

ATTACHMENT 2
PRIORITIZATION OF RECOMMENDED REGION F PROJECTS

DRAFT MEMORANDUM



Innovative approaches
Practical results
Outstanding service

4055 International Plaza, Suite 200 + Fort Worth, Texas 76109 + 817-735-7300 + FAX 817-735-7491

www.freese.com

TO: Region F Water Planning Group
CC: File
FROM: Simone Kiel, Lissa Gregg, and Jordan Skipwith
SUBJECT: Region F Project Prioritization Assumptions
DATE: Updated 8/17/2020
PROJECT: CMD17216

The TWDB, as required by HB4, has developed a standardized spreadsheet for prioritizing projects in the 2021 State Water Plan. The following memo documents the assumptions that the Region F Prioritization Committee and Executive Committee used in prioritizing the water management strategies in the Region F Water Planning Area. Most of the priority standards were evaluated using data from the 2021 Region F Water Plan, but some assumptions were needed to complete the draft scoring. These assumptions and criteria will be reviewed and approved by the RWPG. Strategies for entities that are considered both a Water User Group (WUG) and Major Water Provider (MWP), such as the City of San Angelo and the City of Odessa, were evaluated on a case by case basis.

Criteria: Decade of Need (40% Total Weight)

Uniform Standard 1A - What is the decade the RWP shows the project comes online? [2060 = 0 points; 2050 = 2; 2040 = 4; 2030 = 6; 2020 = 8; 2010 = 10] **Weight: 20%**

- Assumed the first decade the supply is available is the online decade.

Uniform Standard 1B – In what decade is initial funding needed? [2060 = 0 points; 2050 = 2; 2040 = 4; 2030 = 6; 2020 = 8; 2010 = 10] **Weight: 20%**

- Used the data responses from the IFR survey, if available. In cases when the IFR survey indicated the strategy and funding is needed after the online date, the online date was used. This was for consistency with the RWP.
- If there was no IFR response, it was assumed the funding is needed the decade before the supply is online (supply online in 2050, funding is needed in 2040). If the project capital cost is greater than \$100 million, then the funding is needed two decades before the supply is online (e.g., supply online in 2050, funding is needed in 2030).

Criteria: Project Feasibility (10% Total Weight)

Uniform Standard 2A - What supporting data is available to show that the quantity of water needed is available? [Models suggest insufficient quantities of water or no modeling performed = 0 points; models

suggest sufficient quantity of water = 3; Field tests and measurements confirm sufficient quantities of water = 5] **Weight: 2%**

- This criterion is evaluated based on the level of knowledge for a strategy in 2020 (time it was developed for the 2021 RWP).
- Assumed surface water supplies and groundwater supplies evaluated with the WAMs and GAMs are ranked as a "3".
- Assumed municipal conservation estimates are based on existing studies/modeling, therefore, it is ranked as a "3".
- Assumed irrigation conservation strategies are known and researched Best Management Practices and are ranked as a "3".
- Assumed mining conservation (recycling/reuse) strategies are commonly researched and applied conservation practices in the oil and gas industry and are ranked as a "3".
- If the RWPG consultants received information that additional studies have been conducted, it received a ranking of "5".
- Infrastructure projects that used water that was evaluated with models also received a ranking of "3".

Uniform Standard 2B - If necessary, does the sponsor hold necessary legal rights, water rights and/or contracts to use the water that this project would require? [Legal rights, water rights and/or contract application not submitted = 0 points; application submitted = 2; application is administratively complete = 3; legal rights, water rights and/or contracts obtained or not needed = 5] **Weight: 2%**

- This criterion is evaluated based on the level of knowledge for a strategy in 2020.
- Assumed all conservation projects do not need a contract/permit.
- While no groundwater permits are needed in counties with no GCD, water rights will still be needed. Therefore, the scoring is based on whether the entity holds the water rights or not. For county-other, it is assumed that rural customers own the property and thus the water rights. For other WUGs, this criterion is evaluated individually based on consultant's knowledge and timing of the strategy. If no information is available and the strategy is several decades in the future, it is assumed that the WUG does not own the water rights.
- Assumed that direct reuse strategies used existing supplies and no water right was needed.
- Assumed that indirect reuse strategies require legal rights, water rights, and/or application.
- Assumed water treatment strategies used existing supplies and no water right was needed.
- Assumed if a MWP has a contract with an entity, a contract exists and a ranking of "5" was given, unless the strategy specifically states to renew contract.
- Assumed if the voluntary transfer strategy begins several decades in the future, there is no contract.
- Assumed the subordination strategies do not have agreements in place, with the exception for CRMWD sources.
- If the sponsoring entity provided information on current well fields and drilling wells, it was assumed that they had a permit.

Uniform Standard 2C - What level of engineering and/or planning has been accomplished for this project? [Project idea is outlined in RWP = 1 point; feasibility studies initiated = 2; feasibility studies completed = 3; conceptual design initiated = 4; conceptual design completed = 5; preliminary engineering report initiated = 6; preliminary engineering report completed = 7; preliminary design initiated = 8; preliminary design completed = 9; final design complete = 10] **Weight: 4%**

- This criterion is evaluated based on the level of knowledge for a strategy in 2020.
- The default value was a “1” unless consultant was aware of current level of planning.
- Assumed feasibility studies were completed for conservation strategies.

Uniform Standard 2D - Has the project sponsor requested (in writing for the 2021 Plan) that the project be included in the Regional Water Plan? [No = 0 points; yes = 5] **Weight: 2%**

- If a project sponsor requested a project during any cycle of regional water planning, either through personal contact, written requests, or surveys, then the project received a “yes” score.

Criteria: Project Viability (25% Total Weight)

Uniform Standard 3A - In the decade the project supply comes online, what is the % of the WUG's (or WUGs') needs satisfied by this project? [0-100%] **Weight: 8.33%**

- Calculated the % need for the first decade by dividing the supply in the first decade online by the need in the first decade the supply is online. In instances where the need in the decade of interest was zero, it was assumed that the strategy would not be meeting any water needs and should score zero points.

Uniform Standard 3B - In the final decade of the planning period, what is the % of the WUG's (or WUGs') needs satisfied by this project? [0-100%] **Weight: 8.33%**

- Calculated the % need for the final decade by dividing the supply in the final decade by the need in the final decade. In instances where the need in the decade of interest was zero, it was assumed that the strategy would not be meeting any water needs and should score zero points.

Uniform Standard 3C - Is this project the only economically feasible source of new supply for the WUG, other than conservation? [No = 0 points; Yes = 5] **Weight: 4.17%**

- Calculated the number of total strategies for an entity other than municipal, irrigation, or mining conservation. This includes major or wholesale water provider strategies that serve multiple WUGs. If there was only one strategy for that entity, it was assumed to be the only economically feasible source of new supply.
- Conservation strategies are not directly considered under this criterion, so these strategies were assumed to receive a score of zero points.

Uniform Standard 3D - Does this project serve multiple WUGs? [No = 0 points; Yes = 5] **Weight: 4.17%**

- Assumed that if the strategy supplies multiple WUGs then yes; if not, then no.

Criteria: Project Sustainability (15% Total Weight)

Uniform Standard 4A – Over what period of time is this project expected to provide water (regardless of the planning period)? [Less than or equal to 20 yrs = 5 points; greater than 20 yrs = 10] **Weight: 10%**

- Assumed that each decade there is a supply amount the supply was available for 10 years. If the number of decades was greater than 2, the supply was online for greater than 20 years.

- For infrastructure strategies that have no supply assigned, the time period was evaluated based on the expected life of the infrastructure project. (These types of strategies include water treatment strategies and infrastructure rehabilitation.)

Uniform Standard 4B - Does the volume of water supplied by the project change over the regional water planning period? [Decreases = 0 points; no change = 3; increases = 5] **Weight: 5%**

- Assumed that if the supply in the first decade is the same as last decade the project is online, then the supply remains the same and is assigned 3 points. If the supply in the first decade is greater than the last decade supply, then the supply decreases and is assigned 0 points. If the supply in the first decade is less than last decade supply, then the supply increases and is assigned 5 points.
- Infrastructure strategies that have supply assigned, such as water treatment strategies and infrastructure rehabilitation, may but show changes in volume supplied due to changing demands are evaluated based on the total volume that can be delivered by the project. If this volume did not change over time, then the project was assigned 3 points.

Criteria: Project Cost Effectiveness (10% Total Weight)

Uniform Standard 5A - What is the expected unit cost of water supplied by this project compared to the median unit cost of all other recommended strategies in the region's current RWP? [200% or greater than median = 0 points; 150% to 199% = 1; 101% to 149% = 2; 100% = 3; 51% to 99% = 4; 0% to 50% = 5] **Weight: 10%**

- Calculated the unit cost in the first decade online for each individual project in \$/acre-foot, then calculated the median of the first decade unit cost of all of projects. The calculated first decade unit costs were compared to the first decade unit costs in the printed plan. If there was a discrepancy, the lower value was used. The unit cost of each individual project was divided by the median unit cost of all strategies for the region to assess the relative cost.

Project Grouping (Rollup)

- The recommended West Texas Water Partnership project between Midland, San Angelo, and Abilene was rolled up and evaluated as one individual project in the prioritization evaluation, even though there are multiple project components and exchanges of water. Each other recommended project was evaluated individually on its own merits.

Summary of Prioritization Evaluation

The preliminary ranking of the recommended projects in the 2021 Region F Water Plan are shown in **Table 1**. Projects that are scheduled for earlier in the planning period tend to rank high, while projects that are implemented later rank lower. Thus, these rankings primarily reflect the timing of the need for a project, not the merit of a project. Additionally, although there are 111 total recommended projects, some projects, particularly conservation projects, received the same prioritization score. As a result, the project ranking only goes up to 68.

Table 1
Draft 2021 Region F Project Prioritization

Project and Sponsor	Prioritization Score	Prioritization Ranking
ADVANCED GROUNDWATER TREATMENT - BRADY	855.95	1
DEVELOP ADDITIONAL PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - REEVES COUNTY MINING	854.33	2
ADDITIONAL WATER TREATMENT - MASON	830.33	3
DEVELOP OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES - SCURRY COUNTY MANUFACTURING	814.33	4
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - BORDEN COUNTY	777.33	5
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MARTIN COUNTY	777.33	5
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MIDLAND COUNTY	777.33	5
DEVELOP ADDITIONAL ELLENBURGER SAN SABA AQUIFER SUPPLIES - KIMBLE COUNTY MANUFACTURING	775.95	6
DEVELOP ALLUVIAL WELL SUPPLIES - MENARD	774.33	7
DEVELOP CROSS TIMBERS AQUIFER SUPPLIES - BROWN COUNTY, MINING	774.33	7
CONCHO RIVER WATER PROJECT - SAN ANGELO	763.48	8
PURCHASE TREATED WATER FROM CITY OF ODESSA - GREATER GARDENDALE WSC	762.33	9
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - ANDREWS COUNTY	760.68	10
DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - PECOS, MINING	759.10	11
REHABILITATION OF OAK CREEK PIPELINE - BRONTE	754.33	12
WATER TREATMENT PLANT EXPANSION - BRONTE	754.33	12
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - BROWN COUNTY	745.47	13
DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - JUNCTION	741.26	14
DEVELOP OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES IN SOUTHWEST COKE COUNTY - BRONTE	732.67	15
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - IRION COUNTY	728.68	16
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - KIMBLE COUNTY	728.15	17
WEST TEXAS WATER PARTNERSHIP	726.14	18
CRMWD - WARD COUNTY WELL REPLACEMENT	715.67	19
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SCURRY COUNTY	711.30	20
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - COLEMAN COUNTY	708.73	21
PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER - WINTERS	704.47	22
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MITCHELL COUNTY	701.86	23
NEW WATER TREATMENT PLANT - BIG SPRING	699.00	24
MINING CONSERVATION - BROWN COUNTY	695.99	25
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - COKE COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - CONCHO COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - CROCKETT COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - ECTOR COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - HOWARD COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MASON COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MCCULLOCH COUNTY	694.00	26

Project and Sponsor	Prioritization Score	Prioritization Ranking
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MENARD COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - PECOS COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - REAGAN COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - REEVES COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - RUNNELS COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SCHLEICHER COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - STERLING COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SUTTON COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - TOM GREEN COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - UPTON COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - WARD COUNTY	694.00	26
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - WINKLER COUNTY	694.00	26
DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - PECOS COUNTY WCID #1	690.30	27
HICKORY WELL FIELD EXPANSION IN MCCULLOCH COUNTY - SAN ANGELO	682.20	28
IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - GLASSCOCK COUNTY	674.00	29
MINING CONSERVATION - LOVING COUNTY	655.03	30
MINING CONSERVATION - KIMBLE COUNTY	654.00	31
DREDGE RIVER INTAKE - JUNCTION	653.77	32
RO TREATMENT OF EXISTING SUPPLIES - ODESSA	653.33	33
MINING CONSERVATION - ANDREWS COUNTY	643.46	34
MINING CONSERVATION - REEVES COUNTY	640.11	35
MINING CONSERVATION - IRION COUNTY	639.19	36
MINING CONSERVATION - PECOS COUNTY	636.83	37
MINING CONSERVATION - TOM GREEN COUNTY	634.00	38
ADVANCED TREATMENT (RO) OF PAUL DAVIS WELL FIELD SUPPLIES - MIDLAND	633.59	39
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - BROOKSMITH SUD 2020	627.33	40
MINING CONSERVATION - COKE COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - COLEMAN COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - CONCHO COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - CROCKETT COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - GLASSCOCK COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - HOWARD COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - MARTIN COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - MASON COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - MCCULLOCH COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - MENARD COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - MIDLAND COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - REAGAN COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - RUNNELS COUNTY	624.00	41

Project and Sponsor	Prioritization Score	Prioritization Ranking
MINING CONSERVATION - UPTON COUNTY	624.00	41
MINING CONSERVATION - WARD COUNTY	624.00	41
DIRECT NON-POTABLE REUSE FOR SALES FROM COLORADO CITY - MITCHELL COUNTY SEP	615.74	42
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - SONORA 2020	614.00	43
DEVELOP ADDITIONAL EDWARDS-TRINITY-PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - SONORA	607.67	44
MINING CONSERVATION - ECTOR COUNTY	604.00	45
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - MILLERSVIEW-DOOLE WSC 2020	594.00	46
TRANSMISSION PIPELINE REPLACEMENT - PECOS COUNTY WCID #1	590.00	47
DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES FROM ROARK RANCH IN WINKLER CO - MIDLAND COUNTY OTHER	587.67	48
DIRECT NON-POTABLE REUSE - PECOS CITY	586.00	49
MINING CONSERVATION - SCHLEICHER COUNTY	564.00	50
MINING CONSERVATION - STERLING COUNTY	564.00	50
PARTNER WITH MADERA VALLEY WSC & EXPAND WELL FIELD - PECOS CITY	562.00	51
MINING CONSERVATION - SCURRY COUNTY	557.83	52
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - COLEMAN 2020	555.99	53
DIRECT POTABLE REUSE - PECOS CITY	554.00	54
ADVANCED GROUNDWATER TREATMENT - PECOS CITY	546.00	55
DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY-PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - BALMORHEA	546.00	55
MINING CONSERVATION - BORDEN COUNTY	544.00	56
MINING CONSERVATION - CRANE COUNTY	544.00	56
MINING CONSERVATION - MITCHELL COUNTY	544.00	56
MINING CONSERVATION - SUTTON COUNTY	544.00	56
MINING CONSERVATION - WINKLER COUNTY	544.00	56
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - ZEPHYR WSC 2020	544.00	56
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - BROOKESMITH SUD 2040	507.33	57
CRMWD - WARD COUNTY WELL FIELD EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WINKLER COUNTY WELL FIELD	499.67	58
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - SONORA 2040	494.00	59
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - MILLERSVIEW-DOOLE WSC 2040	474.00	60
DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - GRANDFALLS	471.00	61
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - COLEMAN 2040	465.97	62
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - BROOKESMITH SUD 2060	460.67	63
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - ZEPHYR WSC 2040	454.00	64
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - SONORA 2060	334.00	65
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - MILLERSVIEW-DOOLE WSC 2060	314.00	66
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - COLEMAN 2060	305.99	67
WATER AUDITS AND LEAK - ZEPHYR WSC 2060	294.00	68

Calculations reflected are from the revised uniform standards adopted by the SHC 11/28/2018 and approved by the TW08 2/25/2019.
 ** Indicates that additional data may have to be collected by RWPG in order to score projects.

Prioritization Ranking	Project Name	Project Sponsor Entity	Capital Cost	Rural/Agricultural Conservation? (Yes/No)	Criteria 1 - Decade of Need for Project				Criteria 2 - Project Feasibility				Criteria 3 - Project Viability					Criteria 3 Total Score					
					10	10	20	400	5	5	10	5	25	100	100	100	10		5	5			
					Weighted Total Score	Weighted Total Score	Weighted Total Score	Weighted Total Score	Uniform Standard 2A - What supporting data is available to show that the quantity of water needed is available? (Models suggest insufficient quantities of water or no modeling performed = 0 points, models suggest sufficient quantity of water = 3; Field tests, measurements, or project specific studies confirm sufficient quantities of water = 5)	Uniform Standard 2B - If necessary, does the sponsor hold necessary legal rights, water rights and/or contracts to use the water that this project would require? (Legal rights, water rights and/or contract application not submitted = 0 points; application submitted = 2; application is administratively complete = 3; legal rights, water rights and/or contracts obtained or not needed = 5)	Uniform Standard 2C - What level of engineering and/or planning has been accomplished for this project? (Project idea is outlined in RFP = 1 point; feasibility studies initiated = 2; feasibility studies completed = 3; conceptual design initiated = 4; conceptual design completed = 5; preliminary engineering report initiated = 6; preliminary engineering report completed = 7; preliminary design initiated = 8; preliminary design completed = 9; final design complete = 10)	Uniform Standard 2D - Has the project sponsor requested in writing that the project be included in the Regional Water Plan? (No = 0 points; yes = 5)	Criteria 2 Total Score	Criteria 2 Total Score	Criteria 2 Total Score	Criteria 2 Total Score	Uniform Standard 3A - In the decade of the project supply comes online, what is the % of the WUG's (or WUG's) needs satisfied by this project? (Calculation is based on the needs of all WUGs receiving water from the project.)		Uniform Standard 3B - In the final decade of the planning period, what is the % of the WUG's (or WUG's) needs satisfied by this project? (Calculation is based on the needs of all WUGs receiving water from the project.)	Uniform Standard 3C - Is this project the only economically feasible source of new supply for the WUG's, other than conservation? (No = 0 points; Yes = 5)	Uniform Standard 3D - Does this project serve multiple WUGs? (No = 0 points; Yes = 5)		
3	ADDITIONAL WATER TREATMENT - MASON	MASON	\$ 2,605,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	5	5	8	5	23	92	100	100	100	100	5	0	5	25.00
1	ADVANCED GROUNDWATER TREATMENT - BRADY	BRADY	\$ 29,719,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	5	5	10	5	25	100	86	83	85	84.5	5	5	5	27.11
92	ADVANCED GROUNDWATER TREATMENT - PECOS CITY	PECOS CITY	\$ 27,680,000	N	N	8	3	18	360	3	3	1	5	14	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
61	ADVANCED TREATMENT (RO) OF PAUL DAVIS WELL FIELD SUPPLIES - MIDLAND	MIDLAND	\$ 60,804,000	N	N	6	8	14	280	3	3	1	5	14	56	82	8.19	45	4.52	0	5	5	17.71
11	CONCHO RIVER WATER PROJECT - SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO	\$ 116,861,000	N	Y	10	10	20	400	5	5	3	5	13	52	100	10.00	68	6.78	0	5	5	21.78
101	CRMWD - WARD COUNTY WELL FIELD EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WINKLER COUNTY WELL FIELD	COLORADO MWD	\$ 168,324,000	N	N	4	8	12	240	5	5	7	5	22	88	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	5	5	5.00
23	CRMWD - WARD COUNTY WELL REPLACEMENT	COLORADO MWD	\$ 10,440,000	N	N	8	3	18	360	3	3	3	5	16	64	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	5	5	5.00
80	DEVELOP ADDITIONAL EDWARDS-TRINITY-PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - SONORA	SONORA	\$ 437,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	9	36	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	5	5	5.00
8	DEVELOP ADDITIONAL ELLENBURGER SAN SABA AQUIFER SUPPLIES - KIMBLE COUNTY MANUFACTURING	MANUFACTURING, KIMBLE	\$ 1,621,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	83	8.29	71	7.10	5	0	5	20.39
2	DEVELOP ADDITIONAL PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - REEVES COUNTY MINING	MINING, REEVES	\$ 17,465,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	100	10.00	100	10.00	5	0	5	25.00
9	DEVELOP ALLUVIAL WELL SUPPLIES - MENARD	MENARD	\$ 13,835,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	100	10.00	100	10.00	5	0	5	25.00
10	DEVELOP CROSS TIMBERS AQUIFER SUPPLIES - BROWN COUNTY MINING	MINING, BROWN	\$ 2,440,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	100	10.00	100	10.00	5	0	5	25.00
18	DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - JUNCTION	JUNCTION	\$ 7,457,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	80	8.05	80	7.98	5	0	5	21.03
49	DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - PECOS COUNTY WCID #1	PECOS COUNTY WCID #1	\$ 3,630,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	2	5	15	60	59	5.91	61	6.13	0	0	5	12.04
93	DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY-PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - BALMORHEA	BALMORHEA	\$ 1,948,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	5	5	5.00
4	DEVELOP OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES - SCURRY COUNTY MANUFACTURING	MANUFACTURING, SCURRY	\$ 677,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	100	10.00	100	10.00	5	0	5	25.00
19	DEVELOP OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES IN SOUTHWEST COKE COUNTY - BRONTE	BRONTE	\$ 23,694,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	100	10.00	100	10.00	5	0	5	25.00
104	DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - GRANDFALLS	GRANDFALLS	\$ 2,410,000	N	N	4	6	10	200	3	3	0	5	4	16	0	0.00	100	10.00	5	0	5	15.00
14	DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - PECOS, MINING	MINING, PECOS	\$ 493,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	86	8.6	5	0	5	0	5	13.57
84	DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES FROM ROAD RANCH IN WINKLER CO - MIDLAND COUNTY OTH	COUNTY OTHER, MIDLAND	\$ 24,557,000	N	N	8	3	18	360	3	3	1	5	14	56	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	0	5	5.00
85	DIRECT NON-POTABLE REUSE - PECOS CITY	PECOS CITY	\$ 8,707,000	N	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	14	56	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	5	5	5.00
78	DIRECT NON-POTABLE REUSE FOR SALES FROM COLORADO CITY - MITCHELL COUNTY SEP	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, MITCHELL	\$ 8,642,000	N	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	9	36	5	0.48	5	0.48	5	0	5	5.97
91	DIRECT POTABLE REUSE - PECOS CITY	PECOS CITY	\$ 29,541,000	N	Y	8	3	18	360	3	3	1	5	16	64	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	5	5	5.00
54	DREDGE RIVER INTAKE - JUNCTION	JUNCTION	\$ 8,487,000	N	N	10	10	20	400	3	3	1	5	14	56	40	3.99	41	4.14	0	0	5	8.13
50	HICKORY WELL FIELD EXPANSION IN MCCULLOCH COUNTY - SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO	\$ 55,491,000	N	N	8	3	18	360	5	5	9	5	24	96	16	1.56	26	2.58	0	5	5	9.14
13	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - ANDREWS COUNTY	IRRIGATION, ANDREWS	\$ 1,547,740	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	60	5.99	20	2.01	0	0	5	8.00
5	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - BORDEN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, BORDEN	\$ 224,124	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	100	10.00	0	0	5	10.00
17	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - BROWN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, BROWN	\$ 494,000	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	24	2.38	10	1.05	0	0	5	6.18
30	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - COKE COUNTY	IRRIGATION, COKE	\$ 62,837	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
25	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - COLEMAN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, COLEMAN	\$ 35,340	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	6	0.58	12	1.19	0	0	5	1.77
31	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - CONCHO COUNTY	IRRIGATION, CONCHO	\$ 409,807	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
32	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - CROCKETT COUNTY	IRRIGATION, CROCKETT	\$ 15,390	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
33	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - ECTOR COUNTY	IRRIGATION, ECTOR	\$ 86,184	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
51	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - GLASSCOCK COUNTY	IRRIGATION, GLASSCOCK	\$ 1,558,122	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
34	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - HOWARD COUNTY	IRRIGATION, HOWARD	\$ 575,419	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
20	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - IRION COUNTY	IRRIGATION, IRION	\$ 120,042	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	10	1.12	10	1.12	0	0	5	4.16
21	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - KIMBLE COUNTY	IRRIGATION, KIMBLE	\$ 242,318	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	12	1.21	29	2.89	0	0	5	4.10
6	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MARTIN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MARTIN	\$ 4,159,974	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	100	10.00	0	0	5	10.00
35	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MASON COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MASON	\$ 566,124	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
36	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MCCULLOCH COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MCCULLOCH	\$ 264,936	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
37	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MENARD COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MENARD	\$ 417,582	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
7	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MIDLAND COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MIDLAND	\$ 2,064,198	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	100	10.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	10.00
27	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MITCHELL COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MITCHELL	\$ 194,362	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	16	1.62	17	1.73	0	0	5	3.34
38	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - PECOS COUNTY	IRRIGATION, PECOS	\$ 16,941,330	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
39	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - REAGAN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, REAGAN	\$ 2,511,534	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
40	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - REEVES COUNTY	IRRIGATION, REEVES	\$ 6,718,818	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
41	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - RUNNELS COUNTY	IRRIGATION, RUNNELS	\$ 283,176	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
42	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SCHLEICHER COUNTY	IRRIGATION, SCHLEICHER	\$ 82,582	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
24	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SCURRY COUNTY	IRRIGATION, SCURRY	\$ 746,829	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	6	0.58	15	1.50	0	0	5	2.08
43	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - STERLING COUNTY	IRRIGATION, STERLING	\$ 102,486	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
44	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SUTTON COUNTY	IRRIGATION, SUTTON	\$ 128,000	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
45	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - TOM GREEN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, TOM GREEN	\$ 1,875,362	Y	Y	10	10	20	400	3	3	0	5	11	44	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	5	5.00
46	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - UPTON COUNTY	IRRIGATION, UPTON																					

Calculations reflected are from the revised uniform standards adopted by the SHC 11/28/2018 and approved by the TWDB 2/25/2019.
 ** Indicates that additional data may have to be collected by RWPG in order to score projects.

Prioritization Ranking	Project Name	Project Sponsor Entity	Capital Cost	MAXIMUM SC	Criteria 4 - Project Sustainability				Criteria 5 - Project Cost Effectiveness				FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT
					Weighted Criteria 3 Total	10	5	15	150	5	100	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	
3	ADDITIONAL WATER TREATMENT - MASON	MASON	\$ 2,605,000	208.33	10	3	13	130	0	0	830.33		
1	ADVANCED GROUNDWATER TREATMENT - BRADY	BRADY	\$ 29,710,000	225.95	10	3	13	130	0	0	855.95		
92	ADVANCED GROUNDWATER TREATMENT - PECOS CITY	PECOS CITY	\$ 27,680,000	0.00	10	3	13	130	0	0	545.00		
61	ADVANCED TREATMENT (RO) OF PAUL DAVIS WELL FIELD SUPPLIES - MIDLAND	MIDLAND	\$ 60,804,000	147.59	10	5	15	150	0	0	633.59		
11	CONCHO RIVER WATER PROJECT - SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO	\$ 116,861,000	181.48	10	3	13	130	0	0	763.48		
101	CRMWD - WARD COUNTY WELL FIELD EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WINKLER COUNTY WELL FIELD	COLORADO MWD	\$ 168,324,000	41.67	10	3	13	130	0	0	499.67		
23	CRMWD - WARD COUNTY WELL REPLACEMENT	COLORADO MWD	\$ 10,440,000	41.67	10	5	15	150	5	100	715.67		
80	DEVELOP ADDITIONAL EDWARDS-TRINITY-PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - SONORA	SONORA	\$ 437,000	41.67	10	3	13	130	0	0	607.67		
8	DEVELOP ADDITIONAL ELLENBURGER SAN SABA AQUIFER SUPPLIES - KIMBLE COUNTY MANUFACTURING	MANUFACTURING, KIMBLE	\$ 1,621,000	169.95	10	3	13	130	2	40	775.95		
2	DEVELOP ADDITIONAL PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - REEVES COUNTY MINING	MINING, REEVES	\$ 17,465,000	208.33	10	3	13	130	4	80	854.33		
9	DEVELOP ALLUVIAL WELL SUPPLIES - MENARD	MENARD	\$ 13,835,000	208.33	10	3	13	130	0	0	741.33		
10	DEVELOP CROSS TIMBERS AQUIFER SUPPLIES - BROWN COUNTY, MINING	MINING, BROWN	\$ 2,440,000	208.33	10	3	13	130	0	0	774.33		
18	DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - JUNCTION	JUNCTION	\$ 7,457,000	175.26	10	3	13	130	0	0	741.26		
49	DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - PECOS COUNTY WCID #1	PECOS COUNTY WCID #1	\$ 3,630,000	100.30	10	3	13	130	0	0	690.30		
93	DEVELOP EDWARDS-TRINITY PLATEAU AQUIFER SUPPLIES - BALMORHEA	BALMORHEA	\$ 1,948,000	0.00	10	3	13	130	0	0	546.00		
4	DEVELOP OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES - SCURRY COUNTY MANUFACTURING	MANUFACTURING, SCURRY	\$ 677,000	208.33	10	3	13	130	2	40	814.33		
19	DEVELOP OTHER AQUIFER SUPPLIES IN SOUTHWEST COKE COUNTY - BRONTE	BRONTE	\$ 23,694,000	166.67	10	3	13	130	0	0	732.67		
104	DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - GRANDFALLS	GRANDFALLS	\$ 2,410,000	125.00	10	3	13	130	0	0	471.00		
14	DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES - PECOS, MINING	MINING, PECOS	\$ 492,000	113.10	10	3	13	130	4	80	750.10		
84	DEVELOP PECOS VALLEY AQUIFER SUPPLIES FROM ROAD RANCH IN WINKLER CO - MIDLAND COUNTY OTH	COUNTY OTHER, MIDLAND	\$ 24,557,000	41.67	10	3	13	130	0	0	587.67		
85	DIRECT NON-POTABLE REUSE - PECOS CITY	PECOS CITY	\$ 8,707,000	0.00	10	3	13	130	0	0	586.00		
78	DIRECT NON-POTABLE REUSE FOR SALES FROM COLORADO CITY - MITCHELL COUNTY SEP	STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, MITCHELL	\$ 8,642,000	49.74	10	3	13	130	0	0	615.74		
91	DIRECT POTABLE REUSE - PECOS CITY	PECOS CITY	\$ 29,541,000	0.00	10	3	13	130	0	0	554.00		
54	DREDGE RIVER INTAKE - JUNCTION	JUNCTION	\$ 8,487,000	67.77	10	3	13	130	0	0	653.77		
50	HICKORY WELL FIELD EXPANSION IN MCCULLOCH COUNTY - SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO	\$ 55,491,000	76.20	10	5	15	150	0	0	682.20		
13	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - ANDREWS COUNTY	IRRIGATION, ANDREWS	\$ 1,547,740	66.68	10	5	15	150	5	100	760.68		
5	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - BORDEN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, BORDEN	\$ 224,124	83.33	10	5	15	150	5	100	706.33		
17	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - BROWN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, BROWN	\$ 494,000	514.17	10	5	15	150	5	100	745.17		
30	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - COKE COUNTY	IRRIGATION, COKE	\$ 62,837	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
25	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - COLEMAN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, COLEMAN	\$ 35,340	14.73	10	5	15	150	5	100	708.73		
31	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - CONCHO COUNTY	IRRIGATION, CONCHO	\$ 409,807	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
32	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - CROCKETT COUNTY	IRRIGATION, CROCKETT	\$ 15,390	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
33	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - ECTOR COUNTY	IRRIGATION, ECTOR	\$ 86,184	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
51	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - GLASSCOCK COUNTY	IRRIGATION, GLASSCOCK	\$ 1,558,122	0.00	10	3	13	130	5	100	674.00		
34	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - HOWARD COUNTY	IRRIGATION, HOWARD	\$ 575,419	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
20	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - IRION COUNTY	IRRIGATION, IRION	\$ 120,042	34.68	10	5	15	150	5	100	726.68		
21	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - KIMBLE COUNTY	IRRIGATION, KIMBLE	\$ 242,318	34.15	10	5	15	150	5	100	728.15		
6	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MARTIN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MARTIN	\$ 4,159,974	83.33	10	5	15	150	5	100	777.33		
35	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MASON COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MASON	\$ 566,124	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
36	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MCCULLOCH COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MCCULLOCH	\$ 264,936	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
37	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MENARD COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MENARD	\$ 417,582	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
7	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MIDLAND COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MIDLAND	\$ 2,064,198	83.33	10	5	15	150	5	100	777.33		
24	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - MITCHELL COUNTY	IRRIGATION, MITCHELL	\$ 194,262	27.86	10	3	13	130	5	100	701.86		
38	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - PECOS COUNTY	IRRIGATION, PECOS	\$ 16,341,330	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
39	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - REAGAN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, REAGAN	\$ 2,511,534	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
40	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - REEVES COUNTY	IRRIGATION, REEVES	\$ 6,718,818	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
41	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - RUNNELS COUNTY	IRRIGATION, RUNNELS	\$ 283,176	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
42	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SCHLEICHER COUNTY	IRRIGATION, SCHLEICHER	\$ 82,582	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
24	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SCURRY COUNTY	IRRIGATION, SCURRY	\$ 746,829	17.30	10	5	15	150	5	100	711.30		
43	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - STERLING COUNTY	IRRIGATION, STERLING	\$ 102,486	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
44	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - SUTTON COUNTY	IRRIGATION, SUTTON	\$ 128,000	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
45	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - TOM GREEN COUNTY	IRRIGATION, TOM GREEN	\$ 3,875,262	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
46	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - UPTON COUNTY	IRRIGATION, UPTON	\$ 1,145,942	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
47	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - WARD COUNTY	IRRIGATION, WARD	\$ 360,240	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
48	IRRIGATION CONSERVATION - WINKLER COUNTY	IRRIGATION, WINKLER	\$ 399,798	0.00	10	5	15	150	5	100	694.00		
56	MINING CONSERVATION - ANDREWS COUNTY	MINING, ANDREWS	\$ 5,540,000	19.46	10	0	10	100	4	80	643.46		
94	MINING CONSERVATION - BORDEN COUNTY	MINING, BORDEN	\$ 780,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	0	0	544.00		
29	MINING CONSERVATION - BROWN COUNTY	MINING, BROWN	\$ 1,340,000	41.99	10	3	13	130	4	80	695.99		
63	MINING CONSERVATION - COKE COUNTY	MINING, COKE	\$ 400,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
64	MINING CONSERVATION - COLEMAN COUNTY	MINING, COLEMAN	\$ 100,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
65	MINING CONSERVATION - CONCHO COUNTY	MINING, CONCHO	\$ 400,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
95	MINING CONSERVATION - CRANE COUNTY	MINING, CRANE	\$ 720,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	0	0	544.00		
66	MINING CONSERVATION - CROCKETT COUNTY	MINING, CROCKETT	\$ 6,300,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
81	MINING CONSERVATION - ECTOR COUNTY	MINING, ECTOR	\$ 600,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	3	60	604.00		
67	MINING CONSERVATION - GLASSCOCK COUNTY	MINING, GLASSCOCK	\$ 4,960,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
68	MINING CONSERVATION - HOWARD COUNTY	MINING, HOWARD	\$ 2,860,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
58	MINING CONSERVATION - IRION COUNTY	MINING, IRION	\$ 6,440,000	15.19	10	0	10	100	4	80	639.19		
53	MINING CONSERVATION - KIMBLE COUNTY	MINING, KIMBLE	\$ 20,000	0.00	10	3	13	130	4	80	654.00		
52	MINING CONSERVATION - LOVING COUNTY	MINING, LOVING	\$ 10,500,000	33.33	10	0	10	100	4	80	650.33		
69	MINING CONSERVATION - MARTIN COUNTY	MINING, MARTIN	\$ 6,040,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	0	0	624.00		
70	MINING CONSERVATION - MASON COUNTY	MINING, MASON	\$ 850,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
71	MINING CONSERVATION - MCCULLOCH COUNTY	MINING, MCCULLOCH	\$ 7,500,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
72	MINING CONSERVATION - MENARD COUNTY	MINING, MENARD	\$ 920,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
73	MINING CONSERVATION - MIDLAND COUNTY	MINING, MIDLAND	\$ 8,900,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
96	MINING CONSERVATION - MITCHELL COUNTY	MINING, MITCHELL	\$ 620,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	0	0	544.00		
59	MINING CONSERVATION - PECOS COUNTY	MINING, PECOS	\$ 10,780,000	12.83	10	0	10	100	4	80	636.83		
74	MINING CONSERVATION - REAGAN COUNTY	MINING, REAGAN	\$ 8,900,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
57	MINING CONSERVATION - REEVES COUNTY	MINING, REEVES	\$ 17,640,000	16.11	10	0	10	100	4	80	640.11		
75	MINING CONSERVATION - RUNNELS COUNTY	MINING, RUNNELS	\$ 220,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
86	MINING CONSERVATION - SCHLEICHER COUNTY	MINING, SCHLEICHER	\$ 620,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	1	20	564.00		
89	MINING CONSERVATION - SCURRY COUNTY	MINING, SCURRY	\$ 680,000	13.83	10	0	10	100	0	0	557.83		
87	MINING CONSERVATION - STERLING COUNTY	MINING, STERLING	\$ 800,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	1	20	564.00		
97	MINING CONSERVATION - SUTTON COUNTY	MINING, SUTTON	\$ 640,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	0	0	544.00		
60	MINING CONSERVATION - TOM GREEN COUNTY	MINING, TOM GREEN	\$ 980,000	0.00	10	5	15	150	2	40	634.00		
76	MINING CONSERVATION - UPTON COUNTY	MINING, UPTON	\$ 2,020,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
77	MINING CONSERVATION - WARD COUNTY	MINING, WARD	\$ 1,600,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	4	80	624.00		
98	MINING CONSERVATION - WINKLER COUNTY	MINING, WINKLER	\$ 980,000	0.00	10	0	10	100	0	0	544.00		
28	NEW WATER TREATMENT PLANT - BIG SPRING	BIG SPRING	\$ 104,651,000	125.00	10	5	15	150	0	0	699.00		
88	PARTNER WITH MADERA VALLEY WSC & EXPAND WELL FIELD - PECOS CITY	PECOS CITY	\$ 43,107,000	0.00	10	3	13	130	1	20	562.00		
26	PURCHASE FROM PROVIDER - WINTERS	WINTERS	\$ 974,000	130.47	10	5	15	150	0	0	704.47		
12	PURCHASE TREATED WATER FROM CITY OF ODESSA - GREATER GARDENDALE WSC</												