May 15, 2001

ERRATA SHEET
To Region I Water Plan

1. The adopted plan uses steam electric water demands for Anderson and Newton Counties that were not approved by the TWDB. A demand of 11,209 ac./ft. in Anderson, set to begin in 2010 and a demand of 11,200 ac.-ft./yr. in Newton to begin in 2001 came after the Texas Water Development Board approved population and demand numbers were adopted. These demands can be met from Lakes Palestine and Toledo Bend, respectively, without causing shortage in the region during the planning cycle.

2. The yield of Lake Palestine, located in Region I, but with water under contract in Region C and I, has been the subject of several studies which do not agree in their result. The operating entity for the lake, the Upper Neches Municipal Water Authority commissioned a study to determine the firm yield of Lake Palestine this study, completed in April 2000, reported a yield that matches their Certificate of Adjudication from the TNRCC. Region I asserts that there is sufficient water to meet all the contractual needs through the planning horizon. Correspondence from Region C indicates agreement with the Region I yield value to be shown in Table 4 of Appendix B as 238,110 acre-feet per year.

3. Section 3.4, page 3-4 discusses the Major Water Providers, however, the City of Center is not mentioned, although it is described on page 3-7. The City of Center should be listed with the other Major Water Providers on page 3-4.

4. Section 3.4, page 3-6 indicates the Sabine River Authority holds water rights of 147,000 ac.-ft., however, Table 6 indicates the amount is 147,100 ac.-ft. Page 3-6 should be consistent with and conform with Table 6.

5. Section 3.4, page 3-7 indicates the City of Nacogdoches has rights to divert 22,000 ac.-ft./yr from Lake Nacogdoches while Table 6 indicates the amount is 20,162 ac.-ft./yr. Table 6 should be revised to reflect 22,000 ac.-ft.

6. The Task 3 discussion did not mention which WAM run was used, including other assumptions such as consideration of sedimentation over the planning period in determining reservoir firm yields. Run 3 was recognized by the East Texas Regional Water Planning Group as being the run preferred by TNRCC. The Neches WAM was not used by Region I because the WAM was made available after the related tasks for Region I were complete.