

**Section 9**  
**Report to the Legislature on**  
**Water Infrastructure Funding Recommendations**  
**[31 TAC §357.7(a)(14)]**

**9.1 Introduction**

Senate Bill 2 (77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature) requires that an Infrastructure Financing Report (IFR) be incorporated into the regional water planning process. In order to meet this requirement, each regional water planning group (RWPG) is required to examine the funding needed to implement the water management strategies and projects identified and recommended in the region's January 2006 regional water plan.

**9.2 Objectives of the Infrastructure Financing Report**

The primary objectives of the Infrastructure Financing Report are as follows:

- 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.

**9.3 Methods and Procedures**

For the Llano Estacado Water Planning Area, all municipal water user groups having water needs and recommended water management strategies in the regional plan with an associated capital cost were surveyed using the questionnaire provided by the TWDB (Appendix H). For individual cities the survey was mailed to either the mayor or the city manager.

The surveys were mailed via first class U.S. Mail, along with supporting documentation that summarized the water management strategies included in the regional plan for that entity. One follow-up telephone contact was made with each municipal water user surveyed that did not respond by the due date. In all cases, copies of the survey information and forms were e-mailed to those contacted via telephone.

**9.4 Survey Responses**

The Llano Estacado RWPG mailed survey packages to 32 municipal water user groups and received 17 responses, a 53 percent response rate. The list of respondents is included in Table 9-

1, and copies of the completed surveys and related documentation are included in Appendix I. As shown in Table 9-1, the estimated cost of water management strategies of the 17 survey respondents is \$690.96 million, which is about 90.70 percent of the estimated \$761.54 million of capital costs for water management strategies included in the Regional Water Plan for municipal water user groups. The respondents indicated that \$117.54 million is needed from the TWDB funding programs, with \$74.56 million needed for planning, design, and permitting, \$34.95 million needed for acquisition and construction, \$0.06 million needed from the excess capacity fund, \$1.18 million needed for Rural categories, and \$6.79 million needed from the “disadvantaged” fund (Table 9-1).

The list of non-respondents, in alphabetical order, is as follows:

Amherst	Anton	Friena	Hale Center
Kress	Littlefield	Lockney	Petersburg
Plainview	Seagraves	Shallowater	Sudan
Sundown	Tulia	Wolfforth.	

The Canadian River Municipal Water Authority (CRMWA) responded to the IFR Survey in Region A.

Table 9-1 Summary of Infrastructure Financing Survey Responses * Llano Estacado Region										
Name of Political Subdivisions	Recommended Water Management Strategy	Date Needed	Cost (Dollars)	Funding Needed From TWDB Programs					Total (Dollars)	
				Planning Design & Permitting (Dollars)	Acquisition and Construction (Dollars)	Excess Capacity (Dollars)	Rural (Dollars)	Disadvantaged (Dollars)		
City of Lubbock	Lake Alan Henry Pipeline	2010	294,329,000	33,491,000						33,491,000
City of Lubbock	Post Reservoir to LAH Pipeline	2010	110,307,000	8,000,000						8,000,000
City of Lubbock	Brackish Groundwater Desalt	2012	13,167,000	1,000,000						1,000,000
City of Lubbock	Jim Bertram Lake 7	2011	68,288,400	8,000,000						8,000,000
City of Lubbock	North Fork Diversion	2013	153,040,000	15,000,000						15,000,000
Abernathy	Local Groundwater	2013	699,732	69,973	629,759					699,732
Ropesville	Local Groundwater	2012	349,252	34,925	314,327					349,252
Idalou	Local Groundwater	2015	770,132	77,013	693,119					770,132
Farwell	Local Groundwater	2011	163,152	16,315	146,837					163,152
Silverton	Local Groundwater	2011	6,171,850					6,171,850		6,171,850
White River MWD	Local Groundwater	2011	1,063,625	264,227	799,398					1,063,625
White River MWD	Reclaimed Water	2030	38,089,684	8,230,758	29,858,926					38,089,684
Lorenzo	Local Groundwater	2015	276,408		491,458					491,458
Earth	Local Groundwater	2031	619,608	78,632	540,976					619,608
Morton	Local Groundwater	2010	1,185,162	118,516	1,066,646					1,185,162
Denver City	Local Groundwater	2012	786,894					786,894		786,894
Hart	Local Groundwater	2050	509,256						509,256	509,256
Wilson	Local Groundwater	2015	349,252	34,925	64,327			250,000		349,252
New Deal	Local Groundwater	2030	547,803	116,426	117,087			63,490	110,400	547,803
Snyer	Local Groundwater	2012	249,976	24,997	224,979					249,976
Total			690,963,186	74,557,707	34,947,839	63,490	1,177,294	6,791,506		117,537,856
* Dimmitt	Local Groundwater	NA	786,894	Already implemented, and further funding not needed at present time.						
Plains	Local Groundwater		1,186,082	Commented that currently seeking land for future supply, but have no cost now.						