

Austin Water Resource Planning Task Force

Presentation to City Council
September 23, 2014



Drivers/Constraints

- ◆ Ongoing drought demands that we adapt our behavior
- ◆ Drought-vulnerable single source means diversification is necessary in the long-term
 - ◆ Different types of sources carry different types of risk: political, hydrological, regulatory
 - ◆ Centralized new water will always be expensive: e.g. \$2,000 / AF Vista Ridge
- ◆ Cost can be controlled in two ways:
 - ◆ Ask growth to be part of the solution
 - ◆ Deepen commitment to conservation



Principles

- 💧 Affordability for essential uses should be protected
 - 💧 This is not the same as saying that all water services should be maintained at historical cost
 - 💧 Utility still must recover cost of service -> should reflect actual costs imposed by customer classes
- 💧 Local water and conservation first
 - 💧 Must contend with Austin Water revenue model which leads to 140 gpcd metric
 - 💧 Make most effective use of existing supply, find ways to create supply locally
- 💧 Path forward must be directed through true Integrated Water Resource Plan

Water shouldn't come from Austin Water alone

- 💧 Growth can be the solution
- 💧 Stormwater is a water resource
 - 💧 Watershed Protection's problem can be part of Austin Water's solution.
- 💧 Development can bring water
 - 💧 KB Homes' [Double Net Zero House](#)
 - 💧 New School's [University Center](#)
 - 💧 Do our codes & impact fees enable and encourage this?



Near- and Mid-Term Recommended Actions

- ◆ Demand Management (Conservation):
 - ◆ Drought Stage 3
 - ◆ Use tools like WaterSmart to deepen uptake of existing programs
 - ◆ Discourage in-ground irrigation systems in new builds
 - ◆ Build out water reuse system
 - ◆ Remove obstacles to greywater and coordinate with Watershed Protection to use stormwater as supply source
 - ◆ Cooperate with LCRA to explore basin wide water savings with senior water rights holders (i.e. Garwood Irrigation District)

Near- and Mid-Term Recommended Actions

- ◆ Supply Augmentation (Near-Term):
 - ◆ Automate Longhorn Dam gates
 - ◆ Adapt Decker Lake for municipal storage (existing capacity)
 - ◆ Varying Lake Austin operating level
 - ◆ Evaluate cost/yield of capturing Lady Bird Lake inflows
- ◆ Supply Augmentation (Mid-Term):
 - ◆ Enhance Decker Lake storage
 - ◆ Indirect potable reuse into Lady Bird Lake (contingent)

Long-term Centralized Options

- ◆ Integrated Water Resource Plan should consider long-term, capital-intensive options based on full cost (energy, capital, transmission) and risk profile:
 - ◆ Reclaimed Water Infiltration
 - ◆ Aquifer Storage and Recovery
 - ◆ Desalination
 - ◆ Permanent intake to capture Lady Bird Lake inflows
- ◆ “Once-through” groundwater projects not included in Task Force’s recommended options but same need for full-cost / risk analysis applies

Thank You

- ◆ Sharlene Leurig, Task Force Chair, leurig@ceres.org