

# 2002-483-420 FINAL REPORT

RECEIVED

JUN 10 2002

GOVERNMENT

## NORTH EAST TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

FINAL ADOPTED

### Infrastructure Financing Report

June 2002  
(revised)

To: TWDB

camera ready  
original

Preparation of this report was funded by the Texas Water Development Board,  
Prepared by Bucher, Willis, & Ratliff Corporation, Hayter Engineering, Inc.,  
NRS Consulting Engineers, and Parsons.

# NORTH EAST TEXAS REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP

## Infrastructure Financing Report

*Prepared according to Texas Water Development Board Guidelines*

---

*Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation  
NRS Consulting Engineers*

*Hayter Engineering, Inc.  
Parsons*

---

### **I. Introduction**

The Infrastructure Financing Report (IFR) requirement was incorporated into the regional water planning process in response to Senate Bill 2 (77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature). For purposes of the IFR, each regional water planning group (RWPG) is required to determine proposed financing for all of the water management strategies that were proposed in the first round of planning. For each of these strategies, the RWPG must determine the funding needed to implement the strategy, and what types of funding are likely to be accessed.

According to TWDB guidelines, the primary objectives of the IFR are:

To determine the number of political subdivisions with identified needs for additional water supplies that will be unable to pay for their water infrastructure needs without some form of outside financial assistance;

To determine how much of the infrastructure costs in the regional water plans cannot be paid for solely using local utility revenue sources;

To determine the financing options proposed by political subdivisions to meet future water infrastructure needs (including the identification of any State funding sources considered); and,

To determine what role(s) the RWPGs propose for the State in financing the recommended water supply projects.

### **II. Methodology**

To begin the IFR, the North East Texas Regional Water Planning Group (NETRWPG) obtained an IFR survey form developed by the TWDB. In order to help insure statewide consistency, no deviations were allowed by TWDB from the standard survey questions. The NETRWPG then attempted to contact

all of the water user groups (WUG) with water management strategies involving capital costs identified in the first round of planning. WUGs with strategies involving only contract renewals were not contacted, since it is assumed that no capital improvements would be required. The survey form was mailed to the WUGs and at least two follow-up contacts were made, in writing, by telephone, or in person. The information obtained from the surveys was then entered into a TWDB-created Excel spreadsheet, included herein.

For county aggregate WUGs (i.e. manufacturing, agriculture, etc.), which showed shortages during the planning period and where no political subdivision is responsible for providing water supplies, the RWPG determined probable funding mechanisms for meeting the water management strategies. These determinations were compiled into discussion paragraphs included herein.

During the time that the surveys were being completed, the RWPG spent several meetings discussing policy recommendations regarding the State's role in financing water infrastructure projects. Input was given by the members of the planning group, as well as by the WUGs that were contacted for the survey portion of the IFR. The goal of these discussions was to answer the question: *"What is the proper role(s) for the State in financing water supply projects identified in the approved regional water plans?"* As required by TWDB rules, particular attention was given to proposed increases in the level of State participation in funding for regional water supply projects to meet needs beyond the reasonable financing capability of local governments, regional authorities, and other political subdivisions involved in building water infrastructure.

### **III. County Aggregates**

In the North East Texas Region, there are three WUGs with water needs and corresponding water management strategies where no political subdivision is responsible for providing water supply. Because there is no one entity that is responsible for water supply, these WUGs were not sent an IFR survey form. During determination of the water management strategies in the first round of planning, information was sought as to the cause of the water supply shortages. This information was utilized by the RWPG in determining what type(s) of funding might be sought to provide water supply. County aggregate shortages in the North East Texas Region are manufacturing in Camp County, manufacturing in Gregg County, and steam electric in Upshur County; probable financing for each is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Water shortages in Camp County manufacturing are related to anticipated new poultry processing facilities moving into the area with undetermined water supply. After review of the available water resources in the area, the RWPG

determined that the most likely water supply source would be groundwater from the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer. Therefore, the chosen water management strategy was groundwater. Due to the fact that manufacturing is a private entity and not eligible for State or Federal assistance, the RWPG has determined that financing for this water management strategy will likely come from private sources.

Water shortages in Gregg County manufacturing are caused by expected industrial growth near the City of Longview. Currently, manufacturing in Gregg County relies on four primary supply sources: the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer, direct reuse, local supply sources, and the City of Longview water system. The chosen water management strategy to meet new manufacturing needs in Gregg County is purchasing surface water from the City of Longview's water system. Due to the fact that manufacturing is a private entity and not eligible for State or Federal assistance, the RWPG has determined that financing for this water management strategy will likely be provided through private sources.

Water shortages in the steam electric WUG in Upshur County are anticipated due to a proposed steam electric generating facility near the City of Gilmer. The recommended water management strategy for this WUG is to purchase raw water from the City of Gilmer. The needed supply will be available once Lake Gilmer is completed and on-line. The RWPG has determined that since steam electric generation facilities are normally owned by private companies that are not eligible for State or Federal assistance, financing for this water management strategy will likely come from private funding.

#### **IV. IFR Spreadsheet**

The North East Texas RWPG identified 129 entities with water shortages during the first round of planning. Of these, 79 entities had contractual shortages, meaning that a simple renewal of their existing water supply contract or renewal with an increase in supply would solve the WUGs' water needs. Since there is no capital funding required to meet this type of water need, these entities were not included in the IFR. Of the remaining 50 entities with identified shortages, three were county aggregate WUGs, and are discussed in Section III of this report. Therefore, 47 WUGs were involved in the IFR survey process.

The RPWG consultants contacted the 47 entities with water management strategies requiring capital costs by mailing out the TWDB survey form. This form contained the WUG's name, water management strategy and associated capital cost for that strategy. It posed a series of questions regarding anticipated funding sources that the WUG might access to implement the water management strategy. After the surveys were sent, consultants made at

least two follow-up contacts as necessary to each WUG. Some contacts were made by mail, others by facsimile, telephone, or in person. Actual completed survey forms have been included as Appendix 2.

Once attempts had been made to contact all 47 WUGs, the survey results were compiled into an Excel spreadsheet, which was provided by TWDB. This spreadsheet has been included as Appendix 1.

Survey findings are as follows:

- Thirty-nine of the forty-seven WUGs were successfully contacted regarding the IFR survey.
- Twenty-nine of the WUGs who responded to the survey had either secured financing for water management strategies, or anticipate financing the costs of water management strategies through local financial institutions, the sale of bonds, or rate increases, for a total amount of \$16,059,333. Of these 29 groups, 19 have either completed or are in the process of completing water management strategies to meet water needs.
- Anticipated unmet needs for the remaining 10 water user groups total \$5,074,125. In some cases, WUGs intend to utilize funding such as the TWDB Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, Office of Rural and Community Affairs programs, USDA-Rural Development funds, etc. In cases where groups are not eligible for these programs, funding is unknown.
- The general consensus among those systems that do not intend to utilize State funding is that the State should provide assistance through grants or interest-free loans for smaller projects. Several small systems are in need of anywhere from \$40,000 to \$300,000. The fiscal and legal cost of issuing bonds, or the administrative requirements to administer State programs, makes it cost prohibitive to utilize many of the State assistance programs currently available. Therefore, systems are forced to seek financing from private sources and pay higher interest rates than systems that utilize State funding.

In addition to regional water supply needs and associated water management strategies, the NETRWPG also considered out of region needs having water management strategies within the region. These strategies include construction of Prairie Creek Reservoir and Marvin Nichols Reservoir. Since these strategies were not identified to meet regional needs, they are not included in the IFR spreadsheet.

The Sabine River Authority (SRA) was contacted to determine how it intends to finance the construction of Prairie Creek Reservoir. SRA concluded that approximately one-half of the capital cost involved in this strategy could be funded in-house. SRA is uncertain about the source of the remaining one-half of funding. The entity would consider funding from the State Participation Plan, provided that the payback schedule is extended to last the life of the reservoir.

The Sulphur River Basin Authority (SRBA) was contacted to determine how it plans to finance the construction of Marvin Nichols Reservoir, should that strategy be chosen by Region C. The SRBA noted that should Marvin Nichols be built, capital costs would be financed by contract revenue bonds based on the sale of a portion of the water in the reservoir to Region C.

## V. Policy Recommendations

The Policy Recommendation Section of the Infrastructure Finance Report has the framework suggested by the following TWDB guidance.

For the second element of the IFR, Senate Bill 2 (77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature, Regular Session) requires the RWPGs to develop a policy statement(s) that answers the following question:

What is the proper role(s) for the State in financing water supply projects identified in the approved regional water plans? (Paraphrased from TWC §16.053(q)(2) added in Senate Bill 2, 77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature, Regular Session)

For completing this element, Senate Bill 2 (77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature, Regular Session) requires that RWPGs give particular attention to proposed increases in the level of **State Participation** ... in funding for regional water supply projects to meet needs beyond the reasonable financing capability of local governments, regional authorities, and other political subdivisions involved in building water infrastructure.

RWPGs are encouraged to answer this policy question as comprehensively as possible and with as much input as the RWPG believes is appropriate. While statute requires focus on State Participation needs, RWPGs are free to broaden their responses as well.

This section of the IFR considers first the general policy questions involved in State funding, then looks at the leading priority of the Legislature regarding the State Participation Program and lastly summarizes proposed recommendations on issues of particular concern to members of the North East Texas Regional Water Planning Group.

## 1. General Policy Considerations

- A. What is the proper role and goal of State assistance? What is the proper balance between local and state funding? How should assistance be targeted?

These are some of the basic policy questions that the Legislature is trying to answer. In the past, the State role has been limited to providing assistance to mostly smaller municipalities and water systems through a variety of funding programs, many of which use federal subsidies. As noted below, the most common forms of State financing have been through a subsidized loan program (State Participation Program) and unsubsidized state loans (Texas Water Development Fund II). These programs enable water providers to use the borrowing power of the State to assist them with infrastructure construction. In addition, federal and State funds are combined in the State Revolving Fund for both water and wastewater treatment facilities. There are also federally subsidized programs to help Economically Distressed Areas, Colonias and water systems that need new facilities to meet requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act, but these are available only to designated counties, communities or providers that meet special conditions.

Some legislators have proposed a much bigger role for the State, particularly in helping small rural utilities. The impacts of drought on water suppliers across the state seem to indicate that the problem is basically a small systems problem. Hence, there have been proposals put forth in the 1997, 1999 and 2001 legislative sessions to enhance state assistance to small systems through greatly expanded state "subsidized" loan and grant programs. Some of the major water providers have also wanted an expanded state participation program for large-scale projects.

- B. From what source should it be generated? What is the adequate level of state assistance for the range of Texas communities? What criteria should be used to prioritize projects receiving state assistance?

One of the major problems limiting a significant expansion of State financing of long-term water construction projects has been concern about creating a heavy burden for future taxpayers. Under the State Participation Program, TWDB acquires a temporary interest in a project by selling state bonds. Since payments by the local sponsor are deferred, TWDB must service the debt on its share of the project from other sources. TWDB has had a little

funding to use for this, but a major expansion of the program would cause a draw on State general revenues, or another dedicated funding source. The legislature has not been willing to ramp the program up because of fear that they are potentially creating a monster for future legislatures. If the projected growth that would enable the local borrowers to repay their debt does not materialize, the State is left holding the bag and must continue to commit revenue or risk default on bonds.

In the last legislative session, Representative David Counts proposed a constitutional amendment to provide TWDB authorization for an additional \$2 billion in general obligation bonds. The TWDB currently has \$568 million in general obligation bonds that have been authorized by the voters but not yet issued. At the current rate of TWDB bond issuance, the agency would likely deplete this authorization in three to four years. The additional \$2 billion in new authorization will help ensure sufficient funding to meet the water-related infrastructure funding needs of the state for at least another 10 years.

In addition to increases in appropriation of State general revenue funds, several proposals have been made in recent years for a funding mechanism that would be dedicated to water construction needs. These have included:

- a surcharge on all retail water bills statewide,
- extension of the state's sales tax to water sales,
- water user fees and
- impact fees linked to land development parcels.

The Legislature has not yet approved a new or dedicated funding source and is hoping through the IFR to determine the full scope of funding requirements that might require an innovative source.

## **2. State Participation Program for Regional Water Supply Projects.**

According to TWDB guidance, the Legislature's primary concern for the IFR is to gauge the level of State financial assistance that may be necessary for water management strategies that exceed the capacity of any one provider to meet. Presumably, such projects would involve 1) supplying multiple providers through a regional system and/or 2) supplying projected future growth of a single provider that cannot at present afford to pay the full cost of system expansion to meet that level of growth.

The current State Participation program has been designed to deal with such situations in a carefully limited way. Here is TWDB's description of the current program:

The State Participation Program enables TWDB to purchase a temporary ownership interest in a regional project when local sponsors are unable to assume the debt for an optimally sized facility. TWDB may acquire ownership interests in the water rights or a co-ownership interest in the property or treatment works. Currently, TWDB's participation is limited to a maximum of 50% of the project costs and to the portion of the project designated as "excess" capacity. There is also a requirement that the project cannot be reasonably financed without state participation assistance, and that the optimum regional development of the project cannot be reasonably financed without the state participation.

The loan repayments that would have been required, if the assistance had been from a loan, are deferred. Ultimately, however, the cost of the funding is repaid to the Board based upon purchase payments which allow the Board to recover its principal and interest costs and issuance expenses, etc., but on a deferred timetable.

The intent of this program is to allow for optimization of regional projects through limited State participation where the benefits can be documented, and such development is unaffordable without State participation. The goal is to allow for the "Right Sizing" of projects in consideration of future growth.

Members of the North East Texas Regional Water Planning Group have made a number of suggestions concerning the specific implementation of this and other state programs. They have determined that the State funding role should be modified to deal with several problems.

### **3. NETRWPG Proposed Policy Recommendations.**

Potential recommendations for the State role in financing water infrastructure address the following issues.

1. Term of State Participation. The State's lending program ought to offer repayment periods that last the full life of a new reservoir, usually 75 years, instead of the current limit of 34 years. The effect of the shorter period might be to require a smaller number of customers to pay the full cost of the project even though its benefits would go primarily to the expanded customer base in the later years of the project's life. There are also dangers, however, in extending the period to 75 years, as this might allow the deferred

interest to overwhelm local finances and make repayment impossible.

2. Subsidies and Level of Funding. The State should offer more loans with subsidized interest rates to the smaller water providers. Grants should also be expanded to enable these systems to meet future growth.

3. Eligibility. The present State programs mostly favor municipalities and impose higher interest costs on the private rural water supply corporations. Since many of the greatest needs exist among these small rural systems, municipalities, other subdivisions of the State and the non-tax exempt organizations should be treated equally.

4. Alternative Funding. A graduated impact fee could be imposed on new development to provide a source of funding for construction required by growth, rather than continued reliance on general rate increases on all water users. The ability to repay loans would thus increase as the need for water grew. A one-time connection fee would reflect the impact of the growing population of the new development.

5. Incentives for Regional Systems. The State could use grants or deferred and/ or subsidized interest payments to create incentives for small systems to cooperate in regional projects that would be more economical to build. A regional system could also produce sufficient revenue to pay for upgrading technical and management systems for the small providers. In order to prepare for regional cooperation, however, the small systems need access to planning funds, which are now restricted to the large-scale regional planning groups.

**APPENDIX 1**  
**IFR SPREADSHEET**

WUG NAME	WUG ID	WUG RWPG	SEQ ID	CITY ID	WUG COUNTY ID	WUG BASIN ID	WMS NAME	WMS TYPE	SO ID	SO NAME
ATLANTA	040042000	D	0042	0029	034	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL - CITY OF TEXARKANA	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
ATLANTA	040042000	D	0042	0029	034	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL - CITY OF TEXARKANA	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
BLOSSOM	040092000	D	0092	0680	139	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	02290	PAT MAYSE LAKE/RESERVOIR
CADDO MILLS	040135000	D	0135	0685	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
CANTON	040143000	D	0143	0094	234	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
CLARKSVILLE CITY	040172000	D	0172	0844	092	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05090	GLADEWATER LAKE/RESERVOIR
COMMERCE	040195000	D	0195	0129	116	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
COMO	040196000	D	0196	0847	112	03	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	11210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
DEPORT	040242000	D	0242	0857	139	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	02290	PAT MAYSE LAKE/RESERVOIR
DETROIT	040243000	D	0243	0858	194	03	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	482989	LAMAR COUNTY WSD
EAST MOUNTAIN	040262000	D	0262	0860	230	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23010	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
EAST TAWAKONI	040263000	D	0263	0861	190	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
EDGEWOOD	040268000	D	0268	0181	234	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
EMORY	040282000	D	0282	0191	190	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
GLADEWATER	040342000	D	0342	0237	092	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	05090	GLADEWATER LAKE/RESERVOIR
GRAND SALINE	040354000	D	0354	0246	234	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
GREENVILLE	040361000	D	0361	0250	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
HALLSVILLE	040374000	D	0374	0260	102	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05110	CHEROKEE LAKE/RESERVOIR
HOOKS	040416000	D	0416	0284	019	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
LAKEPORT	040502000	D	0502	0893	092	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05110	CHEROKEE LAKE/RESERVOIR
LINDEN	040524000	D	0524	0358	034	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	04070	O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR
LONE OAK	040537000	D	0537	0901	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
MAUD	040572000	D	0572	0393	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
MINEOLA	040599000	D	0599	0406	250	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	25010	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
MOUNT VERNON	040614000	D	0614	0417	080	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	04010	CYPRESS SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
NASH	040622000	D	0622	0423	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
POINT	040706000	D	0706	0939	190	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
QUEEN CITY	040728000	D	0728	0489	034	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
QUINLAN	040729000	D	0729	0736	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
REDWATER	040740000	D	0740	0945	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
RENO	040743000	D	0743	0738	139	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	02290	PAT MAYSE LAKE/RESERVOIR
ROXTON	040778000	D	0778	0951	139	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	02290	PAT MAYSE LAKE/RESERVOIR
VAN	040924000	D	0924	0618	234	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
VAN	040924000	D	0924	0618	234	06	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
WAKE VILLAGE	040937000	D	0937	0628	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
WASKOM	040941000	D	0941	0631	102	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	10210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
WEST TAWAKONI	040956000	D	0956	0989	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
WHITE OAK	040963000	D	0963	0649	092	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05080	BIG SANDY LAKE/RESERVOIR
WILLS POINT	040974000	D	0974	0656	234	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
WILLS POINT	040974000	D	0974	0656	234	08	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
WINNSBORO	040981000	D	0981	0661	250	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	04010	CYPRESS SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
WINNSBORO	040981000	D	0981	0661	250	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	04010	CYPRESS SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
WOLFE CITY	040983000	D	0983	0663	116	03	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	11629	WOODBINE AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996034	D	0996	0757	034	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996034	D	0996	0757	034	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	03410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996080	D	0996	0757	080	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	04010	CYPRESS SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996080	D	0996	0757	080	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	806825	CYPRESS SPRINGS WSC
COUNTY-OTHER	040996092	D	0996	0757	092	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	512010	CITY OF LONGVIEW
COUNTY-OTHER	040996092	D	0996	0757	092	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	465800	CITY OF KILGORE
COUNTY-OTHER	040996092	D	0996	0757	092	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	512010	CITY OF LONGVIEW
COUNTY-OTHER	040996092	D	0996	0757	092	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	09210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER

WUG_NAME	WUG ID	WUG RWPG	SEQ ID	CITY ID	WUG COUNTY ID	WUG BASIN ID	WMS NAME	WMS TYPE	SO ID	SO NAME
COUNTY-OTHER	040996092	D	0996	0757	092	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	09210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	10210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	10210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	04070	O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	10210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	10210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	512010	CITY OF LONGVIEW
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	10210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	10210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	138350	CASH WSC
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	11210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	11210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	138350	CASH WSC
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	342340	CITY OF GREENVILLE
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	750700	ROYSE CITY
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	177000	CITY OF COMMERCE
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	177000	CITY OF COMMERCE
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	95	SABINE RIVER AUTHORITY
COUNTY-OTHER	040996139	D	0996	0757	139	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	651250	CITY OF PARIS
COUNTY-OTHER	040996139	D	0996	0757	139	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	651250	CITY OF PARIS
COUNTY-OTHER	040996139	D	0996	0757	139	03	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	482989	LAMAR COUNTY WSD
COUNTY-OTHER	040996158	D	0996	0757	158	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	15810	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996158	D	0996	0757	158	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	15810	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996158	D	0996	0757	158	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	04070	O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996190	D	0996	0757	190	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	95	SABINE RIVER AUTHORITY
COUNTY-OTHER	040996190	D	0996	0757	190	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	19010	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996194	D	0996	0757	194	02	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996212	D	0996	0757	212	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	21210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996212	D	0996	0757	212	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	21210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996212	D	0996	0757	212	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	21210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996225	D	0996	0757	225	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	651250	CITY OF MOUNT PLEASANT
COUNTY-OTHER	040996225	D	0996	0757	225	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	582250	CITY OF MOUNT PLEASANT
COUNTY-OTHER	040996230	D	0996	0757	230	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23010	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996230	D	0996	0757	230	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23010	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996230	D	0996	0757	230	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	04070	O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996230	D	0996	0757	230	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23010	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	06	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CITY OF TYLER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	06	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	06	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	23410	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996250	D	0996	0757	250	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	25010	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996250	D	0996	0757	250	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	25010	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
MANUFACTURING	041001032	D	1001	1001	032	04	NO STRATEGY LISTED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
MANUFACTURING	041001092	D	1001	1001	092	05	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	050A0	LONGVIEW SYSTEM
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	041002116	D	1002	1002	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	041002230	D	1002	1002	230	04	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	04170	GILMER LAKE/RESERVOIR
DEKALB	040232000	D	0232	0155	019	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
DEKALB	040232000	D	0232	0155	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR

WUG NAME	WUG ID	WUG RWPG	SEQ ID	CITY ID	WUG COUNTY ID	WUG BASIN ID	WMS NAME	WMS TYPE	SO ID	SO NAME
LIBERTY CITY	040522000	D	0522	0715	092	05	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
LONGVIEW	040539000	D	0539	0367	092	05	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
NEW BOSTON	040628000	D	0628	0429	019	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
NEW BOSTON	040628000	D	0628	0429	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
WINNSBORO	040981000	D	0981	0661	080	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	04010	CYPRESS SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
WINNSBORO	040981000	D	0981	0661	080	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	04010	CYPRESS SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996019	D	0996	0757	019	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996019	D	0996	0757	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996019	D	0996	0757	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996019	D	0996	0757	019	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996034	D	0996	0757	034	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	04070	O' THE PINES LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996060	D	0996	0757	060	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	06028	TRINITY AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996060	D	0996	0757	060	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03000	BIG CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996060	D	0996	0757	060	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03000	BIG CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996060	D	0996	0757	060	03	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	03000	BIG CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996060	D	0996	0757	060	03	SUPPLIES/SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION	4C	03000	BIG CREEK LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996080	D	0996	0757	080	03	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
COUNTY-OTHER	040996092	D	0996	0757	092	04	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
COUNTY-OTHER	040996092	D	0996	0757	092	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05090	GLADEWATER LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	3404010	CYPRESS RIVER COMBINED RUN-OF-RIVER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	3404010	CYPRESS RIVER COMBINED RUN-OF-RIVER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	04	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	3404010	CYPRESS RIVER COMBINED RUN-OF-RIVER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996102	D	0996	0757	102	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	10210	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996112	D	0996	0757	112	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03040	SULPHUR SPRINGS LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	03	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	080C0	LAVON LAKE/RESERVOIR NORTH TEXAS MWD
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996116	D	0996	0757	116	08	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
COUNTY-OTHER	040996139	D	0996	0757	139	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	02290	PAT MAYSE LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996190	D	0996	0757	190	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996194	D	0996	0757	194	02	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	02290	PAT MAYSE LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996194	D	0996	0757	194	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996194	D	0996	0757	194	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996194	D	0996	0757	194	03	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	03080	WRIGHT PATMAN LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996225	D	0996	0757	225	03	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	05	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	05010	TAWAKONI LAKE/RESERVOIR
COUNTY-OTHER	040996234	D	0996	0757	234	08	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
COUNTY-OTHER	040996250	D	0996	0757	250	04	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
MANUFACTURING	041001102	D	1001	1001	102	05	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
MANUFACTURING	041001112	D	1001	1001	112	05	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	041002250	D	1002	1002	250	05	NO MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IDENTIFIED		99999	STRATEGY NOT IDENTIFIED

CAP COST	Strategy Implementation Date	How much can P.S. afford from current utility revenue sources?	If Accessing State Participation Program, how much can P.S. afford from current utility revenue sources?	How much is P.S. unable to pay for WMS?	Notes
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$262,193.00	2030	\$0	0	\$262,193	
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$155,922.00	2010	\$0.00	0	0	No response.
\$0.00					
\$665,936.00	2000	\$665,936.00	0	0	Funding has been obtained from USDA-Rural Development
\$403,204.00	2030	\$403,204.00	0	0	Received TDHCA grant. Drilled well in 2002
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$773,815.00	2030	\$400,000.00	0	\$373,815	State should provide assistance through grants or interest-free loans
\$439,509.00	2010				No response.
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$1,424,805.00	2030	\$1,424,805.00	0	0	Sold bonds in 2001
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$224,805.00	2030	\$224,805.00	0	0	Already drilled additional well
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$134,330.40	2020	\$134,330.40	0	0	Well in progress, paid for with local financing
\$313,437.60	2020	\$313,437.60	0	0	Well in progress, paid for with local financing
\$0.00					
\$224,805.00	2030	\$224,805.00	0	0	Received TDHCA grant.
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$828,714.00	2010	\$312,000.00	\$401,000	\$427,714	Based on 5% interest and 20 year payback
\$0.00					
\$221,994.00	2050	\$221,994.00	0	0	Bloomberg WSC.
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$0.00					
\$1,337,993.00	2030	\$1,337,993.00	0	0	West Gregg WSC. Completed 2 wells in 2001





**APPENDIX 2**  
**CONTACT LIST**

Phone Log for IFR Survey									
Political Subdivision (Pol/Sub)	Contact Person	Phone Number	Date Called	Time Called	Date Called	Time Called	Date Called	Time Called	Date Called
Cass County									
Linden	James Rice, <i>Esquire</i>	903-773-9967	1/31	1:56pm	2/16	11:45am			
Bloomburg WSC	Don Westmorland	903-728-5302	1/31	9:32am					
Grege County									
Gladewater	Sharon Johnson	903-845-2196	1/28						
Liberty City	Max Conlin	903-984-9593	1/28						
West Gregg WSC	Mina Nichols	903-983-1816	2/1						
Harrison County									
Waskom	Brian Breeding	903-687-3374	1/31	11:43am	1/31	1:30pm			
Blocker-Crossroads WSC	<i>Steve McGehee, Esquire</i>	903-927-2705							
Caddo Lake WSC	Red Hines	903-781-3286	1/31	1:48pm	2/1	9:43am			
Elysian Fields WSC	Douglas Golden	903-633-2421	1/31	1:50pm					
Harleton WSC	Pat McGill	903-777-3740	1/28						
Noda Hamson WSC	Tom Ford	903-938-6915	1/28						
Waskom Rural WSC No. 1	Brian Breeding	903-687-3374	1/31	11:43am	1/31	1:30pm			
West Hamson WSC	Stan Jackson	903-668-2450	2/8 FAX	10:41am					
Marion County									
Kellyville-Ebola WSC	Bob Lambert	903-665-6590	2/1						
Pine Harbor Water System	John McClellan	214-363-0111	1/31	2:44pm					
Shady Shores Water System	Eugene Case	903-968-4561	1/31						
Upshur County									
East Mountain	Edith Beisch	903-297-0620	1/8						
Dianna WSC	Susan Whitfield	903-662-1837	2/8						
Hammy WSC	Jimmy Whitfield	903-225-5192	2/8						
Patchett WSC	Gerald Brewer	903-234-5438	2/8		2/8				
Union Grove WSC	Dick	903-845-2834	2/8						
Wood County									
Mincoola	Ronnie Bradley	903-569-6182	1/31	3:39pm	2/1	10:10am			
Forks WSC	Ronnie Robertson	903-967-3304	2/5	7:59am					
Lake Fork WSC	<i>Debbie Keller</i>	903-383-7643	1/16	10:37am					

### IFR Survey Contact List

Hayter Engineering, Inc.

WUG NAME	CONTACT NAME	PHONE NUMBER	INTERVIEWER	FIRST CONTACT	SECOND CONTACT	THIRD CONTACT	COMMENTS
Ben Franklin WSC	Jack Cheyney	903-325-4426	RRH	Date: 1/24/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/5/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/6/02 Type: Resent Survey	No response to contacts
City of Pecan Gap	Warner Cheyney	903-359-6362	ACL	Date: 1/22/02 Type: Face to face	Date: NA Type:	Date: NA Type:	
City of Como	James Beach	903-488-3434	ACL	Date: 1/22/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/22/02 Type: Resent Survey	Date: NA Type:	No response to contacts
Pickton WSC	Gary Johnson	903-488-3835	RRH	Date: 1/24/02 Type: Telephone	Date: NA Type:	Date: NA Type:	
Shirley WSC	James Birchfield	903-485-5811	ACL	Date: 1/22/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Resent Survey	
City of Wolfe City	Bob Huckabee	903-496-2800	RRH	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Telephone	Date: NA Type:	Date: NA Type:	
Tri County WSC	Gary Douglas	903-849-2050	ACL	Date: 1/22/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Resent Survey	No response to contacts
Petty WSC	John James	903-378-2498	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Telephone	Date: NA Type:	Date: NA Type:	
Bright Star-Salem	Wanda Gaby	903-765-2701	RRH	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Telephone	Date: NA Type:	Date: NA Type:	
City of Detroit	Travis Bronner	903-674-4573	ACL	Date: 1/22/02 Type: Face to face	Date: NA Type:	Date: NA Type:	
Town of English	Ben Storey	903-684-3743	ACL	Date: 1/22/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Telephone	Date: NA Type:	
Enchanted Lakes	Gary Douglas	903-849-2050	ACL	Date: 1/22/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/30/02 Type: Resent Survey	No response to contacts
Lindale Rural WSC	Walt Smith	903-882-3335	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/4/02 Type: Resent Survey	No response to contacts
Star Mountain WSC	Carrie Lake	903-877-3096	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/4/02 Type: Telephone	
Canton	James Hall	903-567-4434	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/6/02 Type: Telephone	
Grand Saline	Gene Putman	903-962-3122	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/6/02 Type: Telephone	No response to contacts
Van	John Beall	903-963-5050	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 1/30/02 Type: Telephone	
Ben Wheeler WSC	Mary Stone	903-833-5206	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: NA Type:	Date: NA Type:	
Corinth WSC	Steve (supt.)	903-962-5689	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 2/4/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/6/02 Type: Telephone	No response to contacts
Crooked Creek WSC	Dennis Hilliard	903-567-4016	ACL	Date: 1/29/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 1/30/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/6/02 Type: Telephone	
Edom WSC	James Hutchins	903-852-5055	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 2/6/02 Type: Telephone	Date: 2/6/02 Type: Faxed Survey	
Fruitvale WSC	Judy Woodrum	903-896-1224	ACL	Date: 1/25/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 2/1/02 Type: Telephone	Date: NA Type:	
Little Hope-Moore WSC	Chris Johnson	903-567-5821	ACL	Date: 1/30/02 Type: Mailed Survey	Date: 2/6/02 Type: Telephone	Date: NA Type:	

**APPENDIX 3**  
**COMPLETED SURVEY FORMS**

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Ben Franklin WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Contract for surface water from Delta County MUD

Capital Cost: \$ \$176,648

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*no response from WSC.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Ben Wheeler WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Drill a new well into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

Capital Cost: \$ \$326,871

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 100,000.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 100,000.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 226,871.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

1. USDA - Rural Development
2. Texas Water Development Board
3. Private Funding, i.e. Bank Loan

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Blocker-Crossroads WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$203,001

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 203,001.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

TWAS  
TDHCA

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Bloomburg WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$221,994

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 221,994.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ -0-.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ -0-.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

0

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Bright Star-Salem WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: (#1) Drill a New Well into the Carrizo-Wilcox

Capital Cost: \$ 202,052

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 202,052.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Not Applicable – well construction is underway and was paid for in cash*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Bright Star-Salem WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: (#2) Contract W/ SRA for Surface Supply from Lake Fork

Capital Cost: \$ 1,378,389

5. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 650,000.

6. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 835,000.

7. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 543,389.

8. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*ORCA, USDA -- Rural Development, TWDB -- State Revolving Fund*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Caddo Lake WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$278,537

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 278,537.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

0

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** City of Canton

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill a new well into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

**Capital Cost: \$** \$262,193

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 262,193.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

City is not in a position to raise rates, so grants would have to be obtained.

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: City of Como

Water Management Strategy Name: Drill a well into Carrizo-Wilcox

Capital Cost: \$ 155,922

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

see responses from WUE

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Corinth WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Drill a new well into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

Capital Cost: \$ \$117,117

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*No response from WSC.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Crooked Creek WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill a new well into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

**Capital Cost: \$** \$177,565

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 177,565.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** City of Detroit

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Contract with Lamar County WSD for Surface Water from Pat Mayse Lake

**Capital Cost:** \$ 665,936

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 665,936.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Grant funding has already been obtained for this project from USDA -- Rural Development, and design is underway.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Diana WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$240,769

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 240,769.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*RD - to drill additional wells  
TWPMS - future subdivision*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: East Mountain

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$403,204

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 403,204.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

0

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Edom WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill 2 new wells into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

**Capital Cost: \$** \$286,572

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 80,000

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 206,572

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

Edom would like to obtain state or federal funding, but has been unsuccessful in the past because 1) they typically do not need enough money to meet minimum requirements, and 2) they do not have enough low-income customers. They would be interested in obtaining funds from TWDB, ORCA, or Rural Development. They would like to see grants available for smaller dollar amounts, i.e. in the \$100,000 range. Edom is not interested in raising rates.

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Elysian Fields WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$176,135

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 176,135.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*None*  
*Plan to pay cash*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Enchanted Lakes

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill a new well into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

**Capital Cost:** \$ 254,133

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*no response from WUG.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Fouke WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$210,540

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 210,540.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Fruitvale WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Drill 8 wells into the Woodbine

Capital Cost: \$ 1,052,253

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 250,000.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 802,253.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Corporation would likely consider the USDA – Rural Development Agency or TWDB – Drinking Water SRF for additional funding*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Gladewater

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Surface Water

**Capital Cost:** \$773,815

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 400,000.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 373,815.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*The TWDB should offer a grant program or a interest free loan program to help entities secure long term water supply*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** City of Grand Saline

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill 2 new wells into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

**Capital Cost:** \$ \$439,509

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*no response from WUG.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Harleton WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Surface Water

Capital Cost: \$2,890,805

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 2,890,805.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Harmony ISD

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Groundwater

**Capital Cost:** \$456,192

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 456,192.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

0

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Kellyville-Berea WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Surface Water

Capital Cost: \$285,022

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 285,022.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*TRHCA*  
*TUWB*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Lake Fork WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$1,504,665

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 1,504,665.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

0

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Liberty City WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$1,130,716

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 1,130,716.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*The state funding should include a dividend or reward tax systems who do a good job running their systems*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Linden

Water Management Strategy Name: Surface Water

Capital Cost: \$1,424,805

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 1,424,805.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

0

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Little Hope-Moore WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Purchase surface water from Tyler

**Capital Cost:** \$ \$281,655

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ unknown.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ unknown.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ unknown.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

This WUG has tried for several grants and loans in the past, but has been unsuccessful in obtaining funding. In the past, the system has raised rates and borrowed funds locally to make system improvements.

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Mineola

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$224,805

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 224,805.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Local financing  
will be completed.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: North Harrison WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$254,202

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 254,202.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Local Financing*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** City of Pecan Gap

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Purchase Surface Water from Delta Co. MUD

**Capital Cost:** \$ 1,454,618

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 1,454,618.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Grant funding of \$1,454,618 has already been obtained for this project through USDA -- Rural Development, and design is underway.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Petty WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Purchase Surface Water from Pat Mayse Lake through Lamar County WSD

**Capital Cost:** \$ 38,583

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 38,583.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*WSC would probably need a grant for that amount, or might consider a loan, for example from the Drinking Water SRF*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Pickton WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill a well into Carrizo-Wilcox

**Capital Cost:** \$ 206,532

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 206,532.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Pickton recently completed the well that was recommended in the Regional Water Plan. They paid cash, from accumulated reserves.*

*This WUG would perhaps consider applying for the Drinking Water SRF in the future if their needs required a loan.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Pine Harbor Water System

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Groundwater

**Capital Cost:** \$152,242

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 152,242.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Private financing*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Pritchett WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Surface Water

**Capital Cost:** \$2,895,836

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*no response to be recorded*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Shady Shores Water System

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$201,844

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 201,844.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Local Financing*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Shirley WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill a well into Carrizo-Wilcox

**Capital Cost:** \$ 319,964

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 319,964.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*Well is currently underway and was paid for with cash. Only outstanding debt is with a local bank and they do not anticipate needing state funding in the near future.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Star Mountain WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill 3 new wells into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

**Capital Cost:** \$ 2,192,735

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 2,192,735.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*System is unable to raise rates significantly because most of its customers are elderly and on fixed incomes. One well is currently in progress, and is being financed through the ORCA -- STEP Program. Another well will soon be needed, and the system will seek grant funding for construction; probably from ORCA or USDA -- Rural development.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** Tri County WSC

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Purchase Surface Water from Lake Tawakoni through Ables Springs WSC

**Capital Cost:** \$ 13,570

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*no response from entity*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Union Grove WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$411,212

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 411,212.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*One completed  
Planning out more  
RD. for TDKA*

668  
99

### WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: West Harrison WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$254,202

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.00

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.00

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.00

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

See attached sheet

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Waskom

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$224,805

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 224,805.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*TADUCA*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: Waskom Rural WSC No. 1

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$278,537

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 278,537.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*NAMC*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

Name of Political Subdivision: West Gregg WSC

Water Management Strategy Name: Groundwater

Capital Cost: \$1,337,993

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 1,337,993

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** City of Van

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill a new well into the Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifer

**Capital Cost: \$** \$447,768

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 447,768.

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 0.

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 0.

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*A new well is currently in progress at a cost of one million dollars. City has secured private funding for this well. Another well is scheduled for the future, and City will likely approach TWDB for funding of some sort.*

## WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

**Instructions:** For each of the recommended strategies in the regional water plan to meet your water needs, please fill in the water management strategy name and cost (refer to the attached table showing the specific projects recommended for your political subdivision and the estimated capital costs). Answers to the following questions should be provided for each strategy. Use a new sheet for each water management strategy.

**Name of Political Subdivision:** City of Wolfe City

**Water Management Strategy Name:** Drill a well into the Woodbine

**Capital Cost:** \$ 828,714

1. Using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 312,000

2. If you could access the State Participation Program, how much of the capital cost is the political subdivision able to pay for the water management strategy identified above using current utility revenue sources, including implementing necessary rate and tax increases?

The political subdivision can afford to pay \$ 401,000

3. How much of the capital cost is the political subdivision unable to pay for the water management strategy identified above?

The political subdivision cannot afford to pay \$ 427,714

4. For the costs the political subdivision cannot pay, what option(s) is proposed? What, if any, state funding sources would the political subdivision consider? (use additional sheets, if necessary)

*The affordable limit of \$312,000 is based upon 5% interest and a 20 year payback. State Programs to provide the remainder would need to be either grant funds or lower interest/longer payback.*

*State funding the City would consider includes ORCA - Texas Community Development Program and TWDB - Drinking Water SRF*

## ADDENDUM NO. 1

This addendum is in regards to Texas Water Development Board and public comments to the Infrastructure Financing Report.

*Regarding comments to the IFR made by the Executive Administrator:*

A copy of the Executive Administrator's comments has been attached.

1. No response is required to this item.
2. A copy of the notice for the meeting when the NETRWPG adopted the report has been attached.
3. The full cost of the City of Van's strategy has been divided between two basins to better represent the City's location. Seventy percent (\$313,437.60) of the strategy has been entered into basin 06, and thirty percent (\$130,334.40) of the strategy has been entered into basin 05. The spreadsheet in the report has been updated to reflect this change.

*Regarding comments to the IFR made by the public:*

No public comments to the IFR were received.

**ATTACHMENT 1**  
**TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD**  
**TWDB Contract No. 2002-483-420**

**Report Comments**

1. It appears that the IFR draft report data tables were prepared in accordance with the contract.
2. Please provide a copy of the notice for the meeting when the regional water planning group adopted the report.
3. The full cost of the City of Van strategy is recorded twice in the IFR table because the strategy was split between basins in the TWDB template. Please make sure that one cost entry is deleted or split between basins as appropriate.

## NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING

### REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP D

March 20, 2002 – 2:00 P. M.

Texas Agricultural Extension Service

1708 Industrial Blvd.

Mount Pleasant, Texas 75455

In compliance with the Texas Open Meetings Act, Chapter 551, of the Texas Government Code, the Regional Water Planning Group D issues this public notice. On March 20, 2002, 2:00 P. M., the North East Texas Regional Water Planning Group (NETRWPG) will meet. The meeting will be held in the Texas Agricultural Extension Service Center, 1708 Industrial Blvd., Mt. Pleasant, Titus County, Texas. The NETRWPG will consider and act on the following items:

1. Recognitions.
2. Approval of Minutes for the February 13<sup>th</sup> and February 20<sup>th</sup> meetings.
3. Consideration of and action on letter of resignation submitted by Ruth Culver of Harrison County.
4. Consideration and action on Infrastructure Financing Report(IFR). This agenda item includes seeking and receiving public comments on the IFR.
5. Consideration and action on Scope of Work and Budget for update of adopted regional water plan.
6. Review population projections proposed by TWDB.
7. Presentation by Consultants.
8. Financial report by Administrator.
9. Input from Public. General discussion. This agenda item includes public comment on any water management strategy, population forecast, water demand forecast, recommendation of the planning group, or any other planning activity of the NETRWPG.
10. Adjourn.

Additional information maybe obtained from the Administrative Agency for NETRWPG.

Northeast Texas Municipal Water District

Post Office Box 955

Hughes Springs, Texas 75656

Office Tel. No.903/639-7538

Office Fax No. 903/639-2208

E-mail: [netmwd@aol.com](mailto:netmwd@aol.com).

Attn: Walt Sears, Jr., General Manager