA (Sam Rayburn)						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	460	2,590	4,810	7,100	9,480	11,950

Lower Neches Valley Authority | Manufacturing, Jefferson County - Purchase from LNVA (Sam Rayburn)						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	6,100	36,900	71,700	106,200	140,700	175,200

Lufkin | Lufkin - Municipal Conservation						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	137	211	236	260	286	312

Lufkin | Lufkin - Transfer from Sam Rayburn to Lake Kurth

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	0	11,637	22,946	28,000	28,000	28,000
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Lufkin - Conveyance from Sam Rayburn to Kurth Lake - Phase 1	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; New conventional WTP					
Lufkin - Conveyance from Sam Rayburn to Kurth Lake - Phase 2	New conventional WTP; Pump station					
Lufkin - Conveyance from Sam Rayburn to Kurth Lake - Phase 3	Pump station					

Lufkin | Manufacturing, Angelina County - Purchase from Lufkin (Lake Kurth)

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	2,150	2,320	2,490	2,680	2,860	3,060

Lufkin | Mining, Angelina County - Purchase from the City of Lufkin

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	380	420	450	480	510	540

Lufkin | Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lufkin

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	71	216	290	293	296	298
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Lufkin	Transmission water loss mitigation					

Nacogdoches | Angelina Neches River Authority - Lake Columbia

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	0	8,551	8,551	8,551	8,551	8,551
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Nacogdoches - Supply from Lake Columbia (Conveyance)	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir					

Nacogdoches | Municipal Conservation - Nacogdoches

	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	155	241	273	311	350	391

Nacogdoches | Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Nacogdoches						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	209	643	879	912	945	978
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Nacogdoches	Transmission water loss mitigation					

Panola County FWSD 1 | No Recommended WMS Supply Related TO MWP

Port Arthur | Conservation, Water Loss Control - Port Arthur						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	92	92	92	91	90	89
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Conservation, Water Loss Control - Port Arthur	Transmission water loss mitigation					

Port Arthur | Port Arthur - Municipal Conservation						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	473	677	736	788	838	887

Sabine River Authority | East Texas Transfer						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	0	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
East Texas Transfer	Transmission pipeline; Pump station					

Sabine River Authority | Increase Contract - MacBee SUD to SRA						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	0	0	0	996	996

Sabine River Authority | LNVA - Purchase From Sabine River Authority (Toledo Bend)

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	0	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
LNVA - Purchase from Sabine River Authority (Toledo Bend)	New or amended bed and banks permit; New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Amended water right non-exempt IBT					

Sabine River Authority | Sabine River Authority Strategy - Wood County GW

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	1,449	1,449	1,449	1,449	1,449	1,449
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Sabine River Authority Wood County Well Field and Pipeline	New conventional well; New or amended bed and banks permit; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir					

Tyler | County-Other, Smith - Purchase from the City of Tyler

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	280	150	40	0	0	0

Tyler | Manufacturing, Smith County - Purchase from the City of Tyler

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	0	50	420	500	570

Tyler | Mining, Smith County - Purchase from the City of Tyler

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	320	340	360	380	400	430

Tyler | Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tyler

Data Description	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	263	880	1,314	1,390	1,471	1,556
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation - Tyler	Transmission water loss mitigation					

DRAFT Region I Major Water Provider (MWP) Water Management Strategy (WMS) Summary

Tyler | Municipal Conservation, Water Loss Mitigation -Tyler						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
MWP Retail Customers	728	1,235	1,528	1,771	2,036	2,327
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Municipal Conservation - Water Loss Mitigation - Tyler	Transmission water loss mitigation					

Tyler | Southern Utilities - Contract Amendment with Tyler						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	0	0	0	0	70	410

Tyler | Tyler-Lake Palestine						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Transfers Related to Wholesale Customers	105	738	1,115	1,685	2,288	2,843
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Tyler - Lake Palestine Expansion	Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir; Expand WTP capacity					

Upper Neches River Municipal Water Authority | Upper Neches River MWA - Neches Run of River with Lake Palestine						
	Water Volumes (acre-feet per year)					
Data Description	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
Related Unallocated WMS Water Volumes	0	0	0	0	29,092	29,092
WMS Related MWP Sponsored Projects	**Project Description**					
Upper Neches River MWA - Neches Run of River with Lake Palestine	Diversion and control structure; New surface water intake; Transmission pipeline; Pump station; Storage tank/balancing reservoir					