



# **Chapter 9**

## **Report to Legislature on Water Infrastructure Funding Recommendations**

## 9.1 Introduction

The TWDB and Legislative Action governing the regional water planning process require that an Infrastructure Financing Report (IFR) be incorporated into the 2011 Regional Water Plan. In order to meet this requirement, each regional water planning group is required to examine the funding needed to implement the water management strategies and projects identified and recommended in the region's 2011 Regional Water Plan.

## 9.2 Objectives of the Infrastructure Financing Report

The objectives of the IFR area as follow:

- 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 PWPA, all municipal water user groups having identified water needs and recommended water management strategies in the regional plan with an associated cost were surveyed using the questionnaire provided by the TWDB to the region on March 24, 2010. These surveys are included in this chapter. For individual cities, the survey was mailed to the mayor, city manager, or utility manager as deemed appropriate by the Panhandle Water Planning Group (PWPG) Chairman. Surveys were mailed, along with supporting documentation that summarized the regional water planning process, the purpose of the IFR survey, and the water management strategies included in the Initially Prepared Plan (IPP) for the respective entity. Follow up phone contact was made with each political subdivision contacted that did not respond to the survey by the due date. Those entities that had still not responded were mailed a second IFR survey packet to ensure that they had the document readily accessible.

## 9.4 Survey Responses

The PWPG mailed survey packages to multiple municipal water user groups and wholesale providers and received a 100% response rate. Copies of the completed surveys and related documentation are included in this chapter. As shown in Table 9-1, the responses represent the vast majority of the capital costs associated with water management strategies included in the plan. Since almost all other strategies are targeted at individual owners or operators, no capital costs were calculated for these mostly agricultural entities. Of the responses, the surveys show that \$703,451,200 in projects are included to meet projected municipal water deficits in the next 50 years. (Note: Borger's strategy to purchase additional water from CRMWA was removed for the final plan.) The majority of these projects are projected to be needed in the next 10 years. The TWDB survey form for the 2011 Regional Water Plan no longer identifies the percentages of these funds anticipated to be sought in the form of bonds or State and Federal programs as was

done in previous planning cycles. However, with respect to the role the State in financing recommended water supply projects, the PWPG recommends that the Legislature provide adequate funding for the implementation of water management strategies in the plan as local capacity to generate funds for large scale projects continues to be restricted.

**Table 9-1: Municipal Water User Groups with Shortages**

Entity	County	Project	Amount	Construction Year
Amarillo	Potter/Randall	Roberts County Well Field	\$287,377,200.00	2040
Amarillo	Potter/Randall	Potter County Well Field	\$128,511,300.00	2011
Borger	Hutchinson	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$850,000.00	2012
Cactus	Moore	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$10,893,400.00	2011
CRMWA	Hutchinson	Roberts County Well Field	\$21,824,000.00	2010
CRMWA	Hutchinson	Roberts County Water Rights*	\$88,200,000.00	2015
Canyon	Randall	Drill Additional Groundwater Well*	\$9,528,800.00	2015
Dumas	Moore	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$7,997,200.00	2015
Fritch	Hutchinson	Purchase infrastructure	\$2,850,300	2010
Fritch	Hutchinson	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$1,156,600	2020
Greenbelt	Collingsworth	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$1,865,900.00	2012
Gruver	Hansford	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$1,968,500.00	2020
Lefors	Gray	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$1,132,500.00	2015
Memphis	Hall	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$1,042,100.00	2013
PDRA	Ochiltree	Palo Duro Reservoir	\$114,730,000.00	2030
Pampa	Gray	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$1,731,100	2010
Panhandle	Carson	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$3,309,300.00	2020
Perryton	Ochiltree	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$7,087,000.00	2012
Spearman	Hansford	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$3,862,000.00	2020
Sunray	Moore	Groundwater Well/Storage Basin	\$3,121,300.00	2015
Texline	Dallam	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$2,304,000.00	2020
Wheeler	Wheeler	Drill Additional Groundwater Well	\$2,108,700.00	2020
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$703,451,200.00</b>	
*Notes Project Differs From Original Issuance of Survey				

**SAMPLE SURVEY & INFORMATION PACKET TO OBTAIN:  
INFRASTRUCTUE FINANCING INFORMATION FROM  
POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS WITH NEEDS**

**COMPLETED 2010 IFR SURVEYS FOR THE:  
PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP**