

Attachment 3
Changes to Appendix E - Strategy Evaluation Matrix

DRAFT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX E
STRATEGY EVALUATION MATRIX AND QUANTIFIED
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT MATRIX

Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin	Strategy	Environmental Factors															
					Acres Impacted	Wetland Acres Impacted	Acres Impacted Score	Environmental Water Needs Impact	Environmental Water Needs Score	Habitat Impact	Habitat Score	Potential Number of Threatened and Endangered Species Impacted	Threatened and Endangered Species Score	Cultural Resources Impact	Cultural Resources Score	Bays & Estuaries Impact	Bays & Estuaries Score	Environmental Water Quality Impact	Environmental Water Quality Score	Overall Environmental Impacts Score
Tom Green County FWSD 3	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Upper Colorado River Authority	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Subordination	0	N/A	5	Low	3	Low	3	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	Low	3	4
Irrigation	Upton	Upton	Colorado, Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
McCamey	Upton	Upton	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Mining	Upton	Upton	Colorado, Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Rankin	Upton	Upton	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Barstow	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Grandfalls	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Develop Pecos Valley Aquifer Supplies	21	N/A	4	Low	3	Low	3	11	3	Low	3	None	5	Low	3	3
Grandfalls	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Grandfalls	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Purchase from Provider (CRMWD)	0	N/A	5	Low	3	Low	3	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	Low	3	4
Irrigation	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Irrigation	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Weather Modification	0	N/A	5	Positive	5	Low	3	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Mining	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Monahans	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Southwest Sandhills WSC	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Wickett	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Irrigation	Winkler	Winkler	Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Kermit	Winkler	Winkler	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Mining	Winkler	Winkler	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4
Wink	Winkler	Winkler	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	0	N/A	5	None	4	None	4	N/A	5	N/A	4	None	5	None	4	4

DRAFT

Table E-2
Water Management Strategy Evaluation Matrix

Name(s)	Name	Name	Name	Name			#	Unmet Needs				High, Medium, Low	\$		High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low							
Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin Used	Strategy	Recommended or Alternative	Strategy Type	Quantity (Ac-Ft/Yr)	2070	Maximum Need (Ac-Ft/Yr)	Percentage of Max Need Met	Quantity Score	Reliability	Cost (\$/Ac-Ft)	Cost Score	Impacts of Strategy on:					Overall Score (5-45)	Implementation Issues	Comments			
														Environmental Factors	Agricultural Resources/Rural Areas	Other Natural Resources	Key Water Quality Parameters	Third Party Social & Economic Factors							
Andrews	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies	Alternative	Groundwater Development	2,600	2,800	2,800	93%	4	3	\$891	3	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	The City can pursue this strategy independently but cannot receive state funding to do so due to modeled availability constraints		
Andrews	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado	Develop Ogallala Aquifer Supplies	Alternative	Groundwater Development	2,810	2,800	2,800	100%	5	3	\$496	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	32	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	The City can pursue this strategy independently but cannot receive state funding to do so due to modeled availability constraints		
Andrews	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	150	2,800	2,800	5%	1	3	\$952	3	4	4	4	4	3	5	27	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
County-Other	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado, Rio Grande	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies	Alternative	Groundwater Development	250	275	275	91%	4	3	\$252	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	31	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	This entity can pursue this strategy independently but cannot receive state funding to do so due to modeled availability constraints		
County-Other	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado, Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	21	275	275	8%	1	3	\$1,080	2	4	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Irrigation	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado, Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	2,037	10,134	10,134	20%	1	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Livestock	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies	Alternative	Groundwater Development	60	60	60	100%	4	3	\$433	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	31	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	This entity can pursue this strategy independently but cannot receive state funding to do so due to modeled availability constraints		
Manufacturing	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies	Alternative	Groundwater Development	210	209	209	100%	5	3	\$243	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	32	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	This entity can pursue this strategy independently but cannot receive state funding to do so due to modeled availability constraints		
Mining	Andrews	Andrews	Colorado, Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	277	0	1,186	23%	1	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	4	3	5	25	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Great Plains*	Andrews, Gaines	Andrews, Gaines	Colorado, Rio Grande	Develop Ogallala Aquifer Supplies	Alternative	Groundwater Development	200	182	182	110%	5	3	\$190	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	32	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	This entity can pursue this strategy independently but cannot receive state funding to do so due to modeled availability constraints		
Irrigation	Borden	Borden	Brazos	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	295	282	282	105%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Mining	Borden	Borden	Brazos	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	39	0	0	101%	5	1	\$1,117	2	4	4	4	4	3	5	28	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Bangs	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	8	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,221	2	4	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
BCWID #1*	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Brush Control	Recommended	Regional	400	0	0	101%	5	2	\$390	4	3	4	4	2	3	5	28	Brush control is an on-going process that must be continually maintained in order to receive benefits	No attributed water savings, but it is assumed that surface water supplies gained through subordination will be more reliable		
BCWID #1*	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Develop Groundwater Supplies in Brown County	Alternative	Groundwater Development	806	0	0	101%	5	3	\$12,553	1	3	4	4	3	5	27	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production and water quality	Additional study will be needed once a more specific location for this strategy has been selected			
BCWID #1a (non-allocated)	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	5,570	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	33				
Brookesmith SUD	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	25	0	0	101%	5	3	\$705	3	4	4	4	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Brookesmith SUD	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Water Audits and Leak Repairs	Recommended	Conservation	80	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,509	2	4	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Brownwood	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	91	0	0	101%	5	3	\$937	3	4	4	4	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Early	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	9	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,176	2	4	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Irrigation	Brown	Brown	Colorado, Brazos	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	650	1,711	1,713	38%	3	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Mining	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Develop Cross Timbers Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	210	263	268	78%	4	3	\$948	3	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production			
Mining	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	67	263	268	25%	1	1	\$654	3	4	4	4	4	3	5	25	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Zephyr WSC	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	13	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,091	2	4	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Zephyr WSC	Brown	Brown	Colorado	Water Audits and Leak Repairs	Recommended	Conservation	19	0	0	101%	5	3	\$3,498	2	4	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Bronte	Coke	Runnels	Colorado	Develop Other Aquifer Supplies in Runnels County	Alternative	Groundwater Development	75	207	212	35%	3	3	\$2,787	2	3	4	4	4	3	5	27	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production			
Bronte	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Develop Other Aquifer Supplies in Southwest Coke County	Recommended	Groundwater Development	800	207	212	377%	5	3	\$2,424	2	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production			
Bronte	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	207	212	1%	1	3	\$1,647	2	4	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.		
Bronte	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Rehabilitate Oak Creek Pipeline	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	450	207	212	212%	5	5	\$1,748	2	4	4	4	4	4	5	33				
Bronte	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	446	207	448	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	32				
Bronte	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Water Treatment Plant Expansion	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	800	207	212	377%	5	3	\$1,720	2	4	4	4	4	4	5	31				

Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin Used	Strategy	Recommended or Alternative	Strategy Type	Quantity (Ac-Ft/Yr)	2070	Maximum Need (Ac-Ft/Yr)	Percentage of Max Need Met	Quantity Score	Reliability	Cost (\$/Ac-Ft)	Cost Score	Impacts of Strategy on:					Overall Score (5-45)	Implementation Issues	Comments
															Environmental Factors	Agricultural Resources/Rural Areas	Other Natural Resources	Key Water Quality Parameters	Third Party Social & Economic Factors			
Irrigation	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	83	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	20	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Oak Creek (non-allocated)	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	1,025	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Robert Lee Bronte	Coke	Nolan	Colorado	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies in Nolan County	Alternative	Groundwater Development	178	0	237	32%	3	3	\$3,756	2	3	4	4	3	5	27	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Robert Lee	Coke	Tom Green	Colorado	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies in Tom Green County	Alternative	Groundwater Development	75	230	237	32%	3	3	\$4,293	2	3	4	4	3	5	27	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Robert Lee	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	230	237	1%	1	3	\$1,672	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Robert Lee	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Purchase from Provider (Bronte)	Recommended	Purchase from Provider	80	230	237	34%	3	5	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	4	32		
Robert Lee	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Repair and Expand Water Treatment Plant	Alternative	Expanded Use of Supply	335	230	237	141%	5	5	\$2,657	2	4	4	4	TBD	5	29	Financing	1 mgd treatment expansion and new storage tank
Robert Lee	Coke	Coke	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	159	230	237	67%	3	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	31		
Bronte, Ballinger, Winters, Robert Lee ^a	Coke, Runnels	Coke, Runnels	Colorado	Regional System from Lake Brownwood	Alternative	Regional	2,802	641	675	415%	5	3	\$3,904	2	3	4	4	3	3	27	Still would need to reach an agreement with Brownwood and partners.	
Bronte, Ballinger, Winters, Robert Lee ^a	Coke, Runnels	Coke, Runnels	Colorado	Regional System from Lake Fort Phantom Hill	Alternative	Regional	1,155	641	675	171%	5	3	\$7,606	1	3	4	4	3	3	26	Still would need to reach an agreement with Brownwood and partners.	
Coleman	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	15	792	821	2%	1	3	\$1,065	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Coleman	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	1,319	792	821	161%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Coleman	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Water Audits and Leak Repairs	Recommended	Conservation	59	792	821	7%	1	3	\$1,282	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Coleman County SUD	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	9	169	181	5%	1	3	\$1,144	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Coleman County SUD	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	227	169	181	125%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
County-Other	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	1	21	24	4%	1	3	\$5,095	1	4	4	4	3	5	25	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
County-Other	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	24	21	24	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Irrigation	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	47	396	396	12%	1	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	400	396	396	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	5	4	3	5	34		
Manufacturing	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	2	2	2	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Mining	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	5	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Santa Anna	Coleman	Coleman	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	4	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,623	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
County-Other	Concho	Concho	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,836	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Eden	Concho	Concho	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	4	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,541	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Concho	Concho	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	539	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Concho	Concho	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	20	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Crane	Crane	Crane	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	14	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,120	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Crane	Crane	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	36	0	0	101%	5	1	\$1,173	2	4	4	4	3	5	28	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Crockett County WCID 1	Crockett	Crockett	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	13	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,106	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Crockett	Crockett	Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	20	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Crockett	Crockett	Rio Grande	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	1	0	0	101%	5	1	\$0.47	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Mining	Crockett	Crockett	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	315	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
County-Other (Future Sales)	Ector	Ector	Colorado, Rio Grande	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	2,500	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		

Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin Used	Strategy	Recommended or Alternative	Strategy Type	Quantity (Ac-Ft/Yr)	2070	Maximum Need (Ac-Ft/Yr)	Percentage of Max Need Met	Quantity Score	Reliability	Cost (\$/Ac-Ft)	Cost Score	Impacts of Strategy on:					Overall Score (5-45)	Implementation Issues	Comments
															Environmental Factors	Agricultural Resources/Rural Areas	Other Natural Resources	Key Water Quality Parameters	Third Party Social & Economic Factors			
Ector County Utility District	Ector	Ector	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	149	1,097	1,097	14%	1	3	\$292	4	4	4	4	3	5	28	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Ector County Utility District	Ector	Ector	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	1,097	1,097	1,097	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Irrigation	Ector	Ector	Colorado, Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	113	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Ector	Ector	Colorado, Rio Grande	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	449	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	5	4	3	5	34		
Manufacturing	Ector	Ector	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	551	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Mining	Ector	Ector	Colorado, Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	30	0	0	101%	5	1	\$733	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Odessa ^a	Ector	Ward	Colorado	Develop Capitan Reef Complex Aquifer Supplies in Ward County	Alternative	Groundwater Development	8,400	20,676	20,676	41%	3	3	\$2,175	2	3	4	4	3	5	27	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Odessa ^a	Ector	Pecos	Colorado	Develop Pecos Valley/Edwards-Trinity and Capitan Reef Complex in Pecos County	Alternative	Groundwater Development	28,000	20,676	20,676	135%	5	3	\$3,249	2	3	4	4	3	5	29	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Odessa ^a	Ector	Ector	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	990	20,676	20,676	5%	1	3	\$440	4	4	4	4	3	5	28	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Odessa ^a	Ector	Ector	Colorado	RO Treatment of Existing Supplies	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	15,960	20,676	20,676	77%	4	N/A	\$1,111	2	4	4	3	3	5	25		
Odessa ^a	Ector	Ector	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	11,493	20,676	20,676	56%	3	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	31		
Odessa ^a (Future Sales)	Ector	Ector	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	3,930	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Steam Electric Power	Ector	Ector	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	316	316	316	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Greater Gardendale WSC	Ector, Midland	Ector, Midland	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	20	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,108	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Greater Gardendale WSC	Ector, Midland	Ector, Midland	Colorado	Purchase from Provider (Midland FWSD)	Alternative	Purchase from Provider	445	0	0	101%	5	5	\$2,355	2	3	4	4	3	4	30		
Greater Gardendale WSC	Ector, Midland	Ector, Midland	Colorado	Purchase from Provider (Odessa)	Recommended	Purchase from Provider	445	0	0	101%	5	5	\$3,730	2	3	4	4	3	4	30		
Irrigation	Glasscock	Glasscock	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	2,050	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Glasscock	Glasscock	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	248	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Big Spring	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	140	1,785	1,785	8%	1	3	\$557	3	4	4	4	3	5	27	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Big Spring	Howard	Howard	Colorado	New Water Treatment Plant	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	11,210	1,785	1,785	628%	5	5	\$1,128	2	4	4	4	4	5	33		
Big Spring	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	1,785	1,785	1,785	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Coahoma	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	8	152	152	5%	1	3	\$1,222	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Coahoma	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	152	152	152	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Irrigation	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	757	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Manufacturing	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	424	424	424	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Manufacturing (Future Sales)	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	500	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Mining	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	143	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Steam Electric Power	Howard	Howard	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	59	45	45	131%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Irrigation	Irion	Irion	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	158	507	507	31%	3	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Irion	Irion	Colorado	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	202	507	507	40%	3	1	\$0.21	4	4	5	4	4	5	30	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Mertzon	Irion	Irion	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,886	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Irion	Irion	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	322	0	1,766	18%	1	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	25	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Kimble	Kimble	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	319	1,103	1,103	29%	3	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Junction	Kimble	Kimble	Colorado	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	370	604	626	59%	3	3	\$1,573	2	3	4	4	3	5	27	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	

Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin Used	Strategy	Recommended or Alternative	Strategy Type	Quantity (Ac-Ft/Yr)	2070	Maximum Need (Ac-Ft/Yr)	Percentage of Max Need Met	Quantity Score	Reliability	Cost (\$/Ac-Ft)	Cost Score	Impacts of Strategy on:					Overall Score (5-45)	Implementation Issues	Comments
															Environmental Factors	Agricultural Resources/Rural Areas	Other Natural Resources	Key Water Quality Parameters	Third Party Social & Economic Factors			
Junction	Kimble	Kimble	Colorado	Dredging River Intake	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	250	604	626	40%	3	N/A	\$2,388	2	4	4	2	4	5	24	This strategy assumes that the dredged material is relatively clean. If contamination is found, a suitable disposal site will need to be identified.	A suitable location for disposal of the dredged material must be found.
Junction	Kimble	Kimble	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	8	604	626	1%	1	3	\$1,206	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Junction	Kimble	Kimble	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	250	604	626	40%	3	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	31		
Manufacturing	Kimble	Kimble	Colorado	Develop Ellenburger San Saba Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	500	704	704	71%	3	3	\$274	4	3	4	4	3	5	29	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Manufacturing	Kimble	Kimble	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	228	704	704	32%	3	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	31		
Mining	Kimble	Kimble	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	1	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Loving	Loving	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	525	1,000	3,906	13%	1	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	25	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Martin	Martin	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	5,474	4,882	4,882	112%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Martin	Martin	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	302	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Stanton	Martin	Martin	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	11	90	90	12%	1	3	\$1,199	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Stanton	Martin	Martin	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	90	90	90	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Irrigation	Mason	Mason	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	745	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mason	Mason	Mason	Colorado	Additional Treatment	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	700	676	700	100%	4	3	\$856	3	4	4	3	3	5	29		
Mason	Mason	Mason	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	7	676	700	1%	1	3	\$1,278	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Mason	Mason	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	43	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Brady	McCulloch	McCulloch	Colorado	Advanced Groundwater Treatment	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	1,200	1,414	1,420	85%	4	5	\$2,069	2	4	4	3	4	4	30	Possible public resistance to reuse of water	Adequate monitoring and oversight will be required to protect public health and safety
Brady	McCulloch	McCulloch	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	19	1,414	1,420	1%	1	3	\$988	3	4	4	4	3	5	27	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Brady	McCulloch	McCulloch	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	841	1,414	1,420	59%	3	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	31		
Brady Creek (non-allocated)	McCulloch	McCulloch	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	1,109	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Irrigation	McCulloch	McCulloch	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	349	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	McCulloch	McCulloch	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	375	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Richland SUD	McCulloch	McCulloch	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,712	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Menard	Menard	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	549	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Menard	Menard	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	537	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	5	4	3	5	34		
Menard	Menard	Menard	Colorado	Develop Alluvial Well Supplies/Purchase Supplies from Irrigation, Menard	Recommended	Groundwater Development	1,000	196	211	474%	5	3	\$1,741	2	3	4	4	3	5	29		
Menard	Menard	Menard	Colorado	Develop Hickory Aquifer Supplies	Alternative	Groundwater Development	200	196	211	95%	4	3	\$1,320	2	3	4	4	3	5	28	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	This strategy assumes that the water will meet primary drinking standards once blended with City's existing supply
Menard	Menard	Menard	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	5	196	211	2%	1	3	\$1,442	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Menard	Menard	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	46	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Airline Mobile Home Park	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	10	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,263	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
County-Other	Midland	Winkler	Colorado	Develop Pecos Valley Aquifer Supplies from Winkler County	Recommended	Groundwater Development	2,800	0	0	101%	5	3	\$738	3	4	4	4	3	5	31	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Greenwood Water	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	5	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,716	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	2,716	0	1	271600%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	8	0	1	800%	5	3	\$0	5	4	5	4	3	5	34		
Midland*	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Advanced RO Treatment, Expanded Use of Paul Davis Well Field	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	6,327	18,663	18,663	34%	3	3	\$1,656	2	4	4	3	4	4	27		

Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin Used	Strategy	Recommended or Alternative	Strategy Type	Quantity (Ac-Ft/Yr)	2070	Maximum Need (Ac-Ft/Yr)	Percentage of Max Need Met	Quantity Score	Reliability	Cost (\$/Ac-Ft)	Cost Score	Impacts of Strategy on:					Overall Score (5-45)	Implementation Issues	Comments
															Environmental Factors	Agricultural Resources/Rural Areas	Other Natural Resources	Key Water Quality Parameters	Third Party Social & Economic Factors			
Midland ^a	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	1,012	18,663	18,663	5%	1	3	\$436	4	4	4	4	3	5	28	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Midland ^a	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Purchase from Provider (CRMWD)	Alternative	Purchase from Provider	4,000	18,663	18,663	21%	1	5	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	4	30		
Midland ^a	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	2,173	18,663	18,663	12%	1	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	29		
Midland ^a	Multiple	Multiple	Colorado, Rio Grande	West Texas Water Partnership	Recommended	Regional	15,000	18,663	18,663	80%	4	3	\$1,783	2	2	4	4	2	3	24	Follow up discussions will be conducted to explore necessary methodologies and agreements to implement this cooperative use strategy.	Additional study will be needed once a more specific details for this strategy have been determined.
Midland ^a	Multiple	Multiple	Colorado, Rio Grande	West Texas Water Partnership	Alternative	Regional	15,000	18,663	18,663	80%	4	3	\$1,165	2	3	4	4	2	3	25	Follow up discussions will be conducted to explore necessary methodologies and agreements to implement this cooperative use strategy.	Additional study will be needed once a more specific details for this strategy have been determined.
Mining	Midland	Midland	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	445	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Colorado City	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Develop Dockum Aquifer Supplies	Alternative	Groundwater Development	170	183	183	93%	4	3	\$1,824	2	3	4	4	3	5	28	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	This is not a recommended strategy due to DFC and MAG limits
Colorado City	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	19	183	183	10%	1	3	\$1,054	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	256	1,482	1,858	14%	1	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Lake Colorado City (non-allocated)	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	1,800	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Loraine	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	2	0	0	101%	5	3	\$2,138	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	31	0	0	101%	5	1	\$970	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mitchell County Utility	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	6	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,407	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Steam Electric Power	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Indirect Non-Potable Reuse (Sales from Colorado City)	Recommended	Reuse	500	10,326	10,326	5%	1	5	\$1,428	2	3	4	3	4	4	26		
Steam Electric Power	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	1,170	10,326	10,326	11%	1	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	29		
CRMWD ^a	Multiple	Winkler	Colorado	Develop Additional Groundwater Supplies in Reeves, Pecos, Ward, and Winkler Co.	Alternative	Groundwater Development	10,000	25,464	25,464	39%	3	5	\$1,348	2	3	4	4	3	3	27		Additional study will be needed once a more specific location for this strategy has been selected.
CRMWD ^a	Multiple	Ward, Winkler	Colorado	Expand Ward County Well Field and Develop Winkler County Well Field	Recommended	Groundwater Development	22,400	25,464	25,464	88%	4	5	\$849	3	3	3	4	3	3	28		
CRMWD ^a	Multiple	Multiple	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	25,351	25,464	25,464	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
CRMWD ^a	Multiple	Ward	Colorado	Ward County Well Field Well Replacement	Recommended	Groundwater Development	10,343	25,464	25,464	41%	3	5	\$102	4	3	4	4	3	3	29		
CRMWD ^a (non-allocated)	Multiple	Multiple	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	19,913	25,464	25,464	78%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
UCRA	Multiple	Multiple	Colorado	Brush Control	Recommended	Regional	60	0	0	101%	5	2	\$850	3	3	4	2	3	5	27	Brush control is an on-going process that must be continually maintained in order to receive benefits	No attributed water savings, but it is assumed that surface water supplies gained through subordination will be more reliable
Fort Stockton	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	48	0	0	101%	5	3	\$484	4	4	4	4	3	5	32	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Iraan	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	5	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,501	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	21,502	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	106	0	0	101%	5	1	\$5.45	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Mining	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Develop Additional Pecos Valley Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	3,000	0	3,500	86%	4	3	\$164	4	4	4	4	3	5	31		
Mining	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	539	0	3,500	15%	1	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	25	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Pecos County Fresh Water	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,985	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Pecos County WCID #1	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	250	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,224	2	3	4	4	3	5	29	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Pecos County WCID #1	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Replacement of Transmission Pipeline	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	750	0	0	101%	5	5	\$2,767	2	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Pecos WCID	Pecos	Pecos	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	12	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,166	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Big Lake	Reagan	Reagan	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	14	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,139	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Reagan	Reagan	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3,305	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Reagan	Reagan	Colorado	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	1,869	0	0	101%	5	1	\$0.19	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	

Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin Used	Strategy	Recommended or Alternative	Strategy Type	Quantity (Ac-Ft/Yr)	2070	Maximum Need (Ac-Ft/Yr)	Percentage of Max Need Met	Quantity Score	Reliability	Cost (\$/Ac-Ft)	Cost Score	Impacts of Strategy on:					Overall Score (5-45)	Implementation Issues	Comments
															Environmental Factors	Agricultural Resources/Rural Areas	Other Natural Resources	Key Water Quality Parameters	Third Party Social & Economic Factors			
Mining	Reagan	Reagan	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	445	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Balmorhea	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	150	147	147	102%	5	3	\$1,053	2	3	4	4	3	5	29	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Balmorhea	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	2	147	147	1%	1	3	\$2,472	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	8,841	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	326	0	0	101%	5	1	\$1.13	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Madera Valley WSC	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	6	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,425	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Develop Pecos Valley Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	10,400	4,000	10,400	100%	4	3	\$173	4	3	4	4	3	5	30	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Mining	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	882	4,000	10,400	8%	1	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	25	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Pecos	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Advanced Water Treatment Plant	Recommended	Expanded Use of Supply	3,360	0	0	101%	5	3	\$754	3	3	4	4	4	5	31		
Pecos	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Direct Non-Potable Reuse	Recommended	Reuse	560	0	0	101%	5	5	\$1,286	2	3	4	3	4	4	30		
Pecos	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Direct Potable Reuse	Recommended	Reuse	925	0	0	101%	5	5	\$4,961	2	3	4	3	4	4	30		
Pecos	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Indirect Potable Reuse with Aquifer Storage and Recovery	Alternative	Reuse	695	0	0	101%	5	3	\$6,790	1	3	4	4	3	5	28	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production.	
Pecos	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	35	0	0	101%	5	3	\$607	3	4	4	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Pecos	Reeves	Reeves	Rio Grande	Partner with Madera Valley WSC, Expand Pecos Valley Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	8,960	0	0	101%	5	3	\$427	4	3	4	4	3	5	31		
Ballinger	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	12	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,107	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Ballinger	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	794	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
County-Other	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	2	19	23	9%	1	3	\$1,953	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
County-Other	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	23	19	23	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Irrigation	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	373	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Miles	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	48	48	6%	1	3	\$1,730	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	11	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
North Runnels WSC	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	4	156	162	2%	1	3	\$1,407	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
North Runnels WSC	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	89	156	162	55%	3	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	31		
Winters	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	17	204	226	8%	1	3	\$1,191	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Winters	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Purchase from Provider (Abilene)	Recommended	Purchase from Provider	212	204	226	94%	4	5	\$668	3	3	4	4	3	4	30		
Winters	Runnels	Runnels	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	100	204	226	44%	3	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	31		
El Dorado	Schleicher	Schleicher	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	6	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,283	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Schleicher	Schleicher	Colorado, Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	109	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Schleicher	Schleicher	Colorado, Rio Grande	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	275	0	0	101%	5	1	\$0.23	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Mining	Schleicher	Schleicher	Colorado, Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	31	0	0	101%	5	1	\$903	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
County-Other	Scurry	Scurry	Colorado, Brazos	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	30	692	692	4%	1	3	\$863	3	4	4	4	3	5	27	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
County-Other	Scurry	Scurry	Colorado, Brazos	Purchase from Provider (Snyder)	Recommended	Purchase from Provider	607	692	692	88%	4	5	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	4	33		
County-Other	Scurry	Scurry	Colorado, Brazos	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	85	692	692	12%	1	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	29		
Irrigation	Scurry	Scurry	Colorado, Brazos	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	983	6,563	6,565	15%	1	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.

Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin Used	Strategy	Recommended or Alternative	Strategy Type	Quantity (Ac-Ft/Yr)	2070	Maximum Need (Ac-Ft/Yr)	Percentage of Max Need Met	Quantity Score	Reliability	Cost (\$/Ac-Ft)	Cost Score	Impacts of Strategy on:					Overall Score (5-45)	Implementation Issues	Comments
															Environmental Factors	Agricultural Resources/Rural Areas	Other Natural Resources	Key Water Quality Parameters	Third Party Social & Economic Factors			
Manufacturing	Scurry	Scurry	Colorado	Develop Dockum Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	160	156	156	103%	5	3	\$356	4	4	4	4	3	5	32	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Mining	Scurry	Scurry	Colorado, Brazos	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	34	144	419	8%	1	1	\$1,617	2	4	4	4	3	5	24	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Snyder	Scurry	Scurry	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	93	814	814	11%	1	3	\$957	3	4	4	4	3	5	27	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Snyder	Scurry	Scurry	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	814	814	814	100%	4	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	32		
Irrigation	Sterling	Sterling	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	135	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Sterling	Sterling	Colorado	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	48	0	0	101%	5	1	\$0.39	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Mining	Sterling	Sterling	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	40	0	0	101%	5	1	\$931	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Sterling City	Sterling	Sterling	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,759	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Sutton	Sutton	Colorado, Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	168	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Sutton	Sutton	Colorado, Rio Grande	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	34	0	0	101%	5	1	\$0.45	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Mining	Sutton	Sutton	Colorado, Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	32	0	0	101%	5	1	\$1,595	2	4	4	4	3	5	28	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Sonora	Sutton	Sutton	Rio Grande	Develop Additional Edwards-Trinity Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	35	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,000	3	3	4	4	3	5	30		
Sonora	Sutton	Sutton	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	10	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,187	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Sonora	Sutton	Sutton	Colorado	Water Audits and Leak Repairs	Recommended	Conservation	118	0	0	101%	5	3	\$451	4	4	4	4	3	5	32	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Concho Rural Water	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	24	13	13	185%	5	3	\$894	3	4	4	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Concho Rural Water	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Purchase from Provider (UCRA)	Recommended	Purchase from Provider	50	13	13	385%	5	5	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	4	34		
County-Other	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	70	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
DADS Supported Living Center	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	1	0	0	101%	5	3	\$4,116	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Goodfellow Air Force Base	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	11	345	345	3%	1	3	\$1,222	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Goodfellow Air Force Base	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	44	345	345	13%	1	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	29		
Irrigation	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	5,099	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	2,007	0	0	101%	5	1	\$0.44	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Manufacturing	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	37	215	215	17%	1	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	29		
Millersview-Doole WSC	Tom Green	Concho	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	15	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,088	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Millersview-Doole WSC	Tom Green	Concho	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	62	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Millersview-Doole WSC	Tom Green	Coleman	Colorado	Water Audits and Leak Repairs	Recommended	Conservation	68	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,045	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	49	0	0	101%	5	1	\$792	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
San Angelo ^a	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Brush Control	Recommended	Regional	90	13,097	13,097	1%	1	2	\$489	4	3	4	2	3	5	24	Brush control is an on-going process that must be continually maintained in order to receive benefits	No attributed water savings, but it is assumed that surface water supplies gained through subordination will be more reliable
San Angelo ^a	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Desalination of Brackish Groundwater	Alternative	Desalination	11,210	13,097	13,097	86%	4	3	\$1,062	2	4	4	3	3	5	28		
San Angelo ^a	Tom Green	Schleicher	Colorado	Develop Edwards-Trinity Plateau Aquifer Supplies in Schleicher County	Alternative	Groundwater Development	4,500	13,097	13,097	34%	3	3	\$1,800	2	3	4	4	3	5	27	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
San Angelo ^a	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Develop Hickory Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	3,040	13,097	13,097	23%	1	5	\$2,321	2	3	4	4	3	5	27	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
San Angelo ^a	Tom Green	Pecos	Colorado	Develop Pecos Valley/Edwards Trinity in Pecos County	Alternative	Groundwater Development	10,800	13,097	13,097	82%	4	3	\$2,604	2	3	4	4	3	5	28		The necessary infrastructure to move water from Pecos County to Tom Green County will be expensive
San Angelo ^a	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Concho River Water Project (Indirect Potable Reuse)	Recommended	Reuse	8,400	13,097	13,097	64%	3	5	\$1,250	2	3	4	3	4	2	26	Possible public resistance to reuse of water.	Adequate monitoring and oversight will be required to protect public health and safety.
San Angelo ^a	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	668	13,097	13,097	5%	1	3	\$448	4	4	4	4	3	5	28	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.

Entity	Entity County	Project County	Basin Used	Strategy	Recommended or Alternative	Strategy Type	Quantity (Ac-Ft/Yr)	2070	Maximum Need (Ac-Ft/Yr)	Percentage of Max Need Met	Quantity Score	Reliability	Cost (\$/Ac-Ft)	Cost Score	Impacts of Strategy on:					Overall Score (5-45)	Implementation Issues	Comments
															Environmental Factors	Agricultural Resources/Rural Areas	Other Natural Resources	Key Water Quality Parameters	Third Party Social & Economic Factors			
San Angelo ^a	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	1,876	13,097	13,097	14%	1	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	29		
San Angelo ^a	Multiple	Multiple	Colorado, Rio Grande	West Texas Water Partnership	Recommended	Regional	5,000	13,097	13,097	38%	3	3	\$1,783	2	2	4	4	2	3	23	Follow up discussions will be conducted to explore necessary methodologies and agreements to implement this cooperative use strategy.	Additional study will be needed once a more specific details for this strategy have been determined.
San Angelo ^a	Multiple	Multiple	Colorado, Rio Grande	West Texas Water Partnership	Alternative	Regional	5,000	13,097	13,097	38%	3	3	\$1,165	2	3	4	4	2	3	24	Follow up discussions will be conducted to explore necessary methodologies and agreements to implement this cooperative use strategy.	Additional study will be needed once a more specific details for this strategy have been determined.
Tom Green County FWSD 3	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	5	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,616	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Upper Colorado River Authority	Tom Green	Tom Green	Colorado	Subordination	Recommended	Subordination	42	0	0	101%	5	3	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	5	33		
Irrigation	Upton	Upton	Colorado, Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	1,560	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
McCamey	Upton	Upton	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	8	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,264	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Upton	Upton	Colorado, Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	101	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Rankin	Upton	Upton	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	3	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,848	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Barstow	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	1	0	0	101%	5	3	\$3,068	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Grandfalls	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Develop Pecos Valley Aquifer Supplies	Recommended	Groundwater Development	155	155	155	100%	4	3	\$1,245	2	3	4	4	3	5	28	The most significant issue will be locating areas with sufficient well production	
Grandfalls	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	2	155	155	1%	1	3	\$2,804	2	4	4	4	3	5	26	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Grandfalls	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Purchase from Provider (CRMWD)	Alternative	Purchase from Provider	155	155	155	100%	4	5	\$0	5	4	4	4	3	4	33		
Irrigation	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	474	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Weather Modification	Recommended	Regional	259	0	0	101%	5	1	\$0.57	4	4	5	4	4	5	32	Local opposition has caused some programs to shut down, and other programs have readjusted target areas	
Mining	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	80	0	0	101%	5	1	\$632	3	4	4	4	3	5	29	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Monahans	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	27	0	0	101%	5	3	\$763	3	4	4	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Southwest Sandhills WSC	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	30	0	0	101%	5	3	\$863	3	4	4	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Wickett	Ward	Ward	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	2	0	0	101%	5	3	\$2,487	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Irrigation	Winkler	Winkler	Rio Grande	Irrigation Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	526	0	0	101%	5	3	\$21	4	4	5	4	3	5	33	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Kermit	Winkler	Winkler	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	19	0	0	101%	5	3	\$964	3	4	4	4	3	5	31	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Mining	Winkler	Winkler	Rio Grande	Mining Conservation (Recycling)	Recommended	Conservation	49	0	0	101%	5	1	\$1,315	2	4	4	4	3	5	28	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.
Wink	Winkler	Winkler	Rio Grande	Municipal Conservation	Recommended	Conservation	5	0	0	101%	5	3	\$1,665	2	4	4	4	3	5	30	Site specific data needed. May require financial and technical assistance.	Conservation based on generic assessment. Site-specific data not available.

a. Wholesale water provider or water user group strategy that supplies to multiple customers, including potential future customers.

Note: Grey Italics indicates projects that are needed to access supplies from other strategies and are not included in supply totals to avoid double counting.