



9

Infrastructure Financing



This page intentionally left blank.

9 Infrastructure Financing

9.1 Introduction

Senate Bill 2 (77th 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 planning area's 2021 regional water plan.

9.2 Objectives of the Infrastructure Financing Survey

The primary objective of the Infrastructure Financing Survey is to determine the financing options proposed by political subdivisions to meet future water infrastructure needs in the Brazos G Area (including the identification of any State funding sources considered).

9.3 Methods and Procedures

For the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area, all municipal water user groups (except County-Other) and wholesale water providers having water needs and recommended water management strategies with an associated capital cost in the initially prepared regional plan were surveyed using a questionnaire provided by the TWDB. Mining, Irrigation, Livestock and Steam-Electric WUGs were also not mailed a survey. Individual municipalities and wholesale water providers were mailed the survey in early August and asked to return the surveys no later than August 31st.

For each project with an identified capital cost, the survey respondents were asked to enter only the amounts that they wish to receive from the TWDB program listed below:

- **Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition:** Costs were entered into this category if the entity wanted to participate in the TWDB programs offering subsidized interest and deferral of principal and interest for planning, design, permitting, and acquisition costs.
- **Construction Funding:** Costs were entered into this category if the entity wants to obtain subsidized interest for all project costs, including planning, design, and construction.
- **State Participation:** Percentages of costs were entered into this category if the entity wanted to participate in the State Participation Program. State Participation funding offers partial interest and principal deferral for the incremental cost of project elements which are designed and built to serve needs beyond 10 years.

9.4 Survey Responses

The Brazos G RWPG sent letters to 125 municipal water user groups and wholesale water providers and as of September 16, 2020, had received 15 responses, a 12 percent response rate. Of those 125 surveys sent, 70 contain only a conservation WMS. The Brazos River Authority (BRA) is not included in the survey responses received; however,

the BRA did provide correspondence indicating that based on the current status and timelines of the strategies represented within the Initially Prepared 2021 Brazos G Regional Water Plan, that it was premature to establish potential funding amounts that may be requested through the various TWDB financial assistance programs.

As shown in Table 9-1, the 15 responses represent about 31 percent of the estimated capital costs of water management strategies included as part of this survey. Of those responding, for which total capital costs are \$1,458,856,093, the survey shows that approximately \$1.265 billion would be sought through the state funding programs. It is unclear how the remaining 69 percent of the capital costs for those entities not responding would be financed. Georgetown, North Central Texas MWA and Palo Pinto MWD #1 indicated some financing through state participation in owning excess capacity.

The survey responses presented are related to water management strategies and capital costs included in the Initially Prepared 2021 Plan. As a result of public and agency comments on the Initially Prepared 2021 Plan, some strategies and capital costs have been modified in the final 2021 Plan, and those changes are not reflected here. Responses are as of September 16, 2020.

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owning Excess Capacity
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year	
ABILENE	CEDAR RIDGE RESERVIOR	\$283,646,000					No Response
ABILENE	EXPAND WTP (23.2 MGD) – ABILENE	\$61,665,000					No Response
ABILENE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – ABILENE	\$12,241,000					No Response
ACTON MUD	EXPAND WTP SWATS – ACTON MUD	\$23,934,000					No Response
ACTON MUD	TRINITY AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – ACTON MUD	\$965,000					No Response
ALBANY	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – ALBANY	\$1,295,000					No Response
ARMSTRONG WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – ARMSTRONG WSC	\$209,000					No Response
ASPERMONT	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – ASPERMONT	\$496,000					No Response
BARTLETT	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BARTLESS	\$599,000					No Response
BELL COUNTY WCID #1	BELL COUNTY WCID #1 – NORTH REUSE	\$15,186,000					No Response
BELL COUNTY WCID #1	BELL COUNTY WCID #1 – SOUTH REUSE	\$11,578,000					No Response
BELL COUNTY WCID #2	TRINITY AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – BELL COUNTY WCID #2	\$979,000					No Response
BELL COUNTY WCID #3	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BELL COUNTY WCID #3	\$120,000					No Response

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owing Excess Capacity	
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year		
BELL MILAM FALLS WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BELL MILAM FALLS WSC	\$26,000	No Response					
BELLMEAD	REUSE – BELLMEAD/LACY LAKEVIEW	\$8,038,000	No Response					
BELTON	EXPAND WTP (2.1 MGD) – BELTON	\$9,158,000	No Response					
BELTON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BELTON	\$2,142,000	No Response					
BETHESDA WSC	CONSERVATION, IRRIGATION RESTRICTION – BETHESDA WSC	\$8,576	No Response					
BETHESDA WSC	CONSERVATION, WATER LOSS CONTROL – BETHESDA WSC	\$197,156	No Response					
BETHESDA WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BETHESDA WSC	\$12,420,000	No Response					
BISTONE MWSD	CARRIZO AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – BISTONE MWSD	\$1,772,000	No Response					
BISTONE MWSD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BISTONE MWSD	\$577,000	No Response					
BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY	ALLENS CREEK RESERVOIR	\$109,633,890	Response received, but no data provided					
BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY	BELTON TO STILLHOUSE PIPELINE – BRA	\$67,993,000	Response received, but no data provided					
BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY	LAKE AQUILLA REALLOCATION – BRA	\$24,353,000	Response received, but no data provided					
BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY	LAKE GRANGER ASR	\$116,431,000	Response received, but no data provided					
BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY	LAKE GRANGER AUGMENTATION – PHASE 1 – BRA	\$96,685,000	Response received, but no data provided					
BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY	LAKE GRANGER AUGMENTATION – PHASE 2 – BRA	\$845,564,000	Response received, but no data provided					
BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY	LAKE WHITNEY REALLOCATION TO WILLIAMSON COUNTY	\$253,824,000	Response received, but no data provided					
BRECKENRIDGE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION - BRECKENRIDGE	\$282,000	No Response					
BREMOND	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BREMOND	\$133,000	No Response					
BRENHAM	GULF COAST AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – BRENHAM	\$2,958,000	No Response					
BRENHAM	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BRENHAM	\$9,182,000	No Response					
BRUCEVILLE-EDDY	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BRUCEVILLE-EDDY	\$764,000	No Response					
BRUSHY CREEK MUD	MUNICIAPL WATER CONSERVATION – BRUSHY CREEK MUD	\$1,467,000	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%	

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owing Excess Capacity
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year	
BRYAN	BRYAN ASR (CARRIZO-WILCOX) – PHASE 1	\$36,202,000	\$2,000,000	2021	\$13,655,000	2021	0%
BRYAN	BRYAN ASR (CARRIZO-WILCOX) – PHASE 2	\$36,202,000	\$2,500,000	2030	\$27,500,000	2030	0%
BRYAN	CARRIZO GW DEVELOPMENT FOR BRYAN IN BRAZOS COUNTY	\$34,718,000	\$2,500,000	2030	\$17,500,000	2035	0%
BRYAN	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – BRYAN	\$13,868,000	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%
BRYAN	REUSE – BRYAN (OPTION 1)	\$11,092,000	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%
BRYAN	REUSE – MIRAMONT	\$3,894,000	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%
BURLESON	BURLESON – ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE FROM FT WORTH	\$4,688,000	No Response				
BURLESON	CONSERVATION, WATER LOSS CONTROL – BURLESON	\$132,685	No Response				
CALDWELL	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CALDWELL	\$1,369,000	No Response				
CAMERON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CAMERON	\$2,593,000	No Response				
CEDAR PARK	BRUSHY CREEK RUA WATER SUPPLY	\$73,104,263	\$10,965,639	2021	\$62,138,624	2021	0%
CEDAR PARK	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION – CEDAR PARK	\$3,932,000	\$786,400	2025	\$3,145,000	2026	0%
CEDAR PARK	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CEDAR PARK	\$38,089,000	\$7,617,800	2025	\$30,471,200	2026	0%
CEDAR PARK	REUSE – CEDAR PARK	\$7,184,000	\$1,436,800	2023	\$5,747,200	2024	0%
CEGO-DURANGO WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CEGO-DURANGO WSC	\$35,000	No Response				
CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE DISTRICT	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE DISTRICT	\$37,000	No Response				
CENTRAL WASHINGTON COUNTY WSC	GULF COAST AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – CORIX UTILITIES TEXAS INC	\$1,853,359	No Response				
CHILDRESS CREEK WSC	BOSQUE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	\$5,744,000	No Response				
CISCO	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CISCO	\$292,000	No Response				
CLEBURNE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CLEBURNE	\$7,253,000	\$1,160,000	2022	\$6,092,000	2023	0%
CLEBURNE	REUSE – CLEBURNE	\$29,803,000	\$4,769,000	2020	\$23,034,000	2021	0%
CLIFTON	BOSQUE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	\$7,506,000	No Response				
CLIFTON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CLIFTON	\$425,000	No Response				

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owning Excess Capacity	
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year		
COLLEGE STATION	CARRIZO GW DEVELOPMENT FOR COLLEGE STATION IN BRAZOS COUNTY	\$43,914,000	No Response					
COLLEGE STATION	COLLEGE STATION – DPR	\$84,177,000	No Response					
COLLEGE STATION	COLLEGE STATION ASR (REUSE)	\$86,514,000	No Response					
COLLEGE STATION	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – COLLEGE STATION	\$1,305,000	No Response					
COLLEGE STATION	REUSE – COLLEGE STATION	\$3,553,000	No Response					
COOLIDGE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – COOLIDGE	\$24,000	No Response					
CORYELL CITY WATER SUPPLY DISTRICT	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CORYELL CITY WATER SUPPLY DISTRICT	\$108,000	No Response					
CRAWFORD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CRAWFORD	\$156,000	No Response					
CROSS COUNTY WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CROSS COUNTRY WSC	\$129,000	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%	
CROSS PLAINS	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – CROSS PLAINS	\$54,000	No Response					
DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – DOUBLE DIAMOND UTILITIES	\$891,000	No Response					
EAST CRAWFORD WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – EAST CRAWFORD WSC	\$916,000	No Response					
FERN BLUFF MUD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – FERN BLUFF MUD	\$2,130,000	No Response					
FILES VALLEY WSC	CONSERVATION, WATER LOSS CONTROL – FILES VALLEY WSC	\$2,291	No Response					
FLAT WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – FLAT WSC	\$221,000	No Response					
FORT GATES WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – FORT GATES WSC	\$615,000	No Response					
FORT HOOD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – FORT HOOD	\$11,038,000	No Response					
GATESVILLE	EXPAND WTP (1.2 MGD) – GATESVILLE	\$9,577,000	\$1,000,000	2030	\$15,000,000	2035	0%	
GATESVILLE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – GATESVILLE	\$13,327,000	\$0	N/A	\$2,570,000	2021	0%	
GEORGETOWN	EXPAND WTP (21 MGD) – GEORGETOWN	\$85,760,000	\$12,864,000	2021	\$72,896,000	2022	50%	
GEORGETOWN	LAKE GEORGETOWN ASR	\$306,276,000	\$45,941,400	2022	\$260,334,600	2026	75%	
GEORGETOWN	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION – GEORGETOWN	\$579,000	\$86,850	2022	\$492,150	2024	50%	

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owning Excess Capacity
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year	
GEORGETOWN	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – GEORGETOWN	\$162,839,000	\$24,425,850	2024	\$138,413,150	2026	50%
GEORGETOWN	REUSE – GEORGETOWN	\$6,270,000	\$940,500	2025	\$5,329,500	2027	50%
GIDDINGS	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – GIDDINGS	\$1,336,000	No Response				
GLEN ROSE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – GLEN ROSE	\$1,026,000	No Response				
GODLEY	TRINITY AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – GODLEY	\$1,101,000	No Response				
GORDON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – GORDON	\$240,000	No Response				
GRAHAM	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – GRAHAM	\$6,742,000	No Response				
GRANBURY	NORTH WTP	\$45,500,000	\$4,000,000	2026	\$41,500,000	2027	0%
GROESBECK	GROESBECK OFF CHANNEL RESERVOIR – GROESBECK	\$23,599,000	No Response				
HAMILTON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – HAMILTON	\$168,000	No Response				
HAMLIN	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – HAMLIN	\$323,000	No Response				
HARKER HEIGHTS	INTERCONNECT FROM KILLEEN TO HARKER HEIGHTS	\$2,580,000	No Response				
HARKER HEIGHTS	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – HARKER HEIGHTS	\$10,133,000	No Response				
HEARNE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – HEARNE	\$238,000	No Response				
HEWITT	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – HEWITT	\$1,437,000	No Response				
HEWITT	REUSE – BULLHIDE CREEK	\$7,349,000	No Response				
HIGHLAND PARK WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – HIGHLAND PARK WSC	\$418,000	No Response				
HIGHLAND PARK WSC	TRINITY AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – HIGHLAND PARK WSC	\$1,829,000	No Response				
HILLSBORO	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – HILLSBORO	\$2,911,000	No Response				
JAYTON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – JAYTON	\$45,000	No Response				
JAYTON	NEW WTP (0.4 MGD) – JAYTON	\$3,555,000	No Response				
JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	CONSERVATION, WATER LOSS CONTROL – JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	\$6,197	No Response				
JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	EXPAND WTP SWATS – JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	\$8,814,000	No Response				

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owning Excess Capacity
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year	
JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	TRINITY AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	\$9,306,000					No Response
JONAH WATER SUD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – JONAH WATER SUD	\$467,000					No Response
KEMPNER WSC	EXPAND WTP (1.8 MGD) – KEMPNER WSC	\$10,821,000					No Response
KEMPNER WSC	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION – KEMPNER WSC	\$519,000					No Response
KEMPNER WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – KEMPNER WSC	\$1,386,000					No Response
KNOX CITY	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – KNOX CITY	\$299,000					No Response
LACY LAKEVIEW	REUSE – BELLMEAD/LACY LAKEVIEW	\$8,038,000					No Response
LAWN	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – LAWN	\$130,000					No Response
LEANDER	BRUSHY CREEK RUA WATER SUPPLY	\$142,186,421					No Response
LEXINGTON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – LEXINGTON	\$125,000					No Response
LIBERTY HILL	BRUSHY CREEK RUA WATER SUPPLY	\$3,676,679					No Response
LITTLE ELM VALLEY WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – LITTLE ELM VALLEY	\$261,000					No Response
LORENA	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – LORENA	\$18,000					No Response
LORENA	REUSE – BULLHIDE CREEK	\$7,349,000					No Response
MARLIN	BRUSHY CREEK RESERVOIR – MARLIN	\$33,229,000					No Response
MARLIN	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – MARLIN	\$4,066,000					No Response
MART	INTERCONNECT FROM WACO TO MART	\$7,105,372					No Response
MERIDIAN	BOSQUE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	\$4,432,000					No Response
MINERAL WELLS	CONSERVATION, IRRIGATION RESTRICTION – MINERAL WELLS	\$8,576					No Response
MINERAL WELLS	CONSERVATION, WATER LOSS CONTROL – MINERAL WELLS	\$7,493					No Response
MINERAL WELLS	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – MINERAL WELLS	\$187,000					No Response
MULTI COUNTY WSC	CORYELL COUNTY OFF-CHANNEL RESERVIOR	\$82,584,000					No Response
MUNDAY	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – MUNDAY	\$201,000					No Response

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owning Excess Capacity	
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year		
MUSTAND VALLEY WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – MUSTANG VALLEY WSC	\$769,000	No Response					
NAVASOTA	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – NAVASOTA	\$1,348,000	No Response					
NORTH BOSQUE WSC	INTERCONNECT FROM WACO TO NORTH BOSQUE	\$2,428,000	No Response					
NORTH BOSQUE WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – NOTH BOSQUE WSC	\$2,300,000	No Response					
NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS MWA	LAKE CREEK RESERVOIR	\$259,001,000	\$38,850,000	2035	\$220,151,000	2040	50%	
NORTH MILAM WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – NORTH MILAM WSC	\$108,000	No Response					
PALO PINTO COUNTY MWD #1	TURKEY PEAK RESERVOIR	\$102,530,000	\$0	N/A	\$77,430,000	2025	25%	
PARKER WSC	TRINITY AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – PARKER WSC	\$1,045,000	No Response					
POSSUM KINGDOM WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – POSSUM KINGDOM WSC	\$2,212,000	No Response					
PRAIRIE HILL WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – PRAIRIE HILL WSC	\$34,000	No Response					
PRAIRIE HILL WSC	UPGRADE WTP FOR ARSENIC – PRAIRIE HILL WSC	\$1,408,000	No Response					
RANGER	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – RANGER	\$224,000	No Response					
ROBERTSON COUNTY WSC	CARRIZO AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – ROBERTSON COUNTY WSC	\$3,440,000	No Response					
ROBINSON	EXPAND WTP (4 MGD) – ROBINSON	\$16,813,000	No Response					
ROBINSON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – ROBINSON	\$3,743,000	No Response					
ROBY	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – ROBY	\$81,000	\$12,000	2021	\$68,000	2021	0%	
ROCKDALE	CARRIZO AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – ROCKDALE	\$5,086,000	\$762,900	2023	\$4,323,100	2025	0%	
ROCKDALE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – ROCKDALE	\$1,164,000	\$174,600	2024	\$989,400	2025	0%	
ROUND ROCK	BRUSHY CREEK RUA WATER SUPPLY	\$107,826,043	\$5,000,000	2022	\$65,000,000	2022	0%	
ROUND ROCK	MUNICIPAL CONSERVATION – ROUND ROCK	\$69,787	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%	
ROUND ROCK	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – ROUND ROCK	\$28,008,000	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%	
SALADO WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – SALADO WSC	\$5,986,000	No Response					

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owning Excess Capacity	
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year		
SALT FORK WATER QUALITY CORP.	CHLORIDE CONTROL PROJECT	\$106,537,000	No Response					
SNOOK	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – SNOOK	\$719,000	No Response					
SOMERVILLE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – SOMERVILLE	\$171,000	No Response					
SONTERRA MUD	EAST WILLIAMSON COUNTY WATER PROJECT	\$10,289,903	No Response					
SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC	CARRIZO AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC	\$5,080,000	No Response					
SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – SOUTHWEST MILAM WSC	\$472,000	No Response					
SPORTSMANS WORLD MUD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – SPORTSMANS WORLD MUD	\$328,000	No Response					
STAMFORD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – STAMFORD	\$1,907,000	No Response					
STEPHENVILLE	TRINITY AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – STEPHENVILLE	\$7,344,000	No Response					
STRAWN	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – STRAWN	\$133,000	No Response					
STRAWN	TRINITY AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – STRAWN	\$2,447,000	No Response					
SWEETWATER	INTERCONNECT FROM ABILENE TO SWEETWATER	\$21,667,019	No Response					
TAYLOR	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – TAYLOR	\$3,221,000	No Response					
TDCJ LUTHER UNITS	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – TDCJ LUTHER UNITS	\$369,000	No Response					
TDCJ W PACK UNIT	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – TDCJ W PACK UNIT	\$923,000	No Response					
TEMPLE	EXPAND WTP (4.2 MGD) – TEMPLE	\$35,666,000	No Response					
TEMPLE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – TEMPLE	\$69,470,000	No Response					
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	CARRIZO AQUIFER DEVELOPMENT – TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	\$4,931,000	\$1,000,000	2038	\$3,931,000	2039	0%	
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	\$13,455,000	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%	
TEXAS STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – TEXAS STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	\$2,599,000	No Response					
THROCKMORTON	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – THROCKMORTON	\$247,000	No Response					
THROCKMORTON	THROCKMORTON RESERVOIR – THROCKMORTON	\$68,103,000	No Response					

Table 9-1. Summary of Responses to the Infrastructure Financing Survey

Sponsor	Project Name	Capital Cost	Planning, Design, Permitting and Acquisition		Construction		Percent State Participation in Owing Excess Capacity	
			Funding Amount	Year	Funding Amount	Year		
TWIN CREEK WSC	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – TWIN CREEK WSC	\$137,000	No Response					
VALLEY MILLS	BOSQUE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	\$5,490,000	No Response					
VALLEY MILLS	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – VALLEY MILLS	\$270,000	No Response					
VENUS	CONSERVATION, IRRIGATION RESTRICTION – VENUS	\$8,576	No Response					
VENUS	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – VENUS	\$907,000	No Response					
WACO	CONSERVATION – METER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM – WACO	\$15,282,000	No Response					
WACO	MCLENNAN COUNTY ASR (WACO)	\$65,954,000	No Response					
WACO	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WACO	\$69,284,000	No Response					
WACO	REUSE – FLAT CREEK	\$20,014,000	No Response					
WACO	REUSE – WMARSS CHINA SPRING	\$25,888,000	No Response					
WACO	REUSE – WMARSS I-84	\$28,249,000	No Response					
WALSH RANCH MUD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WALSH RANCH MUD	\$410,000	No Response					
WELLBORN SUD	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WELLBORN SUD	\$4,183,000	No Response					
WEST	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WEST	\$116,000	No Response					
WHITNEY	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WHITNEY	\$429,000	No Response					
WILLIAMSON COUNTY MUD 10	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WILLIAMSON COUNTY MUD 10	\$1,452,000	No Response					
WILLIAMSON COUNTY MUD 11	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WILLIAMSON COUNTY MUD 11	\$1,480,000	No Response					
WILLIAMSON COUNTY MUD 9	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WILLIAMSON COUNTY MUD 9	\$946,000	No Response					
WINDSOR WATER	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WINDSOR WATER	\$13,000	No Response					
WOODWAY	MUNICIPAL WATER CONSERVATION – WOODWAY	\$9,639,000	\$0	N/A	\$0	N/A	0%	
Total		\$4,705,520,286	\$168,793,739		\$1,097,710,724			