




Rio Grande RWPG Meeting

2026 Region M Regional Water Plan

Jaime Burke, Black & Veatch
March 1, 2023




1



AGENDA

5.A Status on Current TWDB Contract Activities


1. Schedule and Progress Update
2. Presentation of and Consider Action on Recommendation from Population and Water Demand Subcommittee to Revise Draft Non-Municipal Demand Projections from TWDB
3. Presentation and Initial Discussion of Draft Population and Municipal Demand Projections from TWDB




2

5.A.1 Schedule and Progress Update

3



4



5


Progress Update

- Continued review of non-municipal demand supporting data.
- Held Population and Water Demand Subcommittee meeting on January 12, 2023, to discuss all the non-municipal WUG categories and potential revisions.
- Prepared webinar presentation for municipal WUGs to introduce Regional Water Planning and how to provide input during the process.
- Started review of draft population and municipal demand projections and preparing outreach to WUGs.

*Amendment 1 to the 2021 Region M Water Plan was approved by TWDB and an amendment to the State Water Plan has been adopted.

6

Update on Received Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) Data for this Planning Cycle – GMA 13




Gulf Coast Aquifer and Yegua-Jackson Aquifer determined as Non-Relevant for joint planning purposes in Region M portion of GMA 13

Groundwater availability for non-relevant aquifers will be determined by regional water planning groups for state water planning purposes.

Black & Veatch

7

Update on Received Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) Data for this Planning Cycle – GMA 16




Yegua-Jackson Aquifer determined as Non-Relevant for joint planning purposes in Region M portion of GMA 16

Black & Veatch


8

Update on Received Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) Data for this Planning Cycle – GMA 16

Jim Hogg County - Gulf Coast Aquifer System
Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG)



Starr County - Gulf Coast Aquifer System
Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG)




Yegua-Jackson Aquifer determined as Non-Relevant for joint planning purposes in Region M portion of GMA 16

Black & Veatch


9

Update on Received Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG) Data for this Planning Cycle – GMA 16

Webb County - Gulf Coast Aquifer System
Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG)



Willacy County - Gulf Coast Aquifer System
Modeled Available Groundwater (MAG)



Yegua-Jackson Aquifer determined as Non-Relevant for joint planning purposes in Region M portion of GMA 16

Black & Veatch

10

5.A.2 Presentation of and Consider Action on Recommendation from Population and Water Demand Subcommittee to Revise Draft Non- Municipal Demand Projections from TWDB

Black &
Veatch

11

Population and Water Demand Subcommittee

- Met twice – June 16, 2022, and January 12, 2023.
- Reviewed draft projections and supporting data for all non-municipal categories, asked questions, and provided direction for follow-up.
- Agreed on a recommendation to present to the RWPG for consideration in requesting revisions to TWDB.

Consider action today to approve requested revisions and submit to TWDB

Black &
Veatch

12

Draft Livestock Water Demand Projections (Ac-Ft/Yr)

Region	County	Historical Water Use Estimates					2021 Regional Water Plan Projections						2026 DRAFT Regional Water Plan Projections					
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
M	CAMERON	309	314	264	274	274	436	436	436	436	436	436	287	287	287	287	287	287
M	HIDALGO	722	735	582	603	603	777	777	777	777	777	777	649	649	649	649	649	649
M	JIM HOGG	445	449	392	407	407	376	376	376	376	376	376	420	420	420	420	420	420
M	MAVERICK	453	471	467	487	487	371	371	371	371	371	371	473	473	473	473	473	473
M	STARR	1,131	1,142	800	825	825	1,192	1,192	1,192	1,192	1,192	1,192	945	945	945	945	945	945
M	WEBB	956	980	812	842	842	963	963	963	963	963	963	886	886	886	886	886	886
M	WILLACY	201	204	190	196	196	235	235	235	235	235	235	197	197	197	197	197	197
M	ZAPATA	433	439	299	312	313	398	398	398	398	398	398	359	359	359	359	359	359
Region Total		4,650	4,734	3,806	3,946	3,947	4,748	4,748	4,748	4,748	4,748	4,748	4,216	4,216	4,216	4,216	4,216	4,216

Table 1. Water use parameter comparison, 2021 and 2026 RWP's

TWDB category	Subcategory	2021 RWP water use (gal/head/day)	2026 RWP water use (gal/head/day)
Cattle	Milk	75	55
	Fed & other cattle	15	15
Chickens	Non-broilers	0.086	0.09
	Broilers	0.077	0.09
Turkeys	Turkeys	0.2	0.2
Equine	Horses, ponies, mules, burros, & donkeys	12	12
Hogs	Hogs	11	5
Sheep	Sheep	2	2
Goats	Milk		
	Meat	0.5	2
	Angora		

- Recommendation of P&WD Subcommittee:
 - No revisions needed

Black & Veatch

13

Draft Manufacturing Water Demand Projections (Ac-Ft/Yr)

Region	County	Historical Water Use Estimates					2021 Regional Water Plan Projections						2026 DRAFT Regional Water Plan Projections					
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
M	CAMERON	322	403	356	271	279	1,647	1,846	1,846	1,846	1,846	1,846	460	477	495	513	532	552
M	HIDALGO	2,787	3,564	2,705	2,379	2,118	2,236	2,721	2,721	2,721	2,721	2,721	3,926	4,071	4,222	4,378	4,540	4,708
M	JIM HOGG	0	36	36	37	38	2	2	2	2	2	2	42	44	46	48	50	52
M	MAVERICK	63	58	64	63	89	65	65	65	65	65	65	98	102	106	110	114	118
M	STARR	74	74	74	74	74	95	116	116	116	116	116	81	84	87	90	93	96
M	WEBB	71	39	41	45	59	251	296	296	296	296	296	78	81	84	87	90	93
M	WILLACY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	ZAPATA	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region Total		3,317	4,174	3,276	2,869	2,657	4,305	5,055	5,055	5,055	5,055	5,055	4,685	4,859	5,040	5,226	5,419	5,619

- Cameron County – significant decrease compared to 2021 Plan (GW and SW)
 - Cameron County – Decrease from 2014 to 2015 mainly due to Brownsville Navigation District and Texas Pack Inc. no longer reporting water use
- Hidalgo County – significant increase compared to 2021 Plan (SW)
 - Hidalgo County – Increase from 2014 to 2015 mainly due increased use by Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers and Edinburg Plant – Azteca Milling LP
 - In 2016, Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers show a high use of 2,393 Ac-ft/yr, other years from 2015-2019 are between 1,600-2,000 Ac-ft/yr.

- Recommendation of P&WD Subcommittee: No revisions needed

Black & Veatch

14

Draft Steam-Electric Water Demand Projections (Ac-Ft/Yr)

Region	County	Historical Water Use Estimates					2021 Regional Water Plan Projections						2026 DRAFT Regional Water Plan Projections					
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
M	CAMERON	165	106	70	64	61	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550	165	165	165	165	165	165
M	HIDALGO	7,847	8,653	8,220	10,325	9,404	11,538	11,538	11,538	11,538	11,538	11,538	10,325	10,325	10,325	10,325	10,325	10,325
M	JIM HOGG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	MAVERICK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	STARR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	WEBB	81	94	113	131	103	152	152	152	152	152	152	131	131	131	131	131	131
M	WILLACY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	ZAPATA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Region Total		8,093	8,853	8,403	10,520	9,568	15,240	15,240	15,240	15,240	15,240	15,240	10,621	10,621	10,621	10,621	10,621	10,621

- Cameron County
 - 2021 Plan included 3,400 AFY of demand for two planned facilities associated with Coronado Power Ventures (La Paloma Energy Center).
 - **2026 Plan data show those facilities have been canceled, thus reducing the demand.**
- No new proposed facilities identified for the region this cycle.
- Recommendation of P&WD Subcommittee: No revisions needed

Black & Veatch

15

Draft Mining Demand Projections from TWDB

DRAFT Mining Water Demand Projections for the 2026 Regional Water Plans (Demands in Acre-Feet)							
Region	County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
M	CAMERON	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	HIDALGO	234	260	286	312	337	361
M	JIM HOGG	9	9	9	9	9	9
M	MAVERICK	4,898	4,898	4,898	4,898	4,898	2
M	STARR	193	200	207	213	218	223
M	WEBB	4,142	4,144	4,147	4,149	4,151	31
M	WILLACY	2	2	2	2	2	2
M	ZAPATA	6	6	6	6	6	6
Region Total		9,484	9,519	9,555	9,589	9,621	634

- Projections were developed in the mining water use study that TWDB conducted in partnership with the University of Texas Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) and U.S. Geological Survey.
- For more information regarding the mining study and the report:
<https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/data/projections/MiningStudy/index.asp>
- Recommendation of P&WD Subcommittee: No revisions needed

Black & Veatch

16

Draft Irrigation Demand Projections from TWDB

DRAFT Projections for the 2026 Regional Water Plans (Demands in Acre-Feet)

Region	County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
M	Cameron	333,373	333,373	333,373	333,373	333,373	333,373
M	Hidalgo	542,604	542,604	542,604	542,604	542,604	542,604
M	Jim Hogg	82	82	82	82	82	82
M	Maverick	57,280	57,280	57,280	57,280	57,280	57,280
M	Starr	6,263	6,263	6,263	6,263	6,263	6,263
M	Webb	2,890	2,890	2,890	2,890	2,890	2,890
M	Willacy	61,960	61,960	61,960	61,960	61,960	61,960
M	Zapata	1,414	1,414	1,414	1,414	1,414	1,414
	Region Total	1,005,866	1,005,866	1,005,866	1,005,866	1,005,866	1,005,866

- Methodology – Average of 2015-2019 historical use
- Demands kept flat across the planning decades

		Historical Water Use Estimates				
Region	County	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
M	CAMERON	187,426	387,105	401,206	381,670	309,456
M	HIDALGO	250,015	493,801	695,044	657,699	616,459
M	JIM HOGG	80	160	80	50	42
M	MAVERICK	33,423	38,195	63,716	86,619	64,446
M	STARR	4,561	8,691	7,560	5,365	5,139
M	WEBB	1,967	2,620	2,735	3,920	3,206
M	WILLACY	38,274	76,181	69,611	70,718	55,015
M	ZAPATA	1,021	1,524	1,418	1,513	1,593
	Region Total	516,767	1,008,277	1,241,370	1,207,554	1,055,356

Black & Veatch

17

Irrigation Demands from 2021 Plan

- Requested revision to use 2011 historical use for 2020 Demand
 - Little rainfall (high demand) and full reservoirs (minimal supply constraints)
- Requested rate of change over the planning horizon that used a combination of sedimentation and historic rate at which irrigation water rights have been converted to municipal use.

		Historical Water Use Estimates					2021 Regional Water Plan Projections					
Region	County	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070
M	CAMERON	255,000	537,217	386,000	266,150	289,334	537,217	519,972	502,725	485,479	468,233	450,987
M	HIDALGO	405,000	688,667	495,222	302,491	410,384	688,667	666,560	644,451	622,343	600,236	578,127
M	JIM HOGG	250	360	292	120	80	360	348	337	325	314	302
M	MAVERICK	52,000	61,706	42,740	42,320	62,158	61,706	59,725	57,744	55,763	53,782	51,801
M	STARR	15,000	23,875	13,000	12,438	3,785	23,875	23,109	22,342	21,576	20,809	20,043
M	WEBB	6,100	10,425	6,675	4,250	1,138	10,425	10,090	9,756	9,421	9,086	8,752
M	WILLACY	45,000	99,610	70,000	53,289	53,177	99,610	96,412	93,215	90,017	86,819	83,621
M	ZAPATA	4,000	5,100	1,650	1,310	1,706	5,100	4,936	4,773	4,609	4,445	4,281
	Region Total	782,350	1,426,960	1,015,579	682,368	821,762	1,426,960	1,381,152	1,335,343	1,289,533	1,243,724	1,197,914


Black & Veatch

18

P&WD Subcommittee Recommendation for Revision to Irrigation

- Use the demand projections from the 2021 Plan and extend out to 2080.

Comparison of Irrigation Demand Projections



County	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
CAMERON	519,972	502,725	485,479	468,233	450,987	433,744
HIDALGO	666,560	644,451	622,343	600,236	578,127	556,024
JIM HOGG	348	337	325	314	302	290
MAVERICK	59,725	57,744	55,763	53,782	51,801	49,820
STARR	23,109	22,342	21,576	20,809	20,043	19,277
WEBB	10,090	9,756	9,421	9,086	8,752	8,417
WILLACY	96,412	93,215	90,017	86,819	83,621	80,424
ZAPATA	4,936	4,773	4,609	4,445	4,281	4,117
Region Total	1,381,152	1,335,343	1,289,533	1,243,724	1,197,914	1,152,113

Black & Veatch

19

Consider Action on Recommendations for Revisions to Non-Municipal Demand Projections

- Livestock – No revisions
- Manufacturing - No revisions
- Steam-Electric - No revisions
- Mining - No revisions
- Irrigation - Use the demand projections from the 2021 Plan and extend out to 2080.

Black & Veatch

20

5.A.3 Presentation and Initial Discussion of Draft Population and Municipal Demand Projections from TWDB

Black &
Veatch

21

Draft Population and Municipal Water Demand Projections



TWDB provides the RWPGs with Draft Population and Municipal Water Demand Projections they develop from the State Demographer's Data



The RWPGs are tasked with reviewing the draft projections and providing any requested revisions back to TWDB before August 11, 2023.



The RWPGs will send the draft projections to the utilities (municipal WUGs) to obtain feedback prior to deadline.

Black &
Veatch

22

Draft Population and Municipal Water Demand Projections



TWDB provides the RWPGs with Draft Population and Municipal Water Demand Projections they develop from the State Demographer's Data

- The draft projections include:
 - Population projections based on the Texas Demographic Center (TDC) full (1.0) migration scenario,
 - Baseline Gallons Per Capital Daily (GPCD),
 - Plumbing code savings projections,
 - Municipal demand projections

Black & Veatch

23

Draft Population and Municipal Water Demand Projections

Some key points on these projections include:

- Population projections are based on county-level projections from the Texas Demographic Center (TDC), which used migration rates between the 2010 and 2020 Census to project future growth.
- The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) drafted WUG-level population and water demand projections using the TDC's full-migration scenario (1.0) projections and provided the half-migration scenario (0.5) projections by Region-County for the planning groups' consideration. The higher of the total regional populations is the allowable cap on total population for the region.
- For the 2026 Regional Water Plans (RWPs), draft county population projections being provided to the RWPGs followed the trends, including population declines.
- As expected, the population projections of certain counties and WUGs are significantly different from those in the 2021 Regional Water Plans.
 - The 2021 RWP projections were based on the 2016 RWP projections, which relied on migration rates from 2000-2010 and the TDC's 2012 projections
 - The 2026 draft projections are tied to the 2020 U.S. Census. These projections include associated updates in the TDC cohort model to reflect updated birth and mortality rates.



Black & Veatch

24

TWDB Draft 2026 County Population Projections

Region	County	1.0 migration scenario (WUGs projected using this scenario)						0.5 migration scenario					
		2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080	2030	2040	2050	2060	2070	2080
M	CAMERON	423,347	422,389	415,695	404,490	393,433	382,522	433,804	445,013	449,091	447,915	446,726	445,524
M	HIDALGO	920,647	971,409	997,268	1,000,548	1,003,785	1,006,979	932,285	995,377	1,036,526	1,058,241	1,080,194	1,102,388
M	JIM HOGG	4,366	3,969	3,607	3,246	2,890	2,539	4,676	4,622	4,508	4,391	4,273	4,154
M	MAVERICK	61,051	64,131	66,027	66,653	67,271	67,881	62,424	66,814	70,294	72,996	75,728	78,490
M	STARR	68,683	71,778	73,398	73,394	73,390	73,386	70,499	75,394	79,002	81,275	83,573	85,896
M	WEBB	267,953	267,258	258,696	244,376	230,245	216,300	279,673	290,779	294,162	291,218	288,242	285,233
M	WILLACY	18,905	17,645	16,173	14,603	13,054	11,525	19,933	19,647	19,083	18,366	17,641	16,908
M	ZAPATA	13,377	12,805	12,128	11,392	10,666	9,950	14,075	14,288	14,295	14,158	14,019	13,878
Region M Total		1,778,329	1,831,384	1,842,992	1,818,702	1,794,734	1,771,082	1,817,369	1,911,934	1,966,961	1,988,560	2,010,396	2,032,471

Note: 0.5 migration scenario is higher region-total population projections


RWPG will be able to choose if they feel the 0.5 migration scenario is more appropriate

If it is, the RWPG may want to request that TWDB revise the municipal WUG data using the 0.5 migration scenario (currently uses 1.0) before sending to WUGs for review


Black & Veatch

Comparison of County Population Migration Scenarios (1.0 vs 0.5)

Comparison of Migration Scenarios (1.0 vs. 0.5)



Comparison of Migration Scenarios (1.0 vs. 0.5)



The 0.5 migration scenario results in higher populations

Black & Veatch

TWDB Draft Cameron County WUG Populations (Based on 1.0 Migration Scenario)

County	EntityName	2030 Pop	2040 Pop	2050 Pop	2060 Pop	2070 Pop	2080 Pop	Baseline GPCD	2030 Demar	2040 Demar	2050 Demar	2060 Demar	2070 Demar	2080 Demar
CAMERON	Harlingen	83,677	83,487	82,165	79,949	77,763	75,605	159	13,664	13,158	12,853	12,485	12,143	11,806
CAMERON	Laguna Madre Water District	10,832	10,805	10,630	10,335	10,044	9,755	378	4,397	4,309	4,222	4,101	3,986	3,871
CAMERON	North Alamo WSC	4,213	4,203	4,135	4,019	3,905	3,793	146	639	619	603	584	567	551
CAMERON	Valley MUD 2	3,005	2,998	2,949	2,867	2,786	2,705	286	922	905	887	862	837	813
CAMERON	Brownsville	187,068	186,633	183,643	178,634	173,686	168,799	154	29,761	28,768	28,106	27,289	26,533	25,787
CAMERON	Combes	2,968	2,961	2,912	2,831	2,751	2,671	85	242	227	220	213	207	201
CAMERON	County-Other, Cameron	11,727	11,700	11,516	11,200	10,892	10,586	147	1,753	1,687	1,645	1,598	1,554	1,510
CAMERON	East Rio Hondo WSC	23,778	23,737	23,391	22,821	22,263	21,719	125	3,008	2,888	2,818	2,746	2,679	2,613
CAMERON	La Feria	6,060	6,045	5,947	5,782	5,618	5,455	118	709	671	653	634	616	598
CAMERON	Los Fresnos	7,306	7,288	7,169	6,969	6,772	6,577	60	491	490	482	468	455	442
CAMERON	Military Highway WSC	27,623	27,555	27,107	26,353	25,606	24,867	136	3,848	3,716	3,622	3,517	3,417	3,319
CAMERON	Olimito WSC	7,152	7,151	7,075	6,959	6,850	6,752	166	1,229	1,194	1,173	1,152	1,134	1,118
CAMERON	Palm Valley	1,276	1,273	1,252	1,218	1,182	1,148	166	219	211	206	200	194	189
CAMERON	Primera	4,391	4,380	4,308	4,189	4,070	3,952	79	295	294	290	282	274	266
CAMERON	Rio Hondo	1,670	1,666	1,638	1,593	1,548	1,503	66	112	112	110	107	104	101
CAMERON	San Benito	25,354	25,295	24,890	24,211	23,541	22,878	116	2,941	2,796	2,726	2,646	2,573	2,500
CAMERON	Santa Rosa	2,876	2,869	2,822	2,744	2,665	2,588	79	193	193	190	184	179	174
CAMERON	El Jardin WSC	12,371	12,343	12,146	11,816	11,491	11,169	102	1,207	1,128	1,096	1,063	1,033	1,004
	Total	423,347	422,389	415,695	404,490	393,433	382,522		65,630	63,366	61,902	60,131	58,485	56,863

27

TWDB Draft Hidalgo County WUG Populations (Based on 1.0 Migration Scenario)

County	EntityName	2030 Pop	2040 Pop	2050 Pop	2060 Pop	2070 Pop	2080 Pop	Baseline GPCD	2030 Demar	2040 Demar	2050 Demar	2060 Demar	2070 Demar	2080 Demar
HIDALGO	McAllen	141,286	145,693	147,797	149,346	150,887	152,422	211	31,351	31,523	31,763	32,032	32,338	32,643
HIDALGO	North Alamo WSC	210,315	230,207	240,685	238,875	237,053	235,222	146	31,879	33,883	35,078	34,720	34,442	34,176
HIDALGO	Sharyland WSC	87,834	94,982	98,718	98,320	97,917	97,510	160	14,680	15,455	15,922	15,822	15,752	15,687
HIDALGO	Alamo	19,305	19,544	19,631	19,954	20,276	20,598	125	2,434	2,361	2,347	2,378	2,413	2,447
HIDALGO	County-Other, Hidalgo	6,882	5,444	4,635	5,222	5,809	6,392	109	738	557	467	523	579	633
HIDALGO	Donna	17,160	17,935	18,324	18,437	18,550	18,662	117	2,020	2,015	2,037	2,042	2,053	2,064
HIDALGO	Edcouch	2,520	2,292	2,161	2,283	2,405	2,526	81	195	165	154	162	170	177
HIDALGO	Edinburg	84,697	90,951	94,203	94,015	93,824	93,630	121	10,354	10,673	10,903	10,844	10,817	10,794
HIDALGO	Elsa	4,601	4,129	3,858	4,098	4,339	4,579	102	462	392	363	383	404	425
HIDALGO	Hidalgo	11,921	12,433	12,688	12,775	12,862	12,948	118	1,404	1,398	1,406	1,410	1,418	1,427
HIDALGO	Hidalgo County MUD 1	5,190	5,318	5,378	5,445	5,511	5,578	92	460	444	440	444	448	453
HIDALGO	La Joya	4,705	4,958	5,086	5,105	5,124	5,143	116	550	554	561	562	563	565
HIDALGO	La Villa	2,066	2,431	2,628	2,557	2,487	2,417	100	208	234	248	240	233	227
HIDALGO	Mercedes	14,389	14,428	14,417	14,701	14,984	15,267	102	1,442	1,367	1,349	1,370	1,394	1,417
HIDALGO	Military Highway WSC	15,712	15,226	14,923	15,396	15,869	16,341	136	2,189	2,053	1,994	2,055	2,118	2,181
HIDALGO	Mission	87,233	91,134	93,083	93,675	94,262	94,845	187	17,102	17,438	17,671	17,752	17,855	17,960
HIDALGO	Pharr	84,151	88,893	91,313	91,581	91,845	92,106	100	8,306	8,345	8,428	8,419	8,436	8,456
HIDALGO	San Juan	23,508	23,793	23,896	24,292	24,686	25,079	129	3,084	3,007	2,990	3,033	3,078	3,123
HIDALGO	Westaco	32,009	32,478	32,662	33,176	33,689	34,201	156	5,143	5,040	5,027	5,095	5,168	5,240
HIDALGO	Agua SUD	65,163	69,140	71,182	71,295	71,406	71,513	100	6,510	6,605	6,704	6,692	6,699	6,708
	Total	920,647	971,409	997,268	1,000,548	1,003,785	1,006,979		140,511	143,509	145,852	145,978	146,378	146,803

28

TWDB Draft Jim Hogg County and Maverick County WUG Populations (Based on 1.0 Migration Scenario)

County	EntityName	2030 Pop	2040 Pop	2050 Pop	2060 Pop	2070 Pop	2080 Pop	Baseline GPCD	2030 Demar	2040 Demar	2050 Demar	2060 Demar	2070 Demar	2080 Demar
JIM HOGG	County-Other, Jim Hogg	1,115	1,015	924	835	746	657	109	118	101	91	82	73	64
JIM HOGG	Jim Hogg County WCID 2	3,251	2,954	2,683	2,411	2,144	1,882	126	412	358	322	289	257	225
	Total	4,366	3,969	3,607	3,246	2,890	2,539		530	459	413	371	330	289

County	EntityName	2030 Pop	2040 Pop	2050 Pop	2060 Pop	2070 Pop	2080 Pop	Baseline GPCD	2030 Demar	2040 Demar	2050 Demar	2060 Demar	2070 Demar	2080 Demar
MAVERICK	Eagle Pass	57,401	60,171	61,889	62,787	63,616	64,397	150	8,877	8,995	9,169	9,274	9,386	9,491
MAVERICK	County-Other, Maverick	1,299	847	553	369	247	165	120	150	92	59	39	26	18
MAVERICK	Maverick County	2,351	3,113	3,585	3,497	3,408	3,319	128	313	400	453	439	427	416
	Total	61,051	64,131	66,027	66,653	67,271	67,881		9,340	9,487	9,681	9,752	9,839	9,925

Black & Veatch

29

TWDB Draft Starr County and Webb County WUG Populations (Based on 1.0 Migration Scenario)

County	EntityName	2030 Pop	2040 Pop	2050 Pop	2060 Pop	2070 Pop	2080 Pop	Baseline GPCD	2030 Demar	2040 Demar	2050 Demar	2060 Demar	2070 Demar	2080 Demar
STARR	County-Other, Starr	4,248	4,225	4,268	4,557	4,826	5,079	115	483	456	455	483	509	533
STARR	La Grulla	8,095	8,452	8,638	8,641	8,643	8,645	161	1,356	1,376	1,395	1,393	1,393	1,394
STARR	Rio Grande City	17,419	18,158	18,543	18,556	18,570	18,583	214	3,941	4,014	4,075	4,072	4,074	4,077
STARR	Rio WSC	7,893	9,137	9,815	9,537	9,262	8,990	93	730	806	850	820	796	772
STARR	Roma	20,756	21,438	21,787	21,865	21,942	22,018	108	2,236	2,200	2,211	2,212	2,219	2,226
STARR	Agua SUD	238	230	223	219	215	211	100	24	22	21	21	20	20
STARR	Union WSC	7,021	7,211	7,306	7,345	7,384	7,422	157	1,141	1,134	1,140	1,144	1,150	1,156
STARR	El Sazuz WSC	1,664	1,778	1,839	1,826	1,814	1,802	91	149	153	155	153	152	151
STARR	El Tanque WSC	1,349	1,149	979	848	734	636	134	184	152	128	111	96	83
	Total	68,683	71,778	73,398	73,394	73,390	73,386		10,244	10,313	10,430	10,409	10,409	10,412

County	EntityName	2030 Pop	2040 Pop	2050 Pop	2060 Pop	2070 Pop	2080 Pop	Baseline GPCD	2030 Demar	2040 Demar	2050 Demar	2060 Demar	2070 Demar	2080 Demar
WEBB	County-Other, Webb	2,411	2,404	2,326	2,196	2,064	1,937	105	238	221	209	196	184	173
WEBB	Laredo	256,168	255,503	247,304	233,580	220,039	206,675	126	32,626	31,256	29,951	28,237	26,600	24,984
WEBB	Webb County	9,117	9,095	8,818	8,366	7,922	7,482	107	979	932	896	848	803	759
WEBB	Mirando City WSC	257	256	248	234	220	206	101	25	24	23	22	20	19
	Total	267,953	267,258	258,696	244,376	230,245	216,300		33,868	32,433	31,079	29,303	27,607	25,935

Black & Veatch

30

TWDB Draft Willacy County and Zapata County WUG Populations (Based on 1.0 Migration Scenario)

County	EntityName	2030 Pop	2040 Pop	2050 Pop	2060 Pop	2070 Pop	2080 Pop	Baseline GPCD	2030 Demar	2040 Demar	2050 Demar	2060 Demar	2070 Demar	2080 Demar
WILLACY	North Alamo WSC	4,284	4,066	3,859	3,663	3,477	3,300	146	649	598	562	532	505	479
WILLACY	County-Other, Willacy	4,425	4,203	3,666	2,901	2,089	1,236	112	491	448	385	305	219	130
WILLACY	Lyford	1,889	1,711	1,550	1,404	1,272	1,152	88	160	136	121	110	99	90
WILLACY	Raymondville	6,630	6,127	5,662	5,232	4,835	4,468	106	695	610	558	514	475	439
WILLACY	Sebastian MUD	1,337	1,154	996	878	773	680	64	90	78	67	59	52	46
WILLACY	Port Mansfield PUD	340	384	440	525	608	689	350	128	141	161	191	220	249
	Total	18,905	17,645	16,173	14,603	13,054	11,525		2,213	2,011	1,854	1,711	1,570	1,433

County	EntityName	2030 Pop	2040 Pop	2050 Pop	2060 Pop	2070 Pop	2080 Pop	Baseline GPCD	2030 Demar	2040 Demar	2050 Demar	2060 Demar	2070 Demar	2080 Demar
ZAPATA	County-Other, Zapata	1,105	1,181	1,208	1,196	1,170	1,133	127	138	139	140	139	135	131
	Zapata County San Ygnacio and Ramireño	321	256	206	171	142	119	170	57	44	35	29	24	20
ZAPATA	Zapata County	9,598	9,185	8,697	8,164	7,637	7,116	166	1,658	1,541	1,451	1,360	1,272	1,186
ZAPATA	Falcon Rural WSC	358	273	209	165	131	105	169	63	46	35	28	22	18
ZAPATA	Siesta Shores WCID	1,475	1,412	1,337	1,254	1,173	1,092	123	184	170	160	150	140	130
ZAPATA	Zapata County WCID-Hwy 16 East	520	498	471	442	413	385	266	149	141	133	124	116	108
	Total	13,377	12,805	12,128	11,392	10,666	9,950		2,249	2,081	1,954	1,830	1,709	1,593

Black & Veatch