

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMPILATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Submitted to the Committee on Natural Resources
For HB 16

Compiled on: Wednesday, April 2, 2025 12:50 PM

Note: Comments received by the committee reflect only the view of the individual(s) submitting the comment, who retain sole responsibility for the content of the comment. Neither the committee nor the Texas House of Representatives takes a position on the views expressed in any comment. The committee compiles the comments received for informational purposes only and does not exercise any editorial control over comments.

Hearing Date: April 2, 2025 8:00 AM

Deborah Efurd, Mrs

Self

Pittsburg, TX

I oppose passage of this bill.

Kim Terry
Self, accountant
Jefferson, TX

I am opposed to HB16 and ask that you vote against this bill. Language that allows funds to be used for RESERVOIR PROJECTS is not in the best interest of anyone in East Texas and there are other options that should be considered.

1. Cost-Effectiveness and Scalability:

Reservoirs: Projects like Marvin Nichols come with a \$7 billion price tag, plus ongoing costs for land acquisition, mitigation (e.g., an estimated 130,000 acres for Marvin Nichols), and maintenance. The TWDB estimates reservoirs take 20-30 years to plan and build, delaying returns on investment.

New Technology: Innovations like desalination, advanced water recycling, or atmospheric water generation can be cheaper per unit of water produced over time. For instance, brackish groundwater desalination plants in Texas cost \$50-\$100 million and deliver water within 2-5 years.

2. Environmental Impact:

Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols would flood over 66,000 acres, displacing heritage communities, destroying pristine forests, and disrupting ecosystems like the Sulphur River watershed. Permitting under the Clean Water Act (Section 404) requires costly mitigation that seizes up to 10 acre per one acre of reservoir for PRIVATE LAND.

New Technology: Tech solutions like direct potable reuse (recycling wastewater into drinking water) or desalination have minimal land footprints and avoid habitat destruction. Atmospheric water generators, which extract moisture from the air, produce no ecological disruption and work even in drought conditions.

Tech solutions like direct potable reuse (recycling wastewater into drinking water) or desalination have minimal land footprints and avoid habitat destruction. Atmospheric water generators, which extract moisture from the air, produce no ecological disruption and work even in drought conditions.

3. Faster Implementation:

Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols' timeline stretches to 2050, factoring in permitting, lawsuits, and construction. Texas lost 15 reservoirs to delays or cancellation since the 1980s due to similar hurdles, per TWDB records.

New Technology: Pilot projects can launch within years. San Antonio's H2O desalination plant went from concept to operation in under a decade, now supplying 12 million gallons daily. Rapid deployment addresses urgent needs in growing urban areas like Austin or Dallas without decades-long waits.

4. Public and Political Support

Marvin Nichols faces fierce opposition from Northeast Texas landowners, environmentalists, and Region D planners. Eminent domain battles and lawsuits will inflate costs and timelines. The Republican Party of Texas passed a Resolution in March 2025, OPPOSING eminent domain for reservoirs and federal mitigation under the Clean Water Act.

The bottom line is Texas should fund new technology because it delivers faster, cheaper, and more reliable solutions to the water crisis than outdated 20th-century megaprojects.

Lisa Crossland
Self, Retired Texas Parks and Wildlife
Daingerfield, TX

I am totally against this bill. I am located between the proposed Marvin Nichols Reservoir and Lake of the Pines.

Marie Camino
The Nature Conservancy in Texas
Austin, TX
April 2nd, 2025

House Committee on Natural Resources

8:00 AM, E2.036

RE: The Nature Conservancy in Texas' comments on HB 16

Chairman Harris and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on HB 16. TNC has worked to protect the lands and waters on which all life depends for over 60 years. In that time, we have conserved over 1 million acres of land and 200+ miles of rivers and streams in our great state.

The Nature Conservancy in Texas (TNC) supported the enabling HJR 7 in this committee and applauds the Chairman for his leadership in this historic proposed investment to Texas' water infrastructure. TNC supports the intent of HB 16 and its goals and would like to offer some considerations to ensure successful implementation.

Texas is growing rapidly, and with increased instances of drought, we are facing a water crisis. We strongly support expanding Texas' water resources and see HB 16 as an important step towards ensuring long-term water stability. We are especially supportive of efforts for money to be used for wastewater projects and the addition of non-potable reuse in the definition of water supply.

However, as Texas explores new technologies like desalination and produced water, TNC believes it is critical to have the right safeguards in place to ensure these solutions remain cost-effective, environmentally sound, and beneficial for all Texans. For example, it is important to carefully consider the integration of desalinated water with existing freshwater aquifers and surface water supplies. With appropriate guardrails, Texas can maximize the potential of these innovations.

Additionally, we want to maintain the efficacy of existing bottom-up processes for water and flood planning, which have identified many projects in need of funding. We urge the committee to consider adding provisions that require transparency when choosing which projects receive funding under this legislation to clarify the intent to continue funding these efforts.

TNC urges the committee to advance HB 16 for full consideration with the changes we've laid out.

Thank you,

Marie Camino

Government Relations Program Manager

The Nature Conservancy in Texas

Guadalupe Fernandez

Bayou City Waterkeeper

Houston, TX

Bayou City Waterkeeper supports HB 16, recognizing its crucial focus on Texas's water infrastructure needs. We're especially encouraged by the inclusion of water reuse projects for "New Water Supply for Texas Fund". We urge the addition of water loss mitigation, as these are effective "new" water sources. The enabling legislation's flexible funding approach allows TWDB to respond to the diverse and evolving water challenges across our state. We believe that the water access assessment will provide valuable data to inform future water infrastructure investments. The inclusion of wastewater projects and the integration of FIF & EDAP into the TWF offers the potential for efficient allocation of funding and resources. To maintain program integrity, we recommend establishing minimum funding thresholds and prioritizing multi-benefit projects.

You can review our detailed testimony at: <https://bayoucitywaterkeeper.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/BCWK-HB-16-89R-Natural-Resources.pdf>

Please contact Guadalupe Fernandez at guadalupe@bayoucitywaterkeeper.org or Usman Mahmood at usman@bayoucitywaterkeeper.org with any questions.

Staci Hinton

Self, 3P Ranch

Mount Pleasant, TX

I am in direct opposition to anything that would promote or make available lands for government land grabs or taking rights from landowners. Our land has been in our family since the 1800s. I oppose Marvin Nichols and any movement of government monies into any type of fund that would enable taking land away from the rightful owners of the land!

NO TO HB 16

NO TO MARVIN NICHOLS

Donna Menefee, Texan

Self/We The People

Mount Pleasant, TX

Texas must ditch reservoir projects that offer outdated water solutions at the unnecessary costs associated with big government land grabs. Funding new technology for water scarcity offers many advantages over traditional reservoirs. Texas should prioritize innovative water solutions over reservoirs. Because 1. Cost-Effectiveness & Scalability: Reservoirs: Projects like Marvin Nichols (MNR) come with a \$7billion price tag, plus ongoing costs for land acquisition, mitigation (e.g., an estimated 130,000 acres for MNR), & maint. TWDB estimates reservoirs take 20-30 years to plan & build, delaying returns on investment. New Technology: Innovations like desalination, advanced water recycling or atmospheric water generation can be cheaper per unit of water produced over time. For instance, brackish groundwater desalination plants in Texas cost \$50-\$100 million & deliver water within 2-5 years. 2. Environmental Impact: Reservoirs: MNR would flood over 66,000 acres, displacing heritage communities, destroying pristine forests, and disrupting ecosystems like the Sulphur River watershed. Permitting under the Clean Water Act (Section 404) requires costly mitigation that SEIZES up to 10 acre per one acre of reservoir for PRIVATE LAND. New Technology: Tech solutions like direct potable reuse (recycling wastewater into drinking water) or desalination have minimal land footprints and avoid habitat destruction. Atmospheric water generators, which extract moisture from the air, produce no ecological disruption & work even in drought conditions. 3. Faster Implementation: Reservoirs: MNR's timeline stretches to 2050, factoring in permitting, lawsuits, & construction. Texas lost 15 reservoirs to delays/cancellation since the 1980s due to similar hurdles, per TWDB records. New Technology: Pilot projects can launch within years. San Antonio's H2Oaks desalination plant went from concept to operation in under a decade, now supplying 12 million gallons daily. Rapid deployment addresses urgent needs in growing urban areas like Austin or Dallas without decades-long waits. 4. Climate Resilience: Reservoirs: Relying on surface water makes reservoirs vulnerable to prolonged droughts—Texas's 2011-2015 drought dropped Lake Travis to 34% capacity. New Technology: Solutions like desalination tap brackish aquifers (Texas has 2.7 billion acre-feet of untapped brackish groundwater, per TWDB) or recycle wastewater, both immune to rainfall variability. Atmospheric water generation thrives in humid Gulf Coast areas, producing water regardless of drought. 5. Public and Political Support Reservoirs: MNR faces fierce opposition from Northeast Texas landowners, environmentalists, & Region D planners. Eminent domain battles & lawsuits will inflate costs & timelines. THE REPUBLICAN PARTY OF TEXAS PASSED A RESOLUTION IN MARCH 2025, OPPOSING EMINENT DOMAIN FOR RESERVOIRS & FEDERAL MITIGATION UNDER THE CLEAN WATER ACT which puts this bill in opposition with the party.

Susan Conway

Self

Bogata, TX

The answer for water isn't digging another hole. We as private property owners are losing our homes, farms and ranches. Texans deserve a sustainable water solution that uses 21st technology! We as a nation can not lose anymore agriculture land. There is around 2% of farmers and Ranchers that are feeding the other 98% of this nation. At the rate we are going, this country will be dependent on foreign nations for our food supply! No more Reservoirs! Do better! Protect the land we have left it. Land doesn't reproduce itself. We need better solutions!

Kimberly Lloyd

Self

Cookville, TX

The land that you are looking to overtake has been in my family for over 100 years, your proposal will directly affect 5 of my families properties and will impact the livelihood by reducing their farm and hay production and reduce the grass area for their cattle

Please vote against any land grab and have the people in mind who worked their entire life to have this property

Frankie Orona
Society of Native Nations
San Antonio, TX

Dear Chairman Harris, Vice-Chair Martinez, and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony regarding House Bill 16 and the allocation of funds from the New Water Supply for Texas Fund.

While HB 16 aims to address Texas' urgent water needs, the bill does not currently provide sufficient protections for Indigenous, rural, and low-income communities that have been disproportionately impacted by desalination projects. Specifically, brackish groundwater desalination projects produce large volumes of highly saline brine, which may also contain hazardous treatment chemicals and heavy metals. The discharge and disposal of these byproducts pose serious risks to both public health and the environment.

Key Areas of Concern

Lack of Clarity on Brine Disposal Plans

The bill fails to address how desalination plants will manage and dispose of toxic brine. Without clearly defined protocols and environmental oversight, brine discharge could contaminate local water sources, including those relied on by Indigenous and rural communities.

Disproportionate Harm to Indigenous and Frontline Communities

Historically marginalized communities — including Tribal Nations and rural Texans — are often chosen as sites for polluting infrastructure. These communities frequently lack the political power and resources to resist harmful projects. HB 16 must include protections against environmental injustice and ensure meaningful consultation with affected populations.

Ecosystem Disruption and Loss of Traditional Lands

The discharge of concentrated brine into surface waters or land-based systems threatens aquatic ecosystems and biodiversity. Such degradation also impacts traditional ecological knowledge systems and Indigenous relationships with the land.

Chemical and Radiological Contamination

Desalination processes often involve pre-treatment and anti-fouling chemicals. Without strict regulations and monitoring, these chemicals enter drinking water supplies and/or groundwater. In some cases, trace amounts of naturally occurring radioactive materials can also be concentrated in the brine.

Absence of Long-Term Cumulative Impact Analysis

HB 16 lacks a framework for assessing the cumulative impacts of desalination projects over time. This omission risks underestimating the full environmental and social costs of repeated or large-scale brine disposal in the same areas. To align with principles of environmental justice and ensure the responsible use of public funds, we recommend the following additions to HB 16: Mandatory Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), Public disclosure of brine chemical composition, Prohibition of siting desalination discharge facilities near vulnerable communities, Clear mitigation requirements and accountability mechanisms, and State-supported research and monitoring on the long-term impacts of desalination brine on soil, groundwater, and biodiversity.

Perry Fowler

Texas Water Infrastructure Network (TXWIN)

Austin, TX

I would like to offer the following comments in support of HB 16 on behalf of the Texas Water Infrastructure Network (TXWIN) where I serve as executive Director.

TXWIN Supports the addition of additional types of programs eligible for the Texas Water Fund. Wastewater and water reuse are particularly important. The needs for wastewater funding are immense and reuse should be a more significant part of our water supply strategies.

The only other comment I would like to offer is that the overall infrastructure funding needs in Texas are across the board. According to our 2024 Texas Water Capital Needs Survey the most significant driver for infrastructure investment is aging infrastructure, followed by population growth and regulatory compliance.

The greatest areas of need were for water treatment, water main replacement and rehabilitation, new or alternative water supplies, and wastewater treatment. Link to full survey results <https://www.txwin.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/TWCNS-2024-Cumulative-Survey-Results.pdf>

I want to emphasize this point because it is absolutely critical that we take a balanced approach that maintains the discretionary authority for the Texas Water Development Board to allocate funds as necessary to address current needs which are enormous while planning for the future.

If funding is not sufficient or too heavily weighted or prescriptive it will severely harm our ability to make the types of investments we require to make a truly game changing investment and strategies for addressing our water infrastructure needs.

I would like to also share a link to our 2024 Survey summary document which I think you will find helpful and informative. I am happy to make myself available to any committee members who care to discuss this.

Vanessa Puig-Williams
Environmental Defense Fund
Austin, TX

EDF is pleased to support House Bill 16. As the state grapples with increased drought and population growth, we are grateful for Chair Harris' leadership to ensure a secure water future for Texas.

EDF's work in Texas is focused on ensuring that our water supplies, particularly groundwater, are proactively managed for the benefit of both people and nature. Groundwater underpins our water supply in Texas. Groundwater resources are declining across the state, however, and to ensure that groundwater remains a viable water source for rural Texas and the environment, Texas must look to an array of strategies to conserve groundwater – such as the development of new supplies, aquifer recharge projects, increased water conservation and reuse, infrastructure improvements, and investments in research and science to inform water planning. To do these things, Texas must make long-term, dedicated investments in water.

The development of alternative sources of water to offset the extraction of fresh groundwater is one strategy that may be necessary for both rural and urban communities in Texas to pursue. For this reason, EDF encourages the committee to add language from SB7 to protect fresh groundwater through a prohibition on applicants using the New Water Supply Fund to transport fresh groundwater. We also support the addition of the Flood Infrastructure Fund to the Texas Water Fund, as funding from this program can support natural infrastructure projects that not only mitigate flooding but also recharge aquifers and provide benefits to both people and nature, as well as the Agricultural Water Conservation program, as this program funds projects that result in groundwater conservation and doing so ensures that agriculture – Texas biggest water user – benefits from the public dollars that will be invested.

EDF recommends adding non potable water reuse to the New Water Supply Fund.

We encourage the committee to consider adding non-potable water reuse projects to the list of projects eligible for funding under the New Water Supply Fund, as these projects will help to offset communities' demand for freshwater and represent immediate, cost-effective, and reliable new water sources for Texas. The 2022 State Water Plan shows that Texas will see an almost 10-fold increase in the utilization of reuse from 2020 to 2070. 15% of our future water supply strategies will come from reuse, consequently, it makes sense to invest in this strategy now.

katrina sutton
tnt minerals
Linden, TX

I am against any water project that would flood any land in East Texas.

Eamon Davies
Self - Business owner
Austin, TX

I urge you to NOT move this bill forward while it still includes funding for desalination projects with no safeguards for brine and chemical discharge which are highly toxic and can damage ecosystems, contaminate water supplies and harm the health of humans accessing that water. Frontline, Indigenous and rural communities would be most affected by this pollution, not to mention the earth as a whole and it's waterways. Before any of these desalination projects should be funded, they need to do the upfront work of doing environmental impact studies, soliciting public input, and designing in protections for the communities and ecosystems most at risk. Thank you for taking this comment into account in your decision-making process.

Rachel Hanes
Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance
San Antonio, TX

The Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance strongly supports HB 16 and HJR 7. We appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments on behalf of our 62 member groups that are allied in advocacy for the protection and preservation of our ground and surface water resources in 21 counties within Central/South Texas.

Texas faces several overlapping water issues. The American Society of Civil Engineers' 2025 Texas Infrastructure Report Card gives the state a D+ on drinking water, a C- on stormwater, and a D- on wastewater. Our natural and manmade water infrastructure is increasingly strained, and we could be facing a severe water shortage in some parts of the state within the next five years. The Texas Water Development Board is already equipped with the tools to address many of the issues facing our state's utilities but has not been funded at levels sufficient to address these needs. Texas should and can do better, and the framework laid out in HB 16 represents great potential progress in addressing Texas' water needs. As such, we strongly support HB 16 and HJR 7.

We specifically support the dynamic, balanced, and flexible nature of HB 16/HJR 7. We support the inclusion of potable reuse, brackish desalination, and ASR projects under the New Water Supply for Texas Fund (NWSTF), the inclusion of water and wastewater infrastructure funding under the Texas Water Fund (TWF), and the inclusion of the Flood Infrastructure Fund under the TWF in HB 16, as filed.

We recommend adding water loss mitigation projects and nonpotable reuse projects to the list of projects on which the NWSTF can be spent, prioritizing aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) projects over surface reservoir projects when feasible, prioritizing flood mitigation projects that have a water supply benefit component, and de-prioritizing produced water projects. Potable and nonpotable water reuse, water loss mitigation, ASR, and water supply flood infrastructure projects are all water supply projects that can be deployed more quickly and more cost-effectively than long-term, intensive projects such as water transfer pipelines, produced water recycling, and potentially even brackish and especially seawater desalination.

Potable and nonpotable water reuse, water loss mitigation, ASR, and water supply flood infrastructure projects are strategies that should be made a priority now for Texans, even as other supply strategies that are meant to secure our supplies by 2050 and 2070 are planned and implemented.

The full version of our comments as submitted to the committee clerk and chair may be found here: <https://aquiferalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/GEAA-HB-16-Written-Testimony-4.2.25-1.pdf>.

Thank you,
Rachel Hanes, Policy Director
Annalisa Peace, Executive Director
Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance

Ken Kramer, Dr.
Self (Retired)
Chappell Hill, TX

These comments ON House Bill 16 As Filed are made on behalf of myself and reflect knowledge gained over a half century as a student, college and university teacher, advisory committee member, and professional and volunteer advocate on water resources and the environment in Texas.

In general, I support a large one-time appropriation of at least \$2.5 billion this session to the Texas Water Fund and the dedication of \$1 billion a year to that Fund for a period of at least 10 years.

However, how that money is spent is the key question. Legislators should put the highest priority on funding the repair and/or replacement of broken or failing water supply and wastewater treatment infrastructure. If you have a leaky bucket of water, you should not pour more water into it without first plugging the leaks. Otherwise, you waste money as well as water.

Another waste would be to put the bulk of money for new water supplies into importing water from out-of-state and building a state water “grid” (a massive pipeline system to move water into and around the state) that would be enormously costly in terms of both capital construction and operational maintenance and potentially infeasible. Such a system would strain an already strained electric grid through the vast amount of energy needed to pump water and operate the system and likely would have tremendous adverse impacts on fish and wildlife habitat and the industries based on those resources. The voters of Texas rejected just such a proposal in 1969.

Thus far the House versions of legislation on the Texas Water Fund this session are less likely to lead to such a questionable state water grid than their Senate counterparts, in part because they provide more flexibility to the Texas Water Development Board in determining the best uses of the Texas Water Fund and authorizes the use of the Fund for a wider variety of purposes. I urge the House to maintain those positive features in whatever legislation eventually emerges this session.

Please note that Texas has a robust regional and state water planning process which presents water management strategies and associated projects – including conservation – to meet most projected water needs for Texas over the next 50+ years WITHOUT water importation and a state water grid. (The one major “unmet” water demand is water to sustain current levels of irrigated agriculture in the High Plains, for which there is not an economically viable solution.) While I believe that some projects in some regional plans should be replaced with other solutions, the bottom line is that Texas does not lack solutions to meet most of its water challenges. What it needs is funding to implement those solutions, not to pursue grandiose new ones.

Andrew Wier

Self & Simsboro Aquifer Water Defense Fund [SAWDF]

Elgin, TX

TO: HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

FROM: ANDY WIER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SIMSBORO AQUIFER WATER DEFENSE FUND

SUBJECT: TESTIFYING FOR HB 16

DATE: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 2025

Good morning, Chairman Harris, and members of the Committee. My name is Andy Wier. I am a resident of Bastrop County, a landowner with a domestic well in the Simsboro formation of the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, and the Executive Director for the Simsboro Aquifer Water Defense Fund [SAWDF] a non-profit engaging landowners, businesses, and government to protect the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer and private property rights in groundwater. SAWDF supports HB 16, the enabling legislation for HJR 7, because HB 16 reduces the pressure to mine Texas' freshwater aquifers and improves accountability of water and wastewater systems that may receive public funding.

The Simsboro Aquifer Water Defense Fund [SAWDF] was organized to conserve the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer in central Texas and protect groundwater rights of farmers and ranchers impacted by large-scale groundwater transfers. Within a decade, large-scale groundwater projects will pump the central Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer at levels never seen in the history of this state. The top ten large-scale projects, either in operation or contracted to start within the decade will pump and transport more than 260,000 acre-feet, per year, to subsidize development along the I-35 corridor. These projects total 40% of all the groundwater produced annually in these rural Central Texas counties. (For a sense of scale, Lady Bird Lake holds 7,000 acre-feet. These projects will pump and transport 37-times the volume of Lady Bird Lake, every year, for a minimum of 30 years.)

By 2070 the Average Remaining Available Drawdown, a way of expressing the depressurization of the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, will be reduced to 50-65%, depending on the formation. That is the reality our children will face just 35 years from now—access to 50% of the groundwater we have today. What will our grandchildren have left to access?

We believe this committee has listened and understands our experience. “When you move groundwater, you move livelihoods!” We believe HB 16 protects freshwater aquifers and the livelihoods— the farms, ranches, rural communities, businesses, and schools— that depend on groundwater.

Thank you.

Alan Butler

Self

Bastrop, TX

Protect Rural water rights and ensure that finding is available for the future development of rural communities. Secure funding and so not allow their water rights to be sold off to other growing cities and regions.

Tracy Arbanas

Self

Naples, TX

1. Cost-Effectiveness & Scalability- Reservoirs: Projects like Marvin Nichols come with a \$7 billion price tag, plus ongoing costs for land acquisition, mitigation (an estimated 130,000 acres for Marvin Nichols), & maintenance. The TWDB estimates reservoirs take 20-30 years to plan & build, delaying returns on investment.

New Technology: Innovations like desalination, advanced water recycling, or atmospheric water generation can be cheaper per unit of water produced over time. For instance, brackish groundwater desalination plants in Texas cost \$50-\$100 million & deliver water within 2-5 years.

2. Environmental Impact-Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols would flood over 66,000 acres, displacing heritage communities, destroying pristine forests, & disrupting ecosystems like the Sulphur River watershed. Permitting under the Clean Water Act (Section 404) requires costly mitigation that seizes up to 10 acre per one acre of reservoir for PRIVATE Land.

New Technology: Tech solutions like direct potable reuse (recycling wastewater into drinking water) or desalination have minimal land footprints & avoid habitat destruction. Atmospheric water generators, which extract moisture from the air, produce no ecological disruption & work even in drought conditions.

3. Faster Implementation-Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols' timeline stretches to 2050, factoring in permitting, lawsuits, & construction. Texas lost 15 reservoirs to delays or cancellation since the 1980s due to similar hurdles, per TWDB records.

New Technology: Pilot projects can launch within years. San Antonio's H2Oaks desalination plant went from concept to operation in under a decade, now supplying 12 million gallons daily. Rapid deployment addresses urgent needs in growing urban areas like Austin or Dallas without decades-long waits.

4. Climate Resilience-Reservoirs: Relying on surface water makes reservoirs vulnerable to prolonged droughts—Texas's 2011-2015 drought dropped Lake Travis to 34% capacity.

New Technology: Solutions like desalination tap brackish aquifers (Texas has 2.7 billion acre-feet of untapped brackish groundwater, per TWDB) or recycle wastewater, both immune to rainfall variability. Atmospheric water generation thrives in humid Gulf Coast areas, producing water regardless of drought.

5. Public & Political Support- Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols faces fierce opposition from Northeast Texas landowners, environmentalists, & Region D planners. Eminent domain battles & lawsuits will inflate costs & timelines. The Republican Party of Texas passed a Resolution in March 2025, OPPOSING eminent domain for reservoirs & federal mitigation under the Clean Water Act.

New Technology: Tech investments draw little resistance. Recycling & desalination projects in cities like El Paso & Wichita Falls have gained public acceptance—Wichita Falls' emergency reuse system in 2014 was hailed as a drought lifeline. Funding innovation aligns with Texas's pro-liberty, pro-business, tech-forward image.

Jerilyn Arneson

Self - HR

Cookville, TX

I oppose the amendment to add language to allow funds to be used for RESERVOIR PROJECTS. This is NOT what we voting on. Texans did not vote to steal land. They voted to come up with modern solutions, not early 1900's solutions. As a native Texan with land being impacted that has been in my family over 100 years, watching the pure greed is atrocious. We no longer recognize our Texas Representatives. They have been sold out and tossed every single string of decency and lost everything that Texas has ever stood for. I am embarrassed of our once Great State. An outdated reservoir of 67,000 acres and mitigation land of 150,000 to 650,000????? Any single Texan voting for this is embarrassing. We will fight you EVERY STEP OF THE WAY. WE WILL NEVER GIVE UP OUR LAND!!! Do not make amendments that could put our hard earned land, community, wildlife, families in harms way.

Sherry Pullen

Self

Bogata, TX

I am against Marvin Nickles. Taking land from Texans so developers can make money reselling the land they took by force is wrong. I am the 10th generation to live on my land in RedRiver County. The thought that developers could take the land I love is heartbreaking. There are other water sources so Dallas people can water their yards. I will not leave the land my family has worked for 200 years. Please find your water somewhere without taking people's homes.

Chanda Mitchell

Business owner

Hallsville, TX

No one has added the new recycling plant and biomining - both located in Harrison County. The Mint Biomining located 2120 E. Loop 281 Harrison county uses 92.4 gallons of water per minute they discharge which contains their toxic waste. This is not even including the water the recycling and other chemical companies Eastman has allowed to open. We must not sell our water. We have new farmers and cattle all over our area. Among the life it brings all of us in multiple ways.

Linda Tabb

Self

Bogata, TX

I'm 72 yrs old, and the Marvin Nichols Reservoir has been a thorn in the side of East Texans since 1968. My parents and grandparents were against the land theft since I was 14 or 15 yrs old. So for over 50 years we here in East Texas have had this threat held over us, and stunted our growth. Do we upgrade our property, houses, barns, fences, or encourage our children and grandchildren to settle down here with this threat of DFW, or any Metroplex, thinking they have the right to take everything from us? DFW needs infrastructure repair, which would solve their water problem. No Bill should shore up their ability to build ANY Reservoir, as it is an outdated tool. DFW already has at least 20 lakes for use.

My position on water issues, reservoirs, eminent domain, and federal mitigation is as follows:

Texas must ditch reservoir projects that offer outdated water solutions at the unnecessary costs associated with big government land grabs.

Funding new technology for water scarcity offers many advantages over traditional reservoirs. Texas should prioritize innovative water solutions over reservoirs.

Here's why:

1. Cost-Effectiveness and Scalability:

Reservoirs: Projects like Marvin Nichols come with a \$7 billion price tag, plus ongoing costs for land acquisition, mitigation (e.g., an estimated 130,000 acres for Marvin Nichols), and maintenance. The TWDB estimates reservoirs take 20-30 years to plan and build, delaying returns on investment.

New Technology: Innovations like desalination, advanced water recycling, or atmospheric water generation can be cheaper per unit of water produced over time. For instance, brackish groundwater desalination plants in Texas cost \$50-\$100 million and deliver water within 2-5 years.

2. Environmental Impact:

Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols would flood over 66,000 acres, displacing heritage communities, destroying pristine forests, and disrupting ecosystems like the Sulphur River watershed. Permitting under the Clean Water Act

Angie Criss Turner
East Texas Landowner
Mt Pleasant, TX

My position on water issues, reservoirs, eminent domain, and federal mitigation is as follows:

Texas must ditch reservoir projects that offer outdated water solutions at the unnecessary costs associated with big government land grabs.

Funding new technology for water scarcity offers many advantages over traditional reservoirs. Texas should prioritize innovative water solutions over reservoirs.

Here's why:

1. Cost-Effectiveness and Scalability:

Reservoirs: Projects like Marvin Nichols come with a \$7 billion price tag, plus ongoing costs for land acquisition, mitigation (e.g., an estimated 130,000 acres for Marvin Nichols), and maintenance. The TWDB estimates reservoirs take 20-30 years to plan and build, delaying returns on investment.

New Technology: Innovations like desalination, advanced water recycling, or atmospheric water generation can be cheaper per unit of water produced over time. For instance, brackish groundwater desalination plants in Texas cost \$50-\$100 million and deliver water within 2-5 years.

2. Environmental Impact:

Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols would flood over 66,000 acres, displacing heritage communities, destroying pristine forests, and disrupting ecosystems like the Sulphur River watershed. Permitting under the Clean Water Act.

This will affect East Texans who have lived here for generations. The land is our heritage, legacy, and our home. Any, True Texan, would never destroy the very foundations that have made Texas the greatest state in the nation. Please stand with every Texan, and fight for the landowners.

Angie Criss Turner

Karen Thomas

Self

Bogata, TX

?? CALL TO ACTION RELATED TO MARVIN NICHOLS RESERVOIR

OPPOSE HB16 by Rep. Cody Harris, unless amended to remove funding for reservoir projects.

HB 16 by Rep. Cody Harris will amend Section 15.153 of the Texas Water Code, which governs the Texas Water Assistance Program administered by the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB). Specifically, Section 15.153, titled "Transfer of Projects," addresses the authority and process for transferring water projects funded under this chapter to other entities. This statute supports the TWDB's broader mission to fund and facilitate water infrastructure.

HB 16 will amend the language to now allow funds to be used for RESERVOIR PROJECTS. See the language highlighted below. For a project like the Marvin Nichols Reservoir, Section 15.153 could come into play if the TWDB provides initial funding and later transfers it to a regional water authority (e.g., the Tarrant Regional Water District) after construction.

My position on water issues, reservoirs, eminent domain, and federal mitigation is as follows:

Texas must ditch reservoir projects that offer outdated water solutions at the unnecessary costs associated with big government land grabs.

Funding new technology for water scarcity offers many advantages over traditional reservoirs. Texas should prioritize innovative water solutions over reservoirs.

Here's why:

1. Cost-Effectiveness and Scalability:

Reservoirs: Projects like Marvin Nichols come with a \$7 billion price tag, plus ongoing costs for land acquisition, mitigation (e.g., an estimated 130,000 acres for Marvin Nichols), and maintenance. The TWDB estimates reservoirs take 20-30 years to plan and build, delaying returns on investment.

New Technology: Innovations like desalination, advanced water recycling, or atmospheric water generation can be cheaper per unit of water produced over time. For instance, brackish groundwater desalination plants in Texas cost \$50-\$100 million and deliver water within 2-5 years.

2. Environmental Impact:

Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols would flood over 66,000 acres, displacing heritage communities, destroying pristine forests, and disrupting ecosystems like the Sulphur River watershed. Permitting under the Clean Water Act (Section 404) requires costly mitigation that seizes up to 10 acre per one acre of reservoir for PRIVATE LAND.

New Technology: Tech solutions like direct potable reuse (recycling wastewater into drinking water) or desalination have minimal land footprints and avoid habitat destruction. Atmospheric water generators, which extract moisture from the air, produce no ecological disruption and work even in drought conditions.

See more following.

Karen Thomas

Self retired

Bogata, TX

CONTINUATION

3. Faster Implementation:

Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols' timeline stretches to 2050, factoring in permitting, lawsuits, and construction. Texas lost 15 reservoirs to delays or cancellation since the 1980s due to similar hurdles, per TWDB records.

New Technology: Pilot projects can launch within years. San Antonio's H2Oaks desalination plant went from concept to operation in under a decade, now supplying 12 million gallons daily. Rapid deployment addresses urgent needs in growing urban areas like Austin or Dallas without decades-long waits.

4. Climate Resilience:

Reservoirs: Relying on surface water makes reservoirs vulnerable to prolonged droughts—Texas's 2011-2015 drought dropped Lake Travis to 34% capacity.

New Technology: Solutions like desalination tap brackish aquifers (Texas has 2.7 billion acre-feet of untapped brackish groundwater, per TWDB) or recycle wastewater, both immune to rainfall variability. Atmospheric water generation thrives in humid Gulf Coast areas, producing water regardless of drought.

5. Public and Political Support

Reservoirs: Marvin Nichols faces fierce opposition from Northeast Texas landowners, environmentalists, and Region D planners. Eminent domain battles and lawsuits will inflate costs and timelines. The Republican Party of Texas passed a Resolution in March 2025, OPPOSING eminent domain for reservoirs and federal mitigation under the Clean Water Act.

New Technology: Tech investments draw little resistance. Recycling and desalination projects in cities like El Paso and Wichita Falls have gained public acceptance—Wichita Falls' emergency reuse system in 2014 was hailed as a drought lifeline. Funding innovation aligns with Texas's pro-liberty, pro-business, tech-forward image, attracting bipartisan backing.

6. Diversification of Supply:

Reservoirs: Adding Marvin Nichols boosts surface water capacity but doesn't diversify sources. Texas already has over 7,000 dams, and 90% of supply comes from reservoirs and rivers—over-reliance on reservoirs is exposed during droughts.

New Technology: Funding tech diversifies the portfolio of water sources. Desalination unlocks brackish groundwater, reuse maximizes existing water, and innovations that stretch supplies without new infrastructure. A mix of sources hedges against regional shortages.

The bottom line is Texas should fund new technology because it delivers faster, cheaper, and more reliable solutions to the water crisis than outdated 20th-century megaprojects. Reservoirs like Marvin Nichols lock in billions and take decades for uncertain yields, while tech like desalination or reuse can start small, prove efficacy, and scale as needed. Investing in innovative solutions will yield more water per dollar than drowning farmland for a single dam.

Innovative solutions on water will build a better future for ALL Texans!