

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

[BACKGROUND](#)..... 1

[LOWER COLORADO REGIONAL PLANNING AREA IFR SURVEYS](#) ..... 1

[SURVEY RESULTS](#)..... 2

[CONCLUSIONS](#)..... 3

LCRWPG POLICY STATEMENT..... 4

APPENDIX A: [PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTING SURVEY RESPONSES](#) ..... A-1

APPENDIX B: [INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE SURVEYS](#) ..... B-1

APPENDIX C: [TWDB-REQUIRED SURVEY RESPONSE RECORD](#)..... C-1

APPENDIX D: [SURVEY RESULTS TABLES](#)..... D-1

APPENDIX E: ADDENDUM - SIERRA CLUB & COA COMMENT LETTERS ..... E-1

APPENDIX F: [ACTUAL SURVEY RESPONSES RECEIVED](#)..... F-1

# Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group Infrastructure Finance Report

## BACKGROUND

As a part of Senate Bill 2 (SB 2, 77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature), the Regional Water Planning Groups (RWPGs) are required by the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) to examine the funding required to implement the water management strategies and projects that were identified and recommended in the SB 1 Regional Water Plans. These plans were adopted by the RWPGs in December 2000 and approved by the TWDB in 2001. Each Region's findings are to be presented to the TWDB in an Infrastructure Finance Report (IFR), June 2002.

The primary objectives of the Infrastructure Finance Report are:

- to determine (via mail-out survey) 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 (via mail-out survey) how much of the infrastructure costs in the regional water plans cannot be paid for solely using local utility revenue sources;
- to determine (via mail-out survey) the financing options proposed by political subdivisions to meet future water infrastructure needs (including the identification of State funding sources considered); and,
- to determine (via RWPG policy statement) what role(s) the RWPGs propose for the State in financing the recommended water supply projects.

## LOWER COLORADO REGIONAL PLANNING AREA IFR SURVEYS

The Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group (LCRWPG) had 25 Municipal Water User Groups (WUGs) with needs for additional water supply identified in the SB1 Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan (Region K). Surveys, designed to determine if there are any financial needs for additional infrastructure necessary to providing service for projected water demands during

the 50-year planning period, were sent to the political subdivisions responsible throughout the 14-county Region for the following 18 Municipal WUGs and seven “County-Other” WUGs:

<i>West Lake Hills</i>	<i>Goldthwaite</i>
<i>Anderson Mill CDP</i>	<i>Lakeway</i>
<i>Kingsland</i>	<i>Jonestown</i>
<i>Austin</i>	<i>Garfield</i>
<i>Llano</i>	<i>Blanco</i>
<i>Pflugerville</i>	<i>Dripping Springs</i>
<i>Wells Branch</i>	<i>Cottonwood Shores</i>
<i>Rollingwood</i>	<i>Granite Shoals</i>
<i>Lago Vista</i>	<i>Marble Falls</i>
<i>Llano County-Other</i>	<i>Hays County-Other</i>
<i>Burnet County-Other</i>	<i>Travis County-Other</i>
<i>Blanco County-Other</i>	<i>Gillespie County-Other</i>
<i>Williamson County-Other</i>	

**Appendix A** details Region K’s IFR survey procedure; **Appendix B** contains copies of the Municipal and “County-Other” surveys, as well as each of the three time-specific cover letters, and the TWDB’s definition of the State Participation Program; **Appendices C - F** contain the TWDB-required survey response records, survey results, and actual survey responses, respectively.

The TWDB also requires that the RWPGs provide summary discussions detailing probable funding mechanisms that could meet identified water needs for county aggregate WUGs for which there are no political subdivisions responsible for providing water supplies. Region K had identified issues for irrigation in the lower three counties, as indicated in the SB1 Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan (December 2000).

## **SURVEY RESULTS**

The response rate for the Municipal Infrastructure Surveys was 68 percent. Of those responding, 59 percent indicated a need for funding for infrastructure improvements/replacements for municipal water supply facilities in order to meet projected demands during the 50-year planning period. In addition to drilling additional wells or constructing additional water supply storage basins, typical infrastructure needs indicated include upgrading/replacing distribution system service pumps, distribution mains, booster stations, and storage tanks. Supply-side conservation needs include infrastructure to be able to utilize reclaimed water.

Only about 29 percent of the survey respondents provided answers to the quantitative demand and cost questions. A primary reason for this may be that they were hesitant to become responsible for these identified values. Four respondents stated they were in the planning stages for water management strategies, one respondent provided an implementation date for needed infrastructure improvements/replacements, and only five stated anticipated capital costs. Three WUGs responded that they could not pay for any of the needed capital costs; one stated they could cover 20 percent of the costs; and, one said they could contribute approximately 50 percent of the capital costs. Total estimated need for those responding to the survey was more than \$5 Billion, with 99 percent attributable to the large Austin metropolitan area. Assuming a 10 percent cost sharing for the City of Austin (see the May 29, 2002 COA Comment Letter in *Appendix E*) and 50-100 percent cost sharing for other Municipal WUGs, state-funding assistance would be needed at a minimum of \$800 Million, based on the survey response capital costs provided. See *Appendices C – F* for survey result details. The content of the survey was prescribed by the TWDB and responses had to be very specific in order to conform to the TWDB-formatted database table. Therefore, there is a second database table provided in *Appendix D* that incorporates all of the survey responses received.

## CONCLUSIONS

There is a definite need for state-sponsored funding programs to help meet projected municipal demands for existing and proposed facilities within the Lower Colorado Regional Planning Area. It was not possible to determine the magnitude of the funding needed from these surveys due to a lack of response to the survey's quantitative demand and cost questions. A minimum need of \$800 Million was developed based on those who responded to the survey. These local entities are a valuable resource to use for determining what local infrastructure improvements may be needed to meet projected water demands; however they have not addressed the associated financing details and most were not able to assist in determining what such infrastructure improvements will cost.

The majority of municipal survey respondents indicated they do not have sufficient revenue sources to cover the capital costs required for the needed infrastructure replacements and they would consider any sources of available funding.

The SB1 Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan also identified needs for irrigation within the lower three counties (Colorado, Wharton, and Matagorda counties) of the Region. This is an aggregate WUG for which there is no political subdivision(s) responsible for providing water supplies. The shortfall in irrigation water supply, where rice and other crops depend on reliable water flows, is estimated to be 86,000 acre-feet annually during drought-of-record conditions in the Year 2000, which increases to a deficit of almost 165,000 acre-feet in the Year 2050. These projections take into consideration previously anticipated efficiencies in on-farm water conservation. The LCRWPG has actively discussed probable funding mechanisms that could meet these identified aggregate water needs. Region K's Application to the TWDB for SB2 Regional Water Planning includes several water management strategies aimed at resolving these deficits in irrigation, including construction of several off-channel dams to capture flood flows and/or farmers participating in a Dry-Year Irrigation Reduction Program where other WUGs purchase the water that would have been used to irrigate the farmers' second-crop acreage.

### **LCRWPG POLICY STATEMENT**

In response to the Region K Infrastructure Finance Survey results, the Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group has developed recommendations for the TWDB to present as policy recommendations to the State Legislature. *Appendix E* contains a comment letter from the Sierra Club on May 8, 2002 regarding the LCRWPG's policy statement. These comments, as well as comments from the COA (*Appendix E*), Region K Infrastructure Finance Subcommittee members, and LCRWPG members were considered by the planning group and incorporated into this final report.

Region K favors public policy that would depend on water-user self-financing of Municipal water infrastructure projects to the maximum extent practicable by the local economies. For those WUGs with an absolute need for funding in addition to locally generated funds, Region K recommends that the State adopt some combination of the following funding alternatives [examples provided are for illustrative purposes only as there have not been any attempts made

to determine the amount of funding each would generate or if such funding would be adequate to meet projected infrastructure needs]:

1. Statewide bottled water tax [example: at 0.5 cent (one half of one cent) per pint (500ml) up to 5.0 cents per gallon of bottled water];
2. Statewide water use fees: a fee assessed by the state based on the volume of water used;
3. Statewide consumer product fee (sales tax) [example: 0.25 cent (one quarter of one cent) tax per dollar spent];
4. Statewide property tax assessment; and/or
5. Gasoline, diesel, and aviation fuel tax.

The Planning Group strongly recommends that the State choose one or more of these state-sponsored funding mechanism alternatives to use specifically for infrastructure programs to help meet projected municipal demands for existing and proposed facilities within the Lower Colorado Regional Planning Area.

**APPENDIX A**  
**PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTING SURVEY RESPONSES**

## **IFR SURVEY PROCEDURE**

SB 2 specifies that each RWPG will prepare an Infrastructure Finance Report (IFR) that examines the funding needed to implement the water management strategies and projects that were identified and recommended in the SB 1 Regional Water Plans that were approved by the TWDB in 2001.

The SB1 Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan stated that Region K has 25 WUGs with identified municipal water needs during the 50-year planning period. The political subdivision responsible for providing water to each of these WUGs was chosen to participate in the IFR survey.

The Project Consultant prepared a cover letter and survey questions for the Municipal IFR survey, using the TWDB IFR guidelines. The Project Consultant sent on or around January 18, 2002 a printed cover letter, survey, and postage-paid return envelope to each participant. The cover letter requested that entities please return their survey responses by February 15, 2002. Follow-up letters and surveys required by the TWDB were mailed out on February 18<sup>th</sup> and March 18<sup>th</sup>. Responses received were compiled in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and also in a data table formatted by the TWDB. Results are presented in this report (See *Appendix D*).

**APPENDIX B**  
**MUNICIPAL AND “COUNTY-OTHER”**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE SURVEYS**  
**(AND COVER LETTERS)**

## Municipal Water Infrastructure Financing Survey



**Background:** On January 5, 2001, each of the 16 Regional Water Planning Groups (RWPGs) across the State of Texas formally submitted an adopted regional water plan to the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) per requirements of Senate Bill 1 (75<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature). These regional water plans examined and analyzed the water supply needs for all of the water users in the State. Based on these analyses, the RWPGs identified water management strategies that would be necessary to ensure sufficient additional water supplies for the 50-year planning period. Preliminary capital cost estimates were also developed for each of the strategies recommended.

This year Senate Bill 2 (77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature) has expanded the RWPGs' assignments to include the examination of what financial assistance, if any, is needed to implement each of the recommended water management strategies. Specifically, the RWPGs are required to report to the TWDB how all of the political subdivisions (municipalities, counties, water districts, etc.) in Texas propose to pay for future water infrastructure needs identified in each of the Regional Water Plans.

The Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan identified 27 municipal water user groups (WUGs) with needs and the TWDB has requested their infrastructure improvement needs be identified for the 50-year planning period. **Your input is crucial to completing this task successfully.**

Attached is a **survey** requesting information on infrastructure improvements that are currently needed or are projected to be necessary during the 50-year planning period to adequately service **your** water utility customers. Your participation in this survey would be greatly appreciated.

If you have **any** questions regarding this survey, please contact:

Bill E. Couch, AICP @ (512) 457-7774; couchb@tcbaus.com

**or**

Connie M. Hinojos @ (512) 457-7732; hinojos@tcbaus.com

**PLEASE** take a few minutes to fill out the attached survey and **RETURN** the completed survey in the POSTAGE-PAID RETURN ENVELOPE by Friday **February 15, 2002**.

Thank you for your assistance!

**2<sup>nd</sup> Notice, February 18, 2002**

**Our records indicate that we have not yet heard from you**

## **Municipal Water Infrastructure Financing Survey**



The Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group (LCRWPG) sent out surveys on or about January 18, 2002 to the Municipal Water User Groups with needs for additional water supplies identified in the SB1 Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan. **The primary objectives of this survey are:**

- to determine the number of municipal entities that have projected infrastructure needs during the 50-year planning period, but are unable to pay for these needs without some form of outside financial assistance;
- to determine how much of the infrastructure costs needed cannot be paid for solely using local utility revenue sources; and,
- to determine the financing options proposed by the municipal entities to meet future water infrastructure needs (including the identification of State funding sources considered).

**Your input is crucial to completing this task successfully.** This survey is your opportunity to have your voice heard and your community's needs considered. Your participation in this survey is the only way to obtain important information for use in making financial decisions that could profoundly affect the ability of municipal entities to provide water supply services in Region K.

If you have **any** questions regarding this survey, please contact:

Bill E. Couch, AICP @ (512) 457-7774; couchb@tcbaus.com

**or**

Connie M. Hinojos @ (512) 457-7732; hinojos@tcbaus.com

**PLEASE** take a few minutes to fill out the attached survey and **RETURN** the completed survey in the POSTAGE-PAID RETURN ENVELOPE by Friday **March 15, 2002**.

Thank you for your assistance!

**3<sup>rd</sup> & Final Notice, March 18, 2002**  
**Our records indicate that we have not yet heard from you**

**Municipal Water Infrastructure  
Financing Survey**



The Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group (LCRWPG) sent out surveys on or about January 18, 2002 to the Municipal Water User Groups with needs for additional water supplies identified in the SB1 Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan. Follow-up surveys were sent February 18th to those who had not responded by February 15, 2002. This is your final opportunity to participate in this important financial needs survey. **The primary objectives of this survey are:**

- to determine the number of municipal entities that have projected infrastructure needs during the 50-year planning period, but are unable to pay for these needs without some form of outside financial assistance;
- to determine how much of the infrastructure costs needed cannot be paid for solely using local utility revenue sources; and,
- to determine the financing options proposed by the municipal entities to meet future water infrastructure needs (including the identification of State funding sources considered).

**Your input is crucial to completing this task successfully.** This survey is your opportunity to have your voice heard and your community's needs considered. Your participation in this survey is the only way to obtain important information for use in making financial decisions that could profoundly affect the ability of municipal entities to provide water supply services in Region K.

If you have **any** questions regarding this survey, please contact:

Bill E. Couch, AICP @ (512) 457-7774; couchb@tcbaus.com

**or**

Connie M. Hinojos @ (512) 457-7732; hinojoscm@tcbaus.com

**PLEASE** take a few minutes to fill out the attached survey and **RETURN** the completed survey in the POSTAGE-PAID RETURN ENVELOPE by Monday **April 15, 2002**.

Thank you for your assistance!

## Region K Municipal Water Infrastructure Financing Survey

Name of Municipal WUG: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer the following questions using the list below of recommended municipal water conservation strategies and their projected unit costs that were used in developing the Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan.

	Water Management Strategy	Unit Cost (\$)
1	Supply-side conservation	not specified in plan
2	Reclaimed water	\$394 / ac-ft
3	New Pipeline to WUG	\$ 650 - \$2,400 / ac-ft
4	New Channel or Off-Channel Dam	\$750 – \$2,300 / ac-ft
5	Dredge Existing Reservoirs	\$710 – \$1217 / ac-ft
6	Aquifer Development	\$ 350 – \$2,760 / ac-ft
7	Aquifer Storage & Recovery	\$710 - \$839 / ac-ft

- Does your water utility have any current or projected infrastructure improvement needs during the 50-year planning period?    Yes\_\_\_\_\_    No\_\_\_\_\_

If **Yes** - Please list what these needs are and for what size population and/or size of commercial/industrial water use(s) (use additional sheets, if necessary):

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**February 15, 2002    Follow-Up Explanations**

**Water Infrastructure Financing Survey  
for the Political Subdivision of  
“County-Other”**



The Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group (LCRWPG) sent out surveys on or about January 18, 2002 to all political subdivisions responsible for providing additional drinking water supplies as identified in the SB1 Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan. SB1 defines “County-Other” as the county population left after removing cities with populations of 500 or more. Meeting rural “County-Other” drinking water supply needs are the responsibility of each county, whether or not that county currently owns water utilities. Region K’s Water Supply Plan has “County-Other” needs identified for Burnet, Gillespie, Hays, Llano, Travis, and Williamson counties.

**The primary objectives of this survey are:**

- to determine the number of political subdivisions that have projected infrastructure needs during the 50-year planning period in order to meet the needs of “County-Other”, but are unable to pay for these needs without some form of outside financial assistance;
- to determine how much of the infrastructure costs needed cannot be paid for solely using revenue sources currently available to the political subdivision; and,
- to determine the financing options proposed by the political subdivision to meet future water infrastructure needs (including the identification of State funding sources considered).

**Your input is crucial to completing this task successfully.** This survey is your opportunity to have your voice heard and your county’s rural water needs considered. Your participation in this survey is the only way to obtain important information for use in making financial decisions that could profoundly affect the ability of political subdivisions to provide drinking water supply services in Region K.

If you have **any** questions regarding this survey, please contact:

Bill E. Couch, AICP @ (512) 457-7774; couchb@tcbaus.com

**or**

Connie M. Hinojos @ (512) 457-7732; hinojos@tcbaus.com

**PLEASE** take a few minutes to fill out the attached survey and **RETURN** the completed survey in the POSTAGE-PAID RETURN ENVELOPE by Friday **March 15, 2002**.

Thank you for your assistance!

**3<sup>rd</sup> & Final Notice, March 18, 2002**  
**Water Infrastructure Financing Survey**  
**for the Political Subdivision of**  
**“County-Other”**



The Lower Colorado Regional Water Planning Group (LCRWPG) sent out surveys on or about January 18, 2002 to all water user groups responsible for providing additional drinking water supplies as identified in the SB1 Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan. SB1 defines “County-Other” as the county population left after removing cities with populations of 500 or more. Meeting rural “County-Other” drinking water supply needs are the responsibility of each county, regardless of whether or not that county currently owns water utilities. Region K’s Water Supply Plan has “County-Other” needs identified for Burnet, Blanco, Gillespie, Hays, Llano, Travis, and Williamson counties.

**The primary objectives of this survey are:**

- to determine if counties that have projected infrastructure needs during the 50-year planning period, in order to meet the needs of “County-Other”, are unable to pay for these needs without some form of outside financial assistance;
- to determine how much of the infrastructure costs needed cannot be paid for solely using revenue sources currently available to the county; and,
- to determine the financing options proposed by the county to meet future water infrastructure needs (including the identification of State funding sources considered).

**Your input is crucial to completing this task successfully.** This survey is your opportunity to have your voice heard and your county’s rural water needs considered. Your participation in this survey is the only way to obtain important information for use in making financial decisions that could profoundly affect the ability of political subdivisions to provide drinking water supply services in Region K.

If you have **any** questions regarding this survey, please contact:

Bill E. Couch, AICP @ (512) 457-7774; couchb@tcbaus.com

**or**

Connie M. Hinojos @ (512) 457-7732; hinojos@tcbaus.com

**PLEASE** take a few minutes to fill out the attached survey and **RETURN** the completed survey in the POSTAGE-PAID RETURN ENVELOPE by Monday **April 15, 2002.**

Thank you for your assistance!

## REGION K - WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING SURVEY

Name of County: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

WUG	County	Projected Additional Municipal Water Supply Needs (ac-ft/year)					
		2000	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050
County-Other	Burnet	880	1,103	1,417	1,652	1,686	1,779
County-Other	Llano	0	0	0	1,334	1,449	1,653
County-Other	Travis	60	66	80	7,438	7,954	8,797
County-Other	Williamson	72	103	144	178	200	215
County-Other	Hays	990	1,795	2,558	3,525	4,643	5,227
County-Other	Gillespie	507	547	617	677	887	1,013
County-Other	Blanco	24	70	119	163	183	215

Please answer the following questions using the list below of recommended municipal water supply strategies and their projected unit costs that were used in developing the Lower Colorado Regional Water Plan. **If these are not applicable** to your rural water needs, please answer the questions below using your individual experience and the water supply alternatives accessible to your county.

Water Management Strategy		Unit Cost (\$)
1	Supply-side conservation	not specified in plan
2	Reclaimed water	\$394 / ac-ft
3	New Pipeline to WUG	\$ 650 - \$2,400 / ac-ft
4	New Channel or Off-Channel Dam	\$750 - \$2,300 / ac-ft
5	Dredge Existing Reservoirs	\$710 - \$1217 / ac-ft
6	Aquifer Development	\$ 350 - \$2,760 / ac-ft
7	Aquifer Storage & Recovery	\$710 - \$839 / ac-ft

1. In order to meet "County-Other" additional water supply needs, does your county have any current or projected infrastructure improvement needs during the 50-year planning period?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If **Yes** - Please list what these water use needs are and for what size population (use additional sheets, if necessary):

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



**Definition of the State Participation Program (SPP):**

The SPP enables the 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. The TWDB may acquire ownership interests in the water rights or a co-ownership interest in the property or treatment works. Currently, the TWDB's participation is limited to a maximum of 50 percent 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. (for additional information, see the TWDB website at [http://www.twdb.state.tx.us/assistance/assistance\\_main.htm](http://www.twdb.state.tx.us/assistance/assistance_main.htm))

**APPENDIX C**  
**TWDB-REQUIRED SURVEY RESPONSE RECORD**

### Municipal Survey Response Record

Contact Name	Job Title	Municipal Entity	Street Address	City	County	State	Zip Code	Date Original Survey Mailed	Certified Mail Receipt (Y/N)	Date Follow Up Survey #1 Mailed	Certified Mail Receipt (Y/N)	Date Follow Up Survey #2 Mailed	Certified Mail Receipt (Y/N)	Date Response Received
1 Paul S. Wakefield	Manager	West Lake Hills - Travis Co. WCID #10	5450 Bee Caves Rd, Ste.A	Austin	Travis	TX	78746	1/18/02	Y		Y			1/28/02
2 Bobby Roundtree	City Manager	City of Goldthwaite	PO Box 450	Goldthwaite	Mills	TX	76844	1/18/02	Y					1/28/02
3 Michael Bamer	General Manager, Anderson Mill MUD	Anderson Mill CDP (Travis)	11500 El Salido Pky	Austin	Travis	TX	78750	1/18/02	Y					2/7/02
4 Richard Eason	-	Lakeway MUD	1097 Lohmans Crossing Rd.	Austin	Travis	TX	78734	1/18/02	Y					1/30/02
5 Tommy Collier	General Manager	Kingsland WSC	PO Box 73	Kingsland	Llano	TX	78639	1/21/02	Y					1/24/02
6 John Murchison	General Manager	Jonestown WSC	18649 RM 1431 Ste. 19-A	Jonestown	Travis	TX	78645	1/18/02	Y					2/13/02
7 Teresa Lutes	Engineer	COA -W/WV (Travis & Williamson Co.)	PO Box 1088	Austin	Travis	TX	78767	1/18/02	Y					2/25/02
8 Clovis Boatright	President	Garfield WSC (CDP Travis & Bastrop)	PO Box 1338	Del Valle	Travis	TX	78617	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y			2/20/02
9 Duane Stutver	City Commissioner Pct.3	Llano County - Other	801 Ford Street	Llano	Llano	TX	78643	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y			3/12/02
10 Kenneth Dowell	City Manager	City of Llano	301 W. Main St.	Llano	Llano	TX	78643	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y			3/25/02
11 Jim Powers	County Judge	Hays County-Other	111 E.San Antonio St., Ste.300	San Marcos	Hays	TX	78666	1/18/02	Y					1/28/02
Allen Walther	Dir. Env. Health	Hays County-Other	111 E.San Antonio St., Ste.300	San Marcos	Hays	TX	78666	1/18/02	Y					4/9/02
John Doerfler	County Judge	Williamson Cty-Other	710 Main Street	Georgetown	Williamson	TX	78626	1/18/02	Y					1/24/02
John Doerfler	County Judge	Williamson Cty-Other	710 Main Street	Georgetown	Williamson	TX	78626	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y			2/27/02
13 Elaine Wray (Sam Briscoe, Judge)	County Judge	Travis County-Other	PO Box 1748	Austin	Travis	TX	78767	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y			2/13/02
14 George Byars, Jr.	County Judge	Blanco County-Other	PO Box 471	Johnson City	Blanco	TX	78636	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	-	3/27/02
15 Mark Stroether	County Judge	Gillespie County-Other	101 West Main, Unit 9	Fredericksburg	Gillespie	TX	78624	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	Y	1/24/02
15 Martin McLean	County Judge	Burnet County-Other	220 South Pierce St.	Burnet	Burnet	TX	78611	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	-	4/4/02
16 Nathan Cantrell	Water Foreman	City of Granite Shoals	PO Box 2580	Granite Shoals	Burnet	TX	78654	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	-	4/17/02
17 Charles McCarty		City of Blanco	PO BOX 750	Blanco	Blanco	TX	78606	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	Y	
18 Joey Miller	Director of Public Wks	City of Pflugerville	PO Box 589	Pflugerville	Travis	TX	78691	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	Y	
19 Mary Galloway		Dripping Springs WSC	P Box 354	Dripping Springs	Hays	TX	78620	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	Y	
20 Don Williams	District Manager	Wells Branch MUD #1	2106 Klattenhoss	Austin	Travis	TX	78728	1/21/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	Y	No Response to Survey
21 Dale Pickens	Mayor	City of Cottonwood Shores	3915 Cottonwood Dr.	Marble Falls	Burnet	TX	78654	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	Y	
22 Envir-O-Spec	-	City of Rollingwood	403 Nixon Drive	Austin	Travis	TX	78746	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	-	
23 L.J. McBride	Water Superintendent	City of Lago Vista	PO Box 4727	Lago Vista	Travis	TX	78645	1/18/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	-	
24 Verle Theriot	Director of Public Wks	City of Marble Falls	800 3rd St.	Marble Falls	Burnet	TX	78654	1/21/02	Y	2/18/02	Y	3/18/02	-	

**APPENDIX D**  
**SURVEY RESULTS TABLES**  
**(AND TWDB-FORMATTED DATA TABLE)**

### Municipal Survey Results

Political Subdivision (Pol/Sub)	Water User Type	Response from Pol/Sub (Y/N)	Strategy Name	Strategy Date	Total Capital Cost (\$)	Does P/S have infrastructure needs? (Y/N)	Q1 (\$ Can Pay)	Q2 (\$ Can Pay W/State Participation)	Q3 (\$ Can't Pay)	Utility-Proposed Funding Options
1 Kingsland WSC	Municipal	Y	New 5 MGD WTP (currently have 1.8 MGD WTP serves 5,300 persons; projected 2050 pop. is 21,300)	currently in planning stage	\$ 5 M	Y	\$ 1 M	\$ 1 M	\$ 4 M	Rural Development; TWDB
2 City of Goldthwaite	Municipal	Y	1.) Construction of additional 340 ac-ft storage channel & additional supply line to City(\$2.4M); & 2.) Additional 10" supply line from Colorado River to storage channels (\$ .525M); 2000 Census pop = 1,800	Item 1.) currently pursuing 45% USDA-RD grant	\$ 2.925 M	Y	Item 1.) 55%	same	?	Item 1.) 55% will be funded through increased utility rates; Item 2.) will have to be postponed til financing through grants/low interest loans can be secured
3 Travis Co. WCID # 10	Municipal	Y	Supply-side conservation	-	\$ -	N	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	This is West Lake Hills
4 Lakeway MUD	Municipal	Y	this utility has sufficient revenue sources	-	-	N	-	-	-	-
5 Anderson Mill MUD	Municipal	Y	this utility has sufficient revenue sources	-	-	N	-	-	-	-
6 Jonestown WSC	Municipal	Y	current population 2,500; by 2050, pop. projected to be 5,100. Need upgrades to raw water & treated water distribution lines, additional storage facilities, additional treatment unit at one of the WTPs and an additional new WTP, including more raw water pumps.	-	-	Y	-	-	-	we do not have sufficient revenue sources to pay for improvements; at present it has been our policy to borrow from federal gov. program (RUS) for major capital improvements. Would also be interested in TWDB - SRF program.
7 Garfield WSC	Municipal	Y	Currently planning to build new 250K gallon storage tank & will drill another well. Future anticipate having increased subdivision development (~15,000 persons added) along Hwy 71E (Onion Ck to Bastrop Co.Line);	currently in planning stage	\$ 45 M	Y	-	-	-	WSC charges Equity-Buy-In fee (~\$2,600/std. connection) to pay for new infrastructure, so they should have sufficient revenue sources in the longrun; but need access to a Low Interest State Loan Program in short-term to build.
8 City of Austin	Municipal	Y	Yr 2000 pop = 760,000; Yr 2050 pop = ~1.4M. Needs include increased WTP capacity, transmission mains, pump stations, storage tanks, & distribution mains; also reclaimed water system expansions.	throughout the 50-yr planning period	\$ 5 Billion +	Y	cannot determine at this time			city revenue sources for the City Improvements Program (CIP) include voter-authorized bonds, current revenues, & interim commercial paper funding. City is interested in the State Participation Program for large-scale projects
9 City of Llano	Municipal	Y	dedicated 16" transmission lines to 3 water storage tanks, rehab tanks, 3,500 people	18 months	-	Y	-	-	-	-
10 City of Granite Shoals	Municipal	Y	new 100,000-gallon water tower; new 3-MGD WTP; new water lines	-	-	Y	unknown	-	-	-
1 Llano County	County-Other	Y	said Llano County is not a municipal water user - did not fill out survey	-	-	-	-	-	-	their County-Other need is only a contract renewal, so no need to pursue further
2 Blanco County	County-Other	Y	(1) Alternative BL5 - Purchase treated water from CLWSC & pipeline (~300 ac-ft/ capital cost ~\$ 2.9M); (2) LCRA surface water pipeline from Marble Falls (~2,000 ac-ft; capital cost ~ \$25M)	-	\$ 28 M	Y	none	none	total \$	Projects shared w/City of Blanco and/or Johnson City. Funds from: TWDB grants &/or loans; LCRA / GBRA cooperative funding agreements; Public / private coop. funding agreements; subdiv. or development capital recovery fees.
3 Burnet County	County-Other	Y	Contract Renewal: Best solution would be for LCRA to develop regional water projects to be funded by state funds and revenue bonds.	-	-	Y	none	minimal	majority	county has minimal resources through debt service; minimal county matching funds available; need a water district - the county will not be able to fund water projects.
4 Hays County (1st response)	County-Other	Y	county currently owns no utilities - need to expand service into unserved areas (next 10 yrs, 20-30K add. residents); much of Co. relies solely on GW & projections show demand exceeds aquifer yields	-	-	-	-	-	-	did not understand their role of responsibility for providing water to county-other residents - send survey again with different letter
4 Hays County (2nd response)	County-Other	Y	1) Greatest need is access to surface water sources; current pumpage of GW is exceeding recharge yield, especially in Trinity Watershed. 2) Co. needs infrastructure both large-capacity supply & subdivision lines; many sparsely-developed areas have no supply infrastructure in place.	-	-	Y	none	unknown	unknown	The County expects most of these costs to be borne by the retail providers, and ultimately the end user. The Commissioner's Court would have to decide if they would be willing to fund a % of costs. The County requests & welcomes any outside funding sources.
5 Gillespie County	County-Other	Y	Cty Judge did not think survey applied since they own no utilities - did not fill out survey	-	-	{Y}	-	-	-	did not understand their role of responsibility for providing water to county-other residents - send survey again with explanation letter
6 Williamson County (1st response)	County-Other	Y	Cty Judge wrote Williamson Cty (as a political entity unto itself) does not supply any water utilities - did not fill out survey	-	-	-	-	-	-	Cty. Judge did not understand the cty's role of responsibility for providing water to county-other residents - their need is only a contract renewal, so no need to pursue further
6 Williamson County (2nd response)	County-Other	Y	Still did not fill out survey - their County-Other need is only a contract renewal, so no need to pursue further	-	-	-	-	-	-	Cty. Judge stated that the small portion of Williamson Co. that is in Region K is either in the City of Roundrock, City of Austin, or in 1 of the MUDs in that area.
7 Travis County	County-Other	Y	Did not fill out survey - their Cty-Other need is only a contract renewal - need to pursue further	-	-	-	-	-	-	response: we are not a municipality, although we are a water user.

Region K Municipal Survey Results Summary		
1.) Total # municipal WUGs surveyed:	25	100% of surveys sent out
2.) Total # responses to date:	17	68% of surveys sent out
3.) To date, the # respondents indicating they have an infrastructure need:	10	40% of surveys sent out
4.) To date, the # respondents indicating they have an infrastructure need:	10	59% of those responding
5.) Of the respondents indicating need, # that provided some type of cost information:	5	50% of those indicating need
6.) Total 50-year projected capital cost indicated:	\$ 5,052,925,000	
7.) Dates initial & follow-up surveys were mailed: 1-18-02, 2-18-02, and 3-18-02		

**TWDB - FORMATTED IFR DATA TABLE**

County # and Name		County # and Name		County # and Name		County # and Name		Basin # and Name		Basin # and Name						
WUG_ID	WUG_NAME	WUG_RWPG	SEQ_ID	CITY_ID	WUG_COUNTY_ID	WUG_BASIN_ID	WMS_NAME	WMS_T YPE	SO_ID	SO_NAME	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
<b>Please do not alter populated fields.</b>																
1	ANDERSON MILL	110025000	K	0025	0812	227	246	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P10	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	this utility has sufficient revenue sources
2	ANDERSON MILL	110025000	K	0025	0812	246	241	12	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P10	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	this utility has sufficient revenue sources
3	AUSTIN	110045000	K	0045	0030	227	241	14	WATER CONSERVATION	4A1	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 7 below
4	AUSTIN	110045000	K	0045	0030	227	246	14	WATER REUSE	4B1	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$63,000,000	can't determine at this time	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 7 below
5	AUSTIN	110045000	K	0045	0030	246	246	14	WATER CONSERVATION	4A1	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 7 below
6	AUSTIN	110045000	K	0045	0030	246	246	14	WATER REUSE	4B1	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 7 below
7	AUSTIN	110045000	K	0045	0030	227 & 246	14	14	OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS - include increased WTP capacity, transmission mains, pump stations, storage tanks, & distribution mains; also reclaimed water system expansions.	-	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$ 5 Billion +	they cannot determine at this time	they cannot determine at this time	Yr 2000 pop = 760,000; Yr 2050 pop = ~1.4M. City revenue sources for the City Improvements Program (CIP) include voter-authorized bonds, current revenues, & interim commercial paper funding. City is interested in the State Participation Program for large-scale projects
8	BLANCO	110089000	K	0089	0060	016	18	18	PURCHASE WATER	4E3	18020	CANYON LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$2,910,000	-	-	No Response Received
9	BURNET	110132000	K	0132	0088	027	14	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	No Response Received
10	COTTONWOOD SHORES	110208000	K	0208	0850	027	14	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P1	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	No Response Received
11	DRIPPING SPRINGS	110252000	K	0252	0769	105	14	14	PURCHASE WATER	4E4	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	No Response Received
12	GARFIELD	110333000	K	0333	0774	011	14	14	PURCHASE WATER	4E1	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$20,000	50%	50%	Additional Information Available - See Response # 7 below
13	GARFIELD	110333000	K	0333	0774	227	14	14	PURCHASE WATER	4E1	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 7 below
14	GARFIELD	110333000	K	0333	0774	011 & 227	14	14	OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS build new 250K gallon storage tank & will drill another well. Future projections of increased subdivision development (~15,000 persons added) along Hwy 71E Onion Creek to Bastrop Co.Line.	-	-	-	\$45,000,000	50%	50%	Garfield WSC charges Equity-Buy-In Fee (~\$2,600/std. connection) to pay for new infrastructure, so they should have sufficient revenue sources in the longrun; but need access to a Low Interest State Loan Program in short-term to build.
15	GOLDTHWAITE	110346000	K	0346	0239	167	14	14	DREDGE RESERVOIR	4G9	14350	GOLDTHWAITE LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$100,000	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 19 below
16	GOLDTHWAITE	110346000	K	0346	0239	167	14	14	MILLS COUNTY RESERVOIR	4J2	14300	MILLS COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$4,490,000	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 19 below
17	GOLDTHWAITE	110346000	K	0346	0239	167	14	14	NEW CHANNEL DAM	4G10	14350	GOLDTHWAITE LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$2,405,000	55%	45%	Construction of additional 340 ac-ft storage channel & additional supply line to City; currently pursuing 45% USDA-RD grant; 55% will be funded through increased utility rates; Additional Information Available - See Response # 19 below
18	GOLDTHWAITE	110346000	K	0346	0239	167	14	14	NEW OFF-CHANNEL DAM	4G11	14350	GOLDTHWAITE LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$2,890,000	55%	45%	Additional Information Available - See Response # 19 below
19	GOLDTHWAITE	110346000	K	0346	0239	167	14	14	OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS Additional 10" supply line from Colorado River to storage channels.	-	-	-	\$525,000	50%	50%	project will have to be postponed if financing through grants/low interest loans can be secured; 2000 Census pop = 1,800
20	GRANITE SHOALS	110358000	K	0358	0775	027	14	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P2	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 21 below
21	GRANITE SHOALS	110358000	K	0358	0775	027	14	14	OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS new 100,000-gallon water tower; new 3-MGD WTP; new water lines	-	-	-	UNKNOW	they cannot determine at this time	they cannot determine at this time	Additional Information Available - See Response # 21 below
22	JONESTOWN	110452000	K	0452	0783	227	14	14	INCREASE SUPPLY AND RENEW CONTRACT	4P11	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 23 below
23	JONESTOWN	110452000	K	0452	0783	227	14	14	OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS Need upgrades to raw water & treated water distribution lines, additional storage facilities, additional treatment unit at one of the WTPs and an additional new WTP, including more raw water pumps.	-	-	-	UNKNOW	they cannot determine at this time	they cannot determine at this time	Current population 2,500; by 2050, pop. projected to be 5,100. We do not have sufficient revenue sources to pay for improvements; at present it has been our policy to borrow from federal gov. program (RUS) for major capital improvements. Would also be interested in TWDB - SRF program.
24	KINGSLAND	110471000	K	0471	0889	150	14	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P21	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 25 below
25	KINGSLAND	110471000	K	0471	0889	150	14	14	OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS New 5 MGD WTP	-	-	-	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000	currently have 1.8 MGD WTP serves 5,300 persons; projected 2050 pop. is 21,300; funding source - Rural Development; TWDB
26	LAGO VISTA	110496000	K	0496	0787	227	14	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P12	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	No Response Received

WUG_NAME	WUG_ID	WUG_RWPG	SEQ_ID	CITY_ID	WUG_COUNTY_ID	WUG_BASIN_ID	WMS_NAME	WMS_T YPE	SO_ID	SO_NAME	CAP_COST	Strategy	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
<b>Please do not alter populated fields.</b>																
LLANO	110532000	K	0532	0363	150	14	NEW CHANNEL DAM OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS - Dedicated 16" transmission lines to 3 water storage tanks, rehab tanks, 3,500 people	4G7	14520	LLANO LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$2,530,000	planning	50%	50%	50%	Additional Information Available - See Response # 30 below
LLANO	110532000	K	0532	0363	150	14					UNKNOWN	18 months	50%	50%	50%	
MARBLE FALLS	110561000	K	0561	0385	027	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P3	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	-	-	No Response Received
PFLUGERVILLE	110692000	K	0692	0796	227	14	AQUIFER STORAGE & RECOVERY	4N2	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$4,667,000	-	-	-	-	No Response Received
PFLUGERVILLE	110692000	K	0692	0796	227	14	COLORADO SURFACE WATER	4E6	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$44,915,000	-	-	-	-	No Response Received
PFLUGERVILLE	110692000	K	0692	0796	227	14	GROUNDWATER	4C7	16610	CARRIZO-WILCOX AQUIFER	\$25,710,000	-	-	-	-	No Response Received
ROLLINGWOOD	110768000	K	0768	0741	227	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P13	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	-	-	No Response Received
WELLS BRANCH	110949000	K	0949	0987	227	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P14	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	-	-	No Response Received
WEST LAKE HILLS	110953000	K	0953	0641	227	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P15	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	-	-	Travis Co. WCID # 10 will also do supply-side conservation; they do not have any infrastructure finance needs.
COUNTY-OTHER	110996016	K	0996	0757	016	18	PURCHASE WATER	4E3	18020	CANYON LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$0	-	-	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Response # 39 below
COUNTY-OTHER	110996016	K	0996	0757	016	18	OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS - Blanco County-Other (1) Alternative BL5 - Purchase treated water from CLWSC & pipeline (~300 ac-ft/ capital cost ~\$ 2.9M); (2) LCRA surface water pipeline from Marble Falls (~2,000 ac-ft, capital cost ~ \$25M)				\$28,000,000	planning	0%	0%	100%	Blanco County-Other projects shared w/City of Blanco and/or Johnson City. Funds from: TWDB grants &/or loans; LCRA / GBRA cooperative funding agree- ments; Public / private coop. funding agreements; subdiv. or development capital recovery fees.
COUNTY-OTHER	110996027	K	0996	0757	027	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P4	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	-	-	Contract Renewal: Best solution would be for LCRA to develop regional water projects to be funded by state funds and revenue bonds. (Blumet County has minimal resources through debt service; minimal county matching funds available; need a water district - the county will not be able to fund water projects.)
COUNTY-OTHER	110996086	K	0996	0757	086	14	AQUIFER STORAGE & RECOVERY	4N1	14999	OTHER LOCAL SUPPLY	\$8,030,000	planning	0%	0%	100%	Gillespie City Judge did not think survey applied since they own no utilities - did not fill out survey; did not understand their role of responsibility for providing water to county-other residents - send survey again with explanation letter.
COUNTY-OTHER	110996086	K	0996	0757	086	14	GROUNDWATER	4C3	08616	HICKORY AQUIFER	\$300,000	planning	0%	0%	100%	Gillespie City Judge did not think survey applied since they own no utilities - did not fill out survey; did not understand their role of responsibility for providing water to county-other residents - send survey again with explanation letter.
COUNTY-OTHER	110996105	K	0996	0757	105	14	AQUIFER RECHARGE	4G5	10511	EDWARDS-BFZ AQUIFER	\$4,555,000	planning	0%	0%	100%	Additional Information Available - See Response # 47 below
COUNTY-OTHER	110996105	K	0996	0757	105	14	PURCHASE WATER	4E5	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$2,200,000	planning	0%	0%	100%	Additional Information Available - See Response # 47 below
COUNTY-OTHER	110996105	K	0996	0757	105	14	PURCHASE WATER	4E4	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$23,610,000	planning	0%	0%	100%	Additional Information Available - See Response # 47 below
COUNTY-OTHER	110996105	K	0996	0757	105	14	PURCHASE WATER	4I2	18020	CANYON LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$15,110,000	planning	0%	0%	100%	Additional Information Available - See Response # 47 below
COUNTY-OTHER	110996105	K	0996	0757	105	14	OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS Blanco County-Other needs infrastructure both large-capacity supply & subdivision lines; many sparsely-developed areas have no supply infrastructure in place.				UNKNOWN	planning	0%	0%	100%	Greatest need is access to surface water sources; current pumpage of GW is exceeding recharge yield, especially in Trinity Watershed. The County expects most of these costs to be borne by the retail providers, and ultimately the end user. The Commissioner's Court would have to decide if they would be willing to fund a % of costs. The County requests & welcomes any outside funding sources.
COUNTY-OTHER	110996150	K	0996	0757	150	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P5	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Responses # 15-19 above
COUNTY-OTHER	110996167	K	0996	0757	167	14	MILLS COUNTY RESERVOIR	4I2	14300	MILLS COUNTY LAKE/RESERVOIR	\$0	-	-	-	-	Additional Information Available - See Responses # 15-19 above
COUNTY-OTHER	110996227	K	0996	0757	227	12	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P16	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	-	-	
COUNTY-OTHER	110996227	K	0996	0757	227	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P17	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	-	-	
COUNTY-OTHER	110996227	K	0996	0757	227	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P18	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	-	-	
COUNTY-OTHER	110996227	K	0996	0757	227	18	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P19	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	-	-	
COUNTY-OTHER	110996246	K	0996	0757	246	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P20	MWP41010	CITY OF AUSTIN	\$0	-	-	-	-	
MANUFACTURING	11001161	K	1001	1001	161	13	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P6	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	-	-	Non-Municipal Entities were not included in survey
MANUFACTURING	11001161	K	1001	1001	161	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P7	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	-	-	Non-Municipal Entities were not included in survey
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER	11002161	K	1002	1002	161	14	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P8	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	-	-	Non-Municipal Entities were not included in survey
MINING	11003161	K	1003	1003	161	15	CONTRACT RENEWAL	4P9	140B0	HIGHLAND LAKES SYSTEM	\$0	-	-	-	-	Non-Municipal Entities were not included in survey
IRRIGATION	11004045	K	1004	1004	045	13	CONTINUED RETURN FLOW UTILIZATION	4O1	14500	COLORADO ROR	\$0	-	-	-	-	Non-Municipal Entities were not included in survey
IRRIGATION	11004045	K	1004	1004	045	13	DELIVERY SYSTEM WATER CONSERVATION	4A4	14500	COLORADO ROR	\$13,000,000	-	-	-	-	Non-Municipal Entities were not included in survey
IRRIGATION	11004045	K	1004	1004	045	13	DEVELOP WATER CONSERVING RICE VARIETY	4A6	14500	COLORADO ROR	\$2,000,000	-	-	-	-	Non-Municipal Entities were not included in survey



**APPENDIX E**

**ADDENDUM : SIERRA CLUB AND CITY OF AUSTIN COMMENT LETTERS**

**LETTER FROM THE CITY OF AUSTIN:**

-----Original Message-----

From: Lutes, Teresa  
City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility  
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:22 PM

RE: Additional Information for Region K Municipal Water Infrastructure Financing Survey-  
City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility

As you know Austin provided a response to the Municipal Water Infrastructure Financing Survey for the Region K Lower Colorado Region back in February. We received a subsequent request for additional information. We have the following to add to our original response:

With a hard copy of this e-mail I will be delivering to you a copy of last year's approved Water and Wastewater Utility's approved Capital Improvements Plan to provide you with more detailed information about upcoming near-term CIP projects. Austin anticipates spending an average of approximately \$100 million per year on water, wastewater, and reclaimed water systems infrastructure capital improvement projects. Over the next 50 years Austin anticipates infrastructure capital improvements costs to exceed \$5 billion, in today's dollars. As I recall you specifically requested more information on the amount of funding the City may seek over the 50-year planning horizon if the City had access the State Participation program to help fund these utility improvements. Our original survey response indicated that we could not determine at this time what specific funding sources might be best for funding for these improvements over the 50-year planning horizon. At this time, given our credit rating and cost of capital, we would probably not seek a loan through the State's participation Program. We would instead access our own bond funds. The City of Austin will continue to explore all available funding sources as these needs develop. However, for the purposes of the survey, we understand that it would be useful for you to have a dollar amount estimate to use in the survey response tally. We understand that such an estimate would not represent an actual request for funding or commitment for future requests or any specific dollar amounts associated with any future requests. In that light, for the purposes of this survey, we feel it would be reasonable for you to use a figure of \$500 million or 10% of \$5 billion, in today's dollars, as an amount the City of Austin might seek if it had access to the State's Participation program. Austin's preference would be to receive future grant funds particularly for projects in the areas of water treatment technology and water reuse or reclamation.

We hope this additional information meets your needs. Should you require additional information or clarification, please contact Teresa Lutes at 972-0179.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide input via this survey.

**APPENDIX F**  
**ACTUAL SURVEY RESPONSES RECEIVED**  
**(Xerox copies of completed survey forms)**