

TO: TWDB

FROM: Amy Kaarlela, Tom Gooch

CC: Region C Prioritization Subcommittee
Project File – NTD11336

SUBJECT: Draft Methodology for 2011 RCWP Project Prioritization and Draft Prioritization List

DATE: May 14, 2014

This memorandum outlines the draft methodology applied to complete the TWDB Project Prioritization Template for 2011 RCWP projects. This methodology incorporates input from the Region C Prioritization Subcommittee. Updated versions of this document will be generated as necessary to capture changes to assumptions and methodology as the process evolves. TWDB's standard scoring template (Excel spreadsheet) was used for the prioritization process. TWDB provided the template pre-populated with WMSs from DB12 to Region C on January 6, 2014. Region C consultants have added supplementary tabs to this spreadsheet for the purpose of documenting all answers to Standards.

At the end of this memorandum is a table containing the prioritized list of all 799 Region C WMSs. Also at the end of this memorandum is a list of concerns the Subcommittee has with the prioritization process and scoring system as well a supplementary table which the subcommittee feels is appropriate and useful for the prioritization process.

Strategy Grouping (Rollup)

The 2011 Region C RWP included several large interdependent water management strategies. In a number of cases, representing these strategies in DB12 was challenging. In many cases strategies that in reality are mutually dependent are listed separately in DB12. This presents a potential need for grouping of some strategies for project prioritization. The following strategies have been grouped for the purpose of prioritization. These WMS are shaded on the prioritization list so they may be identified more easily.

Recommended Water Management Strategy	TWDB Alpha unique identifier	Sponsors
Lake Ralph Hall	C737	Upper Trinity RWD
Lake Ralph Hall – indirect reuse	C738	Upper Trinity RWD
Lake Palestine connection (integrated pipeline with TRWD)	C191	Dallas
TRWD third pipeline and reuse	C696	Tarrant Regional WD
Toledo Bend project	C560	North Texas MWD
Toledo Bend project	C695	Tarrant Regional WD
Toledo Bend project	C704	Terrell

Recommended Water Management Strategy	TWDB Alpha unique identifier	Sponsors
Oklahoma water to NTMWD, TRWD, UTRWD Oklahoma water to NTMWD, TRWD, UTRWD Oklahoma water to NTMWD, TRWD, UTRWD	C559 C694 C740	North Texas MWD Tarrant Regional WD Upper Trinity RWD
Marvin Nichols Reservoir Marvin Nichols Reservoir Marvin Nichols Reservoir Marvin Nichols Reservoir	C558 C693 C701 C739	North Texas MWD Tarrant Regional WD Terrell UTRWD
Main Stem Trinity pump station (Lake Ray Hubbard indirect reuse – DWU) Main stem pump station (additional East Fork) NTMWD	C193 C557	Dallas North Texas MWD

Uniform Standard 1A - What is the decade the RWP shows the project comes online?

Scoring of this standard is as follows:

2060 = 0 points; 2050 = 2; 2040 = 4; 2030 = 6; 2020 = 8; 2010 = 10.

The following methodology was applied to determine project start decade:

- The default approach is to score the project based on the first decade with a supply allocation/strategy volume per the data provided in the scoring template.
- Alternatively, if strategy volume is zero in all decades, the score is based on the first decade with an annual cost.
- For grouped strategies (listed in the table above), some components of the strategy may begin in later decades than other components. In order to result in consistent scoring for these grouped strategies, those components beginning in later decades have been scored consistently with the other components of the grouped strategy.

Uniform Standard 1B - In what decade is initial funding needed?

Scoring of this standard is as follows:

2060 = 0 points; 2050 = 2; 2040 = 4; 2030 = 6; 2020 = 8; 2010 = 10.

The following methodology was applied to determine project start decade:

- All conservation projects were given a score of 10.
- For non-conservation projects with a capital cost of more than \$100 million, the funding is assumed to be needed two decades before the project comes online (with the maximum score being 10).
- For non-conservation projects with a capital cost of \$100 million or less, the funding is assumed to be needed one decade before the project comes online (with the maximum score being 10).

- For grouped strategies (listed in the table above), some components of the strategy may begin in later decades than other components. In order to result in consistent scoring for these grouped strategies, those components beginning in later decades have been scored consistently with the other components of the grouped strategy.

Uniform Standard 2A - What supporting data is available to show that the quantity of water needed is available?

The TWDB scoring of this standard is as follows:

- 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

In an effort to further define and document the specific data for each WMS, Region C has developed a more detailed/expanded scoring guide as follows:

- Score of 0 for:
 - No Modeling performed
 - Assumed no Modeling
 - Over-drafting of groundwater wells
- Score of 3 for:
 - Conservation analyzed in 2011 Plan
 - Detailed Study conducted
 - GAM modeling for groundwater supply
 - WAM modeling for surface water supply
 - Reuse – relying on modeled future effluent
- Score of 5 for:
 - Existing water source (surface)
 - Reuse – effluent currently being discharged
 - Facility improvements only; no supply associated

Each WMS has been individually assessed on this scoring criteria and documented on a separate sheet (“Standard 2”) in the Prioritization Template.

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?

The TWDB scoring of this standard is as follows:

- 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

In an effort to further define and document the specific data for each WMS, Region C has developed a more detailed/expanded scoring guide as follows:

- Score of 0 for:
 - Contract needed
 - Contract increase needed - not applied
 - Groundwater - new; permit needed from GCD
 - Permit needed from GCD for supplemental well
 - Water right application not submitted
- Score of 2 for:
 - Water right application submitted
- Score of 3 for:
 - Contract increase needed – applied
 - Water right application administratively complete
- Score of 5 for:
 - Conservation - no water right needed
 - Contract in place
 - Groundwater - existing; no permit needed
 - No water right needed
 - Water right obtained
 - Water treatment plant - no right needed

Each WMS has been individually assessed on this scoring criteria and documented on a separate sheet (“Standard 2”) in the Prioritization Template.

Uniform Standard 2C - What level of engineering and/or planning has been accomplished for this project?

The TWDB scoring of this standard is as follows:

- 1 = Outlined in RWP
- 2 = Feasibility study initiated
- 3 = Feasibility study completed

- 4= Conceptual design initiated
- 5 = Conceptual design completed
- 6 = Preliminary engineering report initiated
- 7 = Preliminary engineering report completed
- 8 = Preliminary design initiated
- 9 = Preliminary design completed
- 10 = Final design completed

This criterion should be answered using available data and judgment as available. Potential sources of information include the 2011 RWP and support material, the 2016 RWP entity survey, updated stakeholder data, or recollections by FNI staff. In many cases, reliable information is not readily available even through the sources named above. For that reason, the Subcommittee approved the following approach:

- If specific information was available, score as appropriate based on specific information
- For Projects with capital costs over \$50 million, consultants contacted project sponsors to determine level of engineering/planning.
- For Projects with capital costs of \$50 million or less, the following assumptions were applied:
 - Conservation and overdrifting by existing wells were scored as 10 because no design is required
 - Projects coming online in 2010 were scored as 10 (final design complete)
 - Projects coming online in 2020 were scored as 8 (preliminary design initiated)
 - Projects coming online in 2030 were scored as 4 (conceptual design initiated)
 - Projects coming online in 2040-60 were scored a 1 (outlined in Regional Water Plan)

A number of WMSs on the prioritization list represent the compilation of multiple facility improvements or new/expanded water treatment plants that occur over multiple decades. In such cases, the score for 4C was based on the level of engineering of the first component of the project and would consequently need funding first.

Each WMS has been individually assessed on this scoring criteria and documented on a separate sheet ("Standard 2") in the Prioritization Template.

Uniform Standard 2D - Has the project sponsor requested (in writing for the 2016 Plan) that the project be included in the Regional Water Plan?

The decision of the subcommittee is as follows. All projects should receive a "Yes" answer based on the fact that prior to the publication of the final 2011 RCWP, all WUGs/WWPs were provided a copy of their

final WMSs to be included in the plan and were asked to respond if they did not agree. Non-response to this correspondence implied agreement. If a WUG/WWP did not agree with the WMSs, those WMSs were adjusted per the direction of the WUG/WWP.

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?

Addressing this criterion requires a more complex dataset than that provided in the TWDB Prioritization Template. For a number of the strategies listed, the supply volume listed by the template is not equal to the ultimate supply provided by the strategy. In some cases, supplies needed to be “rolled up” from multiple DB12 WMSs. In other cases, the average capacity of the project (for water treatment plants) should be considered as the supply volume provided by the WMS (rather than the volume listed in DB17, which in many cases was zero). In order to address this, an alternate table of supply volumes was developed that is referenced for some projects. This reference table, rather than the provided template data, was used to answer this question. The following logic was applied in scoring this criterion:

- Entities with no needs received a score of 100% (rather than a calculated “error” of supply divided by 0 need). This applied mostly to conservation and supplemental well strategies.
- If the WMS served only one WUG, then the score was auto-calculated based on the supply and need in the first decade online for that one WUG. A “flag” helped determine if the auto-calculation should use the TWDB template supplies or use supplies from the alternate table of supplies.
- If the WMS applied to multiple WUGs/WPPs, the sum of needs for those WUGs/WPPs was calculated. The score was then auto-calculated based on the supply and need in the first decade online. A “flag” helped determine if the auto-calculation should use the TWDB template supplies or use supplies from the alternate table of supplies.

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?

This criterion was addressed in the same manner as Uniform Standard 3A, using the year 2060 needs and supplies.

Uniform Standard 3C - Is this project the only economically feasible source of new supply for the WUG, other than conservation?

The TWDB scoring of this standard is 0 for “No” and 5 for “Yes”. The subcommittee made the determination that all projects should receive a “Yes” answer (score of 5).

Uniform Standard 3D - Does this project serve multiple WUGs?

The TWDB scoring of this standard is 0 for “No” and 5 for “Yes”. This question was answered individual for each WMS. In general, all conservation was assumed to apply to only the entity listed as the sponsor. In the same way, most WMSs sponsored by non-municipal and County Other WUGs were assumed to serve only the WUG listed as the sponsor. In general, projects sponsored by WWPs were assumed to serve multiple WUGS (all WWP customers) unless specific information dictated otherwise. In all other cases, this standard was answered individually based on project knowledge. All scoring is documented on a separate sheet (“Standard 3”) in the Prioritization Template.

Uniform Standard 4A - Over what period of time is this project expected to provide water (regardless of the planning period)?

The TWDB scoring of this standard is 5 for “Less than 20 years” and 10 for “More than 20 years”. This criterion was scored using an automatic calculation. If a strategy was listed in two or more decades, it was assumed to be in service “more than 20 years” (based on input from the subcommittee). Projects starting in 2050 or 2060 were examined to determine if they continued after 2060. Most of the projects in the regional plan are anticipated to have lifespans of many decades, and therefore the majority of entries in the prioritization template will achieve the maximum points on this criterion. The exceptions to this are:

- Overdrafting strategies
- Temporary or Interim strategies shown in only one planning decade
- Emergency supplies.

The auto-calculation for each WMS is documented on a separate sheet (“Standard 4A”) in the Prioritization Template.

Uniform Standard 4B - Does the volume of water supplied by the project change over the regional water planning period?

The TWDB scoring of this standard is 0 for “Decreases”, 3 for “No change,” and 5 for “Increases”. This criterion was scored using an automatic calculation which compares supply from the first decade online to the supply in 2060. As mentioned under Standard 3A and 3B, some of the supply volumes provided in the TWDB template (from DB12) did not represent the total supply volume provided by the WMS. In

some cases, this question referenced the alternate table of supplies to answer this question. The auto-calculation for each WMS is documented on a separate sheet (“Standard 4B”) in the Prioritization Template.

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?

The TWDB scoring of this standard is as follows:

- 0 = 200% greater than median
- 1 = 150-199% greater than median
- 2 = 101-149% greater than median
- 3 = 100% of median
- 4 = 51-99% of median
- 5 = 0-50% of median

For each project, a unit cost for each decade was calculated using the annual cost and supply volume or alternate supply volume as calculated for Standard 3A. For Grouped WMSs, a unit cost for each decade was calculated using the combined annual cost of all sponsors and divided by the combined supply volume for all sponsors for the project. For most WMSs with no supply such as water treatment plants and supplemental wells, the alternate supply volume described under Standard 3A was used to calculate unit cost. There were 8 individual WMS that were infrastructure projects with no supply and are intended to make use of available supply shown under other WMSs. In those 8 cases, a unit cost was not calculated and the WMSs were given the neutral score of 3.

Once the decadal unit costs were calculated for each WMS, each WMSs decadal costs were averaged to determine a unit cost for all years online for each WMS. The unit costs for all WMSs were then compiled and a median was developed. WMSs with \$0 unit costs were eliminated from the calculation of the median cost, per the direction of the Subcommittee.

Once the median unit cost of all WMSs in the RWP was determined (as described above), the average unit cost of each WMS (as described above) was compared to that median unit cost. Each WMS was scored according to its relation to the median unit cost per TWDB scoring guidelines.

The calculation for each WMS is documented on a separate sheet (“Standard 5”) in the Prioritization Template.

Concerns with prioritization process

During the process of prioritization, the Subcommittee identified a number of concerns that they would like addressed in subsequent prioritization efforts. Those concerns are as follows:

- The Subcommittee has concerns as to how this list will appear to the public without sufficient explanation of what the projects are, how the scores were calculated, and without knowledge of how some of these projects are interdependent.
 - Because of the simplistic naming convention required for DB12, it is difficult for the general public to know what projects these WMSs actually represent. Examples are: “Purchase from provider”, “Conveyance Project”, “Facility Improvements”.
 - It should be explained that the WMSs titled “Supplemental Wells” do not represent increase groundwater use within Region C. This naming convention was developed to describe “replacement wells”. These were included in response to TWDB’s requirement that any project applying for TWDB financing be included in the Region C Plan.
 - Although some projects were grouped as described at the beginning of this memo, it was not possible to group all projects that relied on another WMS. For example, many WMSs rely on the supply from the proposed Lower Bois d’Arc Creek Reservoir project but may have ranked higher than the reservoir project. In reality, those WMSs will not be possible until after the construction of the reservoir.
 - Most conservation strategies rank high on the prioritization list (as would be expected), however, many of these projects have no capital cost and would not realistically be applying for SWIFT funding. Having them considered alongside projects that would actually apply for SWIFT funding is not practical. For that reason, a supplemental prioritization list is presented at the end of this memo which does not contain the conservation strategies.
- A number of WMSs on the prioritization list represent the compilation of multiple facility improvements or new/expanded water treatment plants that occur over multiple decades. In DB12 these were treated as a single WMS, and subsequently are treated as a single WMS in this prioritization process. This gives the appearance of very large capital costs in one decade when in reality those projects occur in multiple decades. (*example: NTMWD Facility Improvements of \$2.3 billion in 2010 when in reality this cost is spread over all 6 decades, with only \$527 million in 2010*).

- For WMSs that have been grouped together, some sponsors have expended different levels of planning and engineering (Standard 2C) and have different first decade online (Standard 1). In order to keep these projects grouped and result in the same score, answers to Standards 1 and 2C may not reflect the auto-calculated formulas or the answers each sponsor has provided to consultants.
- Standard 4B scores WMSs based on whether the volume of water supplied by the project changes over time, with a score of 0 if the supply decreases. The Subcommittee feels this unfairly affects the score of reservoir projects because of small decreases in supply over time due to sedimentation.
- A small number of strategies in the 2011 Region C Water Plan were not listed in the TWDB pre-populated template. Region C is still evaluating whether these project need to be included in the prioritization process. A draft of these projects and their scoring will be given to TWDB for their review sometime after the June 1, 2014 deadline (we estimate it will be before July 1, 2014). Contingent on TWDB approval, Region C intends to add these projects to the final list of prioritized projects in its final submission to the TWDB on September 1, 2014.

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need 400	Feasibility 100	Viability 250	Sustain- ability 150	Cost Effective 100	FINAL SCORE FOR 1,000	Rank
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
COUNTY-OTHER, COOKE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	208	150	100	950	T1
COUNTY-OTHER, FANNIN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	208	150	100	950	T1
COUNTY-OTHER, WISE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	208	150	100	950	T1
HIGHLAND PARK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	208	150	100	950	T1
SANSOM PARK VILLAGE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	208	150	100	950	T1
UNIVERSITY PARK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	208	150	100	950	T1
DENISON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$25,961	400	92	197	150	100	939	7
KIOWA HOMEOWNERS WS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	178	150	100	920	8
MINING, JACK	Indirect reuse - Jacksboro for Jack County mining	\$200,000	400	80	208	130	100	918	9
CORSICANA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$31,760	400	92	168	150	100	910	10
DAWSON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	164	150	100	906	11
BLOOMING GROVE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	163	150	100	905	T12
EVERMAN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	163	150	100	905	T12
RICE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	161	150	100	903	T14
MUENSTER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	161	150	100	903	T14
FAIRFIELD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	158	150	100	900	16
RICE WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	157	150	100	899	T17
NAVARRO MILLS WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	157	150	100	899	T17
MINERAL WELLS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	156	150	100	898	T19
CHATFIELD WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	156	150	100	898	T19
PALMER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	156	150	100	898	T19
M E N WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	156	150	100	898	T19
SOUTH GRAYSON WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	153	150	100	895	23
MANSFIELD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$118,016,000	360	92	250	150	40	892	T24
GRAPEVINE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$45,647	400	92	150	150	100	892	T24
BRYSON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	208	150	40	890	T26
PAYNE SPRINGS	New wells - Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	\$378,000	400	72	208	130	80	890	T26
COUNTY-OTHER, ROCKWA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	147	150	100	889	T28
COUNTY-OTHER, TARRANT	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	147	150	100	889	T28
RENO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	147	150	100	889	T28
SHERMAN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$33,049	400	92	147	150	100	889	T28
AURORA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	146	150	100	888	T32
KERENS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	146	150	100	888	T32
WOODBINE WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	144	150	100	886	T34
DALWORTHINGTON GARD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	144	150	100	886	T34
HURST	Municipal conservation - basic	\$33,764	400	92	144	150	100	886	T34
COLLEYVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$24,497	400	92	143	150	100	885	T37
NORTH RICHLAND HILLS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$54,029	400	92	143	150	100	885	T37
SACHSE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$19,826	400	92	143	150	100	885	T37
ANNETTA SOUTH	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	143	150	100	885	T37
MESQUITE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$62,452	400	92	143	150	100	885	T37
ROCKETT SUD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$38,460,000	360	84	250	150	40	884	T42
TERRELL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$21,683	400	92	142	150	100	884	T42
LUELLA WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	100	883	T44
TROPHY CLUB	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	100	883	T44
MABANK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	161	150	80	883	T44
ROCKETT SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	100	883	T44
ROWLETT	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	100	883	T44
ROYSE CITY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	140	150	100	882	T49
MAYPEARL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	160	150	80	882	T49
BOYD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	140	150	100	882	T49
IRVING	Municipal conservation - basic	\$10,000	400	92	140	150	100	882	T49
HACKBERRY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	140	150	100	882	T49
GLENN HEIGHTS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	140	150	100	882	T49
THE COLONY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
HEATH	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
SOUTHLAKE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
MURPHY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
ROCKWALL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
NEW HOPE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
MILLIGAN WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
ROANOKE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
HIGHLAND VILLAGE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
FATE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
PLANO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	100	881	T55
SUNNYVALE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	100	880	T66
COMMUNITY WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	100	880	T67
NEVADA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	100	880	T67
HASLET	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	138	150	100	880	T67
PARKER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	100	880	T67
ITALY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	100	880	T67
CULLEOKA WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	100	880	T67
LAVON WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	100	880	T67
ANNETTA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	100	880	T67
TALTY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
MELISSA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need 400	Feasibility 100	Viability 250	Sustain- ability 150	Cost Effective 100	FINAL SCORE FOR 1,000	Rank
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
MARILEE SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
RICHLAND HILLS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
OAK GROVE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
EAST FORK SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
COLLEGE MOUND WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
ARGYLE WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
HIGH POINT WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
GASTONIA-SCURRY SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
PROSPER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
SOUTHWEST FANNIN COU	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
WESTWORTH VILLAGE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	100	879	T75
MANSFIELD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$28,819	400	92	136	150	100	878	T88
COUNTY-OTHER, KAUFMA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	136	150	100	878	T88
POST OAK BEND CITY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	136	150	100	878	T88
BLACKLAND WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	136	150	100	878	T88
PELICAN BAY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	136	150	100	878	T88
SCURRY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	136	150	100	878	T88
CROWLEY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	136	150	100	878	T88
SANCTUARY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
FOREST HILL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
MCLENDON-CHISHOLM	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
RIVER OAKS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
SEVEN POINTS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
WEST WISE RURAL SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
PARADISE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
WATAUGA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
LUCAS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
KEMP	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
BARDWELL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	100	877	T95
TOOL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	100	876	T106
NEW FAIRVIEW	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	100	876	T106
KRUM	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	100	876	T106
LADONIA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	100	876	T106
BARTONVILLE WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	100	876	T106
TWO WAY SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	100	876	T106
MELISSA	Conveyance project (1)	\$1,916,000	360	84	182	150	100	876	T106
BELLS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	100	876	T106
ARLINGTON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	100	876	T106
CORSICANA	Conveyance project (1)	\$28,160,000	360	92	233	150	40	875	T115
MINING, WISE	Direct reuse	\$0	360	92	173	150	100	875	T115
KRUGERVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	133	150	100	875	T115
HALTOM CITY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	133	150	100	875	T115
HOWE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	133	150	100	875	T115
WILLOW PARK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	133	150	100	875	T115
COLLINSVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	133	150	100	875	T115
LINCOLN PARK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	132	150	100	874	T122
VALLEY VIEW	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	132	150	100	874	T122
MUSTANG SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	132	150	100	874	T122
LEONARD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	132	150	100	874	T122
BOLIVAR WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	132	150	100	874	T122
COUNTY-OTHER, DENTON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	131	150	100	873	T127
NEWARK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	131	150	100	873	T127
SOUTHMAYD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	131	150	100	873	T127
AUBREY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	131	150	100	873	T127
GUNTER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	131	150	100	873	T127
SHADY SHORES	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	131	150	100	873	T127
BLUE RIDGE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	130	150	100	872	T133
DENTON	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$265,434,000	360	72	250	150	40	872	T133
ABLES SPRINGS WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	130	150	100	872	T133
LEWISVILLE	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$53,666,000	400	60	221	150	40	871	136
IRRIGATION, KAUFMAN	Golf course conservation	\$0	400	92	148	150	80	870	T137
PROSPER	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	128	150	100	870	T137
HIGHLAND VILLAGE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	128	150	100	870	T137
IRRIGATION, TARRANT	Golf course conservation	\$0	400	92	148	150	80	870	T137
HUDSON OAKS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	147	150	80	869	141
ALVORD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
BLUE MOUND	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
COUNTY-OTHER, COLLIN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
COUNTY-OTHER, DALLAS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
COUNTY-OTHER, ELLIS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
COUNTY-OTHER, FREESTON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
COUNTY-OTHER, GRAYSON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
COUNTY-OTHER, HENDERS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
COUNTY-OTHER, NAVARR	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
COUNTY-OTHER, PARKER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
ECTOR	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need 400	Feasibility 100	Viability 250	Sustain- ability 150	Cost Effective 100	FINAL SCORE FOR 1,000	Rank
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
EUSTACE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
FROST	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
JACKSBORO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
JOHNSON COUNTY SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
LINDSAY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
LOG CABIN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
MALAKOFF	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
MILFORD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
PANTEGO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
PECAN HILL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
SAVOY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
TEAGUE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
TRINIDAD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
VIRGINIA HILL WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
RED OAK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	145	150	80	867	T142
FORT WORTH	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	100	867	T142
KELLER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	145	150	80	867	T142
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Denton Creek wastewater treatment plant reuse	\$9,506,000	360	92	184	130	100	866	170
MIDLOTHIAN	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$66,150,000	360	72	243	150	40	865	171
NORTH COLLIN WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	142	150	80	864	T172
DANVILLE WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	142	150	80	864	T172
EAST CEDAR CREEK FWSD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$14,540,000	360	84	250	150	20	864	T172
FORNEY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	80	863	T175
BEDFORD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	80	863	T175
R-C-H WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	80	863	T175
SAINT PAUL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	80	863	T175
EDGECLIFF	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	80	863	T175
SAGINAW	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	80	863	T175
LOWRY CROSSING	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	80	863	T175
FARMERSVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	140	150	80	862	T182
WHITESBORO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	140	150	80	862	T182
WESTOVER HILLS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$18,461	400	92	140	150	80	862	T182
FORNEY LAKE WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	140	150	80	862	T182
MT ZION WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	80	861	T186
PRINCETON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	80	861	T186
JOSEPHINE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	80	861	T186
WAXAHACHIE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	80	861	T186
RUNAWAY BAY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	139	150	80	861	T186
AZLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	119	150	100	861	T186
ATHENS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$25,600	400	92	138	150	80	860	192
BONHAM	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	80	859	T193
NORTHLAKE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	137	150	80	859	T193
POTTSBORO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	137	150	80	859	T193
DOUBLE OAK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	136	150	80	858	T196
SPRINGTOWN	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$408,750	400	72	176	130	80	858	T196
RHOME	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	136	150	80	858	T196
JUSTIN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$19,324	400	92	136	150	80	858	T196
WHITEWRIGHT	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	80	857	T200
ALEDO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	135	150	80	857	T200
GUN BARREL CITY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	80	857	T200
LAKE DALLAS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	80	857	T200
HICKORY CREEK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	80	857	T200
COPPER CANYON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	80	857	T200
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Facility improvements	\$2,295,829,800	400	100	167	130	60	857	T200
DENTON COUNTY FWSD #1	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	80	857	T200
BARTONVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	135	150	80	857	T200
DALLAS	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$1,068,033,000	360	72	234	150	40	856	T209
ARGYLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	134	150	80	856	T209
PONDER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	133	150	80	855	T211
GAINESVILLE	Cooke County project	\$50,280,000	360	100	245	150	0	855	T211
CELINA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	133	150	80	855	T211
WESTON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	132	150	80	854	214
CORSICANA	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	131	150	80	853	215
FLOWER MOUND	Municipal conservation - basic	\$42,253	400	92	110	150	100	852	T216
DALLAS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	110	150	100	852	T216
GRAPEVINE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$8,412	400	92	129	150	80	851	T218
LAKE SIDE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	129	150	80	851	T218
IRRIGATION, ELLIS	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$2,487,000	400	72	208	130	40	850	T220
WORTHAM	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$4,662,000	400	92	208	130	20	850	T220
POTTSBORO	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	127	150	80	849	T222
ALEDO	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	127	150	80	849	T222
LADONIA	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	127	150	80	849	T222
ARGYLE WSC	Supplemental wells	\$2,836,000	400	72	167	130	80	849	T222
SHERMAN	Supplemental wells	\$33,882,000	400	72	167	130	80	849	T222
MARILEE SUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	127	150	80	849	T222

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need	Feasibility	Viability	Sustain-ability	Cost Effective	FINAL SCORE FOR	Rank
			400	100	250	150	100	1,000	
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
WESTON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	80	848	T228
WAXAHACHIE	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$38,452,000	360	84	214	150	40	848	T228
KRUM	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	80	848	T228
HOWE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	80	848	T228
COLLINSVILLE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	80	848	T228
CHICO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	106	150	100	848	T228
BOLIVAR WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	80	848	T228
MUSTANG SUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	80	848	T228
BLUE RIDGE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	80	848	T228
ABLES SPRINGS WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	80	848	T228
WALNUT CREEK SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	105	150	100	847	T238
EAST CEDAR CREEK FWSD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	125	150	80	847	T238
IRRIGATION, COLLIN	Golf course conservation	\$0	400	92	125	150	80	847	T238
IRRIGATION, DALLAS	Golf course conservation	\$0	400	92	125	150	80	847	T238
IRRIGATION, DALLAS	Supplemental wells	\$316,000	400	92	125	130	100	847	T238
LIVESTOCK, DALLAS	Supplemental wells	\$186,000	400	92	125	130	100	847	T238
LIVESTOCK, JACK	Supplemental wells	\$43,000	400	92	125	130	100	847	T238
LIVESTOCK, KAUFMAN	Supplemental wells	\$56,000	400	92	125	130	100	847	T238
LIVESTOCK, NAVARRO	Supplemental wells	\$105,000	400	92	125	130	100	847	T238
LIVESTOCK, ROCKWALL	Supplemental wells	\$28,000	400	92	125	130	100	847	T238
MINING, DALLAS	Supplemental wells	\$316,000	400	92	125	130	100	847	T238
MINING, NAVARRO	Supplemental wells	\$348,000	400	92	125	130	100	847	T238
WEST CEDAR CREEK MUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	104	150	100	846	T250
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	Indirect reuse	\$0	360	84	172	130	100	846	T250
MCKINNEY	Municipal conservation - basic	\$53,573	400	92	103	150	100	845	T252
FERRIS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	103	150	100	845	T252
LAKESIDE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$18,728	400	92	162	150	40	844	254
FRISCO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$38,971	400	92	101	150	100	843	T255
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	Conveyance project (1)	\$50,912,000	400	88	205	150	0	843	T255
BENBROOK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	121	150	80	843	T255
RICHARDSON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$10,000	400	92	100	150	100	842	T258
CEDAR HILL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$31,256	400	92	100	150	100	842	T258
WILMER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	100	150	100	842	T258
LEWISVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$61,895	400	92	100	150	100	842	T258
GARLAND	Municipal conservation - basic	\$81,051	400	92	97	150	100	839	T262
KAUFMAN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$22,543	400	92	97	150	100	839	T262
DUNCANVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	117	150	80	839	T262
ALLEN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$8,711	400	92	97	150	100	839	T262
FAIRVIEW	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	97	150	100	839	T262
WALNUT CREEK SUD	Conveyance project (1)	\$10,093,000	360	84	184	130	80	838	T267
CORINTH	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	116	150	80	838	T267
WYLIE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	115	150	80	837	T269
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL	Lake Ralph Hall	\$286,401,000	360	80	207	150	40	837	T269
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL	Lake Ralph Hall - indirect reuse	\$0	360	80	207	150	40	837	T269
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Las Colinas reuse	\$14,530,000	360	92	175	130	80	837	T269
TOM BEAN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	174	150	20	836	273
DENTON COUNTY FWSD #1	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	93	150	100	835	T274
FRISCO	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$38,971	400	92	93	150	100	835	T274
COPPELL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$7,192	400	92	91	150	100	833	T276
ANNA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	111	150	80	833	T276
FORT WORTH	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$772,646,000	360	92	190	150	40	832	T278
GRAND PRAIRIE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$10,000	400	92	110	150	80	832	T278
FAIRVIEW	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	89	150	100	831	280
CARROLLTON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$10,000	400	92	88	150	100	830	T281
VAN ALSTYNE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	108	150	80	830	T281
WISE COUNTY WSD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$14,540,000	360	84	216	150	20	830	T281
WHITE SETTLEMENT	Municipal conservation - basic	\$27,254	400	92	136	100	100	828	284
COUNTY-OTHER, DALLAS	Supplemental wells	\$794,000	400	92	125	130	80	827	T285
COUNTY-OTHER, DENTON	Supplemental wells	\$1,170,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
COUNTY-OTHER, KAUFMAN	Supplemental wells	\$404,000	400	92	125	130	80	827	T285
FAIRFIELD	Supplemental wells	\$2,556,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
IRRIGATION, DENTON	Supplemental wells	\$116,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
IRRIGATION, GRAYSON	Supplemental wells	\$10,032,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
IRRIGATION, PARKER	Supplemental wells	\$28,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
IRRIGATION, WISE	Supplemental wells	\$35,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
KIOWA HOMEOWNERS WSD	Supplemental wells	\$1,948,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
LIVESTOCK, COOKE	Supplemental wells	\$4,614,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
LIVESTOCK, DENTON	Supplemental wells	\$116,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
LIVESTOCK, FANNIN	Supplemental wells	\$1,472,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
LIVESTOCK, GRAYSON	Supplemental wells	\$1,025,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
LIVESTOCK, HENDERSON	Supplemental wells	\$56,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
LIVESTOCK, PARKER	Supplemental wells	\$28,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
LIVESTOCK, TARRANT	Supplemental wells	\$75,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
LIVESTOCK, WISE	Supplemental wells	\$35,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
MANUFACTURING, COLLIN	Supplemental wells	\$506,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285
MANUFACTURING, HENDE	Supplemental wells	\$315,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need	Feasibility	Viability	Sustain-ability	Cost Effective	FINAL SCORE FOR	Rank	
			400	100	250	150	100	1,000		
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT		
MINING, GRAYSON	Supplemental wells	\$2,885,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285	
MINING, HENDERSON	Supplemental wells	\$82,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285	
MINING, PARKER	Supplemental wells	\$38,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285	
MINING, WISE	Supplemental wells	\$49,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285	
PROSPER	Supplemental wells	\$4,583,166	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285	
THE COLONY	Supplemental wells	\$4,218,000	400	72	125	130	100	827	T285	
BUENA VISTA - BETHEL SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	85	150	100	827	T285	
RICHARDSON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$10,000	400	92	83	150	100	825	T311	
ENNIS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$27,821	400	92	143	150	40	825	T311	
CRANDALL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$19,942	400	92	103	150	80	825	T311	
IRRIGATION, ROCKWALL	Golf course conservation	\$0	400	92	103	150	80	825	T311	
LANCASTER	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$2,373,000	360	76	198	150	40	824	T315	
SHERMAN	Grayson County project	\$146,071,000	360	64	250	150	0	824	T315	
SEAGOVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	81	150	100	823	T317	
TRENTON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	141	150	40	823	T317	
WALNUT CREEK SUD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$50,890,000	360	72	221	150	20	823	T317	
MUENSTER	Subordination agreement - future-only sources	\$8,217,000	360	92	241	130	0	823	T317	
ADDISON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	79	150	100	821	T321	
JUSTIN	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	99	150	80	821	T321	
TIOGA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$18,528	400	92	137	150	40	819	T323	
COUNTY-OTHER, JACK	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	77	150	100	819	T323	
GAINESVILLE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	77	150	100	819	T323	
EULESS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$48,804	400	92	95	150	80	817	T326	
DECATUR	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	95	150	80	817	T326	
GREATER TEXOMA UTILITY	Grayson County project	\$136,016,000	400	64	203	150	0	817	T326	
FARMERS BRANCH	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,502	400	92	94	150	80	816	329	
COUNTY-OTHER, JACK	Conveyance project (1)	\$4,602,000	400	92	173	150	0	815	330	
BURLESON	Conveyance project (2)	\$2,592,000	360	84	180	150	40	814	T331	
HONEY GROVE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	152	150	20	814	T331	
MIDLOTHIAN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$23,236	400	92	91	150	80	813	T333	
COMBINE WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	71	150	100	813	T333	
BRIDGEPORT	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	91	150	80	813	T333	
GARLAND	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$10,000	400	92	91	150	80	813	T333	
FILES VALLEY WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	71	150	100	813	T333	
MCKINNEY	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$10,000	400	92	90	150	80	812	338	
BRIDGEPORT	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	89	150	80	811	T339	
DENTON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$10,000	400	92	69	150	100	811	T339	
COMBINE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	69	150	100	811	T339	
ALLEN	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$8,711	400	92	88	150	80	810	342	
ENNIS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	127	150	40	809	T343	
MANUFACTURING, GRAYS	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	400	92	87	150	80	809	T343	
ATHENS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	127	150	40	809	T343	
ROCKETT SUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	127	150	40	809	T343	
MANUFACTURING, PARKE	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	127	150	80	809	T343	
BOLIVAR WSC	Supplemental wells	\$10,842,000	400	72	167	130	40	809	T343	
HUTCHINS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	86	150	80	808	T349	
PONDER	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	40	808	T349	
TWO WAY SUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	40	808	T349	
TRENTON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	40	808	T349	
LEONARD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	126	150	40	808	T349	
NEWARK	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	40	808	T349	
FLOWER MOUND	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$10,000	400	92	66	150	100	808	T349	
WILLOW PARK	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	40	808	T349	
GUNTER	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	40	808	T349	
HICKORY CREEK SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	126	150	40	808	T349	
BALCH SPRINGS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	65	150	100	807	T359	
COUNTY-OTHER, COLLIN	Supplemental wells	\$595,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
COUNTY-OTHER, COOKE	Supplemental wells	\$6,354,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
COUNTY-OTHER, GRAYSON	Supplemental wells	\$31,620,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
COUNTY-OTHER, HENDERS	Supplemental wells	\$404,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
COUNTY-OTHER, WISE	Supplemental wells	\$348,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
HIGHLAND VILLAGE	Supplemental wells	\$4,992,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
HONEY GROVE	Supplemental wells	\$1,844,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
IRRIGATION, DENTON	TRA Denton Creek wastewater treatment plant reuse	\$0	360	92	125	130	100	807	T359	
IRRIGATION, FANNIN	Supplemental wells	\$5,123,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
IRRIGATION, WISE	Golf course conservation	\$0	360	92	125	150	80	807	T359	
LEONARD	Supplemental wells	\$2,442,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
LIVESTOCK, ELLIS	Supplemental wells	\$388,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
MANUFACTURING, WISE	Supplemental wells	\$259,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
MINING, DENTON	Supplemental wells	\$267,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
MINING, ELLIS	Supplemental wells	\$388,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
NORTHLAKE	Supplemental wells	\$500,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
RED OAK	Supplemental wells	\$1,749,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
TEAGUE	Supplemental wells	\$2,324,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	
TWO WAY SUD	Supplemental wells	\$7,387,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359	

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need	Feasibility	Viability	Sustain-ability	Cost Effective	FINAL SCORE FOR	Rank
			400	100	250	150	100	1,000	
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
WESTON	Supplemental wells	\$1,168,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359
WHITESBORO	Supplemental wells	\$2,708,000	400	72	125	130	80	807	T359
IRVING	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$10,000	400	92	85	150	80	807	T359
KAUFMAN	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	83	150	80	805	T382
CROSS ROADS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	83	150	80	805	T382
LITTLE ELM	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	83	150	80	805	T382
LANCASTER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	62	150	100	804	385
COCKRELL HILL	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	61	150	100	803	386
LADONIA	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$12,966,000	360	84	208	150	0	802	T387
OAK LEAF	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	80	150	80	802	T387
KENNEDALE	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	80	150	80	802	T387
SPRINGTOWN	Water treatment plant - new	\$8,188,000	360	84	227	130	0	801	T390
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Lower Bois d'Arc Creek Reservoir	\$615,498,000	360	76	175	150	40	801	T390
COPPELL	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$7,192	400	92	59	150	100	801	T390
COUNTY-OTHER, NAVARRO	Supplemental wells	\$558,000	360	84	125	130	100	799	T393
COMMUNITY WATER COM	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	57	150	100	799	T393
WYLIE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,001	400	92	76	150	80	798	T395
BETHESDA WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	56	150	100	798	T395
RUNAWAY BAY	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$2,735,000	360	84	204	130	20	798	T395
PILOT POINT	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	56	150	100	798	T395
OVILLA	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	75	150	80	797	T399
PANTEGO	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	125	100	80	797	T399
CORINTH	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	75	150	80	797	T399
WEATHERFORD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	74	150	80	796	402
MOUNTAIN PEAK SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	73	150	80	795	403
AURORA	Purchase from water provider (2)	\$1,439,000	360	76	208	150	0	794	T404
BLUE RIDGE	Conveyance project (3)	\$2,294,000	360	76	208	150	0	794	T404
M E N WSC	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$3,002,000	360	76	208	150	0	794	T404
MIDLOTHIAN	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	52	150	100	794	T404
SANGER	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	70	150	80	792	408
TERRELL	Conveyance project (1)	\$32,551,000	400	92	149	150	0	791	T409
NORTH HUNT WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	49	150	100	791	T409
CRESSON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	48	150	100	790	T411
CORSICANA	Water treatment plant - new	\$32,388,400	360	100	160	130	40	790	T411
SPRINGTOWN	Municipal conservation - basic	\$19,443	400	92	67	150	80	789	T413
BURLESON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	47	150	100	789	T413
CADDO BASIN SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	46	150	100	788	T415
TIOGA	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	20	788	T415
BENBROOK	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	66	150	80	788	T415
BELLS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	20	788	T415
AUBREY	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	126	150	20	788	T415
FROST	Supplemental wells	\$558,000	400	92	125	130	40	787	T420
WESTON	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$27,722,000	360	76	201	150	0	787	T420
LITTLE ELM	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$421,000	400	72	104	130	80	786	422
BETHEL-ASH WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	43	150	100	785	423
KENNEDALE	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$717,000	400	72	142	130	40	784	T424
CASH SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	42	150	100	784	T424
MANUFACTURING, DENTON	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$717,000	400	72	142	130	40	784	T424
PAYNE SPRINGS	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	61	150	80	783	427
DAWSON	Water treatment plant - new	\$1,044,000	360	84	208	130	0	782	428
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Tarrant County project	\$59,008,000	360	80	191	150	0	781	T429
NEWARK	Conveyance project (2)	\$2,376,000	360	84	187	150	0	781	T429
WORTHAM	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	138	150	0	780	431
GAINESVILLE	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	400	80	149	50	100	779	T432
COUNTY-OTHER, FREESTONE	Supplemental wells	\$463,000	360	64	125	130	100	779	T432
IRRIGATION, FREESTONE	Supplemental wells	\$75,000	360	64	125	130	100	779	T432
LIVESTOCK, FREESTONE	Supplemental wells	\$75,000	360	64	125	130	100	779	T432
MINING, FREESTONE	Supplemental wells	\$118,000	360	64	125	130	100	779	T432
MINING, TARRANT	Supplemental wells	\$156,000	360	64	125	130	100	779	T432
SARDIS-LONE ELM WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	57	150	80	779	T432
FARMERS BRANCH	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,502	400	92	57	150	80	779	T432
CARROLLTON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$10,000	400	92	57	150	80	779	T432
NEW FAIRVIEW	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$2,518,400	360	76	192	150	0	778	441
IRRIGATION, ELLIS	Golf course conservation	\$0	400	92	55	150	80	777	T442
AZLE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	55	150	80	777	T442
OAK POINT	Municipal conservation - basic	\$5,000	400	92	54	150	80	776	444
PILOT POINT	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$443,000	400	72	133	130	40	775	445
SARDIS-LONE ELM WSC	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$9,467,000	360	76	188	150	0	774	T446
CORSICANA	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$19,970,000	360	84	160	130	40	774	T446
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL	Facility improvements - reuse sources	\$590,686,000	400	100	83	130	60	773	448
LITTLE ELM	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	50	150	80	772	449
DE SOTO	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	89	150	40	771	T450
BLACKLAND WSC	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$3,067,000	360	76	185	150	0	771	T450
OVILLA	Conveyance project (2)	\$6,169,000	360	84	176	150	0	770	452
BARDWELL	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	0	768	T453

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need	Feasibility	Viability	Sustain-ability	Cost Effective	FINAL SCORE FOR	Rank
			400	100	250	150	100	1,000	
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
WEATHERFORD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$36,422,000	280	68	250	150	20	768	T453
WHITEWRIGHT	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	126	150	0	768	T453
AZLE	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$20,892,000	360	84	194	130	0	768	T453
AZLE	Water treatment plant - new	\$14,964,000	360	84	194	130	0	768	T453
ALVORD	Supplemental wells	\$1,508,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
AUBREY	Supplemental wells	\$1,794,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
AURORA	Supplemental wells	\$1,512,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
BELLS	Supplemental wells	\$2,033,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
BLUE MOUND	Supplemental wells	\$1,528,168	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
BLUE RIDGE	Supplemental wells	\$1,528,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
CELINA	Supplemental wells	\$2,838,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
COLLINSVILLE	Supplemental wells	\$2,990,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
ECTOR	Supplemental wells	\$1,332,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
GUNTER	Supplemental wells	\$2,475,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
IRRIGATION, DENTON	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$717,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
ITALY	Supplemental wells	\$2,434,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
LINDSAY	Supplemental wells	\$1,380,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
LOG CABIN	Supplemental wells	\$1,400,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
LUELLA WSC	Supplemental wells	\$4,214,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
MALAKOFF	Supplemental wells	\$1,512,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
MANUFACTURING, DENTON	Supplemental wells	\$504,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
MANUFACTURING, ELLIS	Supplemental wells	\$13,358,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
MANUFACTURING, HENDE	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	320	92	125	150	80	767	T458
MANUFACTURING, PARKE	Supplemental wells	\$242,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
MARILEE SUD	Supplemental wells	\$4,307,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
MAYPEARL	Supplemental wells	\$1,559,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
NEW FAIRVIEW	Supplemental wells	\$1,340,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
PANTEGO	Supplemental wells	\$3,510,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
SOUTH GRAYSON WSC	Supplemental wells	\$14,471,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER,	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$717,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
TIOGA	Supplemental wells	\$1,830,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
VIRGINIA HILL WSC	Supplemental wells	\$3,096,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T458
SARDIS-LONE ELM WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	44	150	80	766	T486
LAKESIDE	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$662,000	280	48	208	130	100	766	T486
BUENA VISTA - BETHEL SU	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	44	150	80	766	T486
ATHENS	Supplemental wells	\$1,959,000	400	72	83	130	80	765	T489
GAINESVILLE	Supplemental wells	\$5,648,000	400	72	83	130	80	765	T489
HOWE	Supplemental wells	\$2,286,000	400	72	83	130	80	765	T489
NORTH RICHLAND HILLS	Supplemental wells	\$502,000	400	72	83	130	80	765	T489
SPRINGTOWN	Supplemental wells	\$1,421,000	400	72	83	130	80	765	T489
DECATUR	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	83	150	40	765	T489
IRRIGATION, KAUFMAN	Supplemental wells	\$56,000	400	92	42	130	100	764	T495
MINING, JACK	Supplemental wells	\$63,000	400	92	42	130	100	764	T495
BLOOMING GROVE	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$1,495,400	360	64	208	130	0	762	497
COLLEGE MOUND WSC	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$2,569,000	360	76	175	150	0	761	T498
FERRIS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	79	150	40	761	T498
BENBROOK	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$17,046,000	360	84	167	150	0	761	T498
PELICAN BAY	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$1,430,400	360	76	174	150	0	760	501
GREATER TEXOMA UTILITY	Collin-Grayson Municipal Alliance System	\$77,366,000	360	100	149	150	0	759	T502
IRRIGATION, COLLIN	Supplemental wells	\$608,000	360	64	125	130	80	759	T502
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER,	Supplemental wells	\$374,000	360	64	125	130	80	759	T502
CRANDALL	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	76	150	40	758	505
WEATHERFORD	Facility improvements	\$545,000	280	76	230	130	40	756	506
WEST CEDAR CREEK MUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	73	150	40	755	507
MANSFIELD	Water treatment plant - new	\$41,080,000	360	84	160	130	20	754	T508
HEBRON	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	360	92	72	150	80	754	T508
R-C-H WSC	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$2,416,000	360	76	167	150	0	753	T510
BRANDON-IRENE WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	360	92	51	150	100	753	T510
ANNETTA	Conveyance project (2)	\$1,522,100	360	84	159	150	0	753	T510
WALNUT CREEK SUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	70	150	40	752	T513
DALLAS	Dallas Water Utilities reuse	\$82,920,000	360	80	102	130	80	752	T513
DALLAS	Additional pipeline from Lake Tawakoni (more Lake Fork sup	\$496,243,000	360	100	151	100	40	751	T515
GRAND PRAIRIE	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$33,724,000	360	76	185	130	0	751	T515
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Kaufman County reuse	\$9,761,000	360	92	168	130	0	750	517
FLO COMMUNITY WSC	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	360	92	47	150	100	749	T518
SARDIS-LONE ELM WSC	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	400	80	119	50	100	749	T518
RED OAK	Conveyance project (2)	\$8,012,000	360	84	155	150	0	749	T518
GUN BARREL CITY	Water treatment plant - new	\$11,576,000	360	84	175	130	0	749	T518
CROWLEY	Conveyance project (2)	\$621,000	360	84	154	150	0	748	522
ANNA	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	65	150	40	747	T523
ALEDO	Supplemental wells	\$2,232,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
BARDWELL	Supplemental wells	\$581,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
COUNTY-OTHER, ELLIS	Supplemental wells	\$8,826,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
COUNTY-OTHER, PARKER	Supplemental wells	\$331,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
EUSTACE	Supplemental wells	\$1,035,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need	Feasibility	Viability	Sustain-ability	Cost Effective	FINAL SCORE FOR	Rank
			400	100	250	150	100	1,000	
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
LAKESIDE	Supplemental wells	\$2,065,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
PALMER	Supplemental wells	\$1,152,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
POTTSBORO	Supplemental wells	\$1,125,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
SOUTHMAYD	Supplemental wells	\$1,519,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
WHITEWRIGHT	Supplemental wells	\$6,181,000	400	72	125	130	20	747	T523
MACBEE SUD	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	360	92	45	150	100	747	T523
DALLAS	Lake Palestine connection (integrated pipeline with TRWD)	\$887,954,000	360	100	187	100	0	747	T523
TARRANT REGIONAL WD	TRWD third pipeline and reuse	\$914,424,000	360	100	187	100	0	747	T523
GLENN HEIGHTS	Supplemental wells	\$1,659,000	400	92	83	130	40	745	S37
SOUTHLAKE	Conveyance project (2)	\$9,427,000	360	84	150	150	0	744	T538
BEDFORD	Supplemental wells	\$2,062,000	400	72	42	130	100	744	T538
CARROLLTON	Supplemental wells	\$1,173,000	400	92	42	130	80	744	T538
COUNTY-OTHER, JACK	Supplemental wells	\$372,000	400	92	42	130	80	744	T538
EULESS	Supplemental wells	\$2,250,000	400	72	42	130	100	744	T538
GRAND PRAIRIE	Supplemental wells	\$3,000,000	400	92	42	130	80	744	T538
IRRIGATION, COOKE	Supplemental wells	\$1,678,000	400	72	42	130	100	744	T538
IRRIGATION, ELLIS	Supplemental wells	\$394,000	400	72	42	130	100	744	T538
IRRIGATION, TARRANT	Supplemental wells	\$75,000	400	72	42	130	100	744	T538
MANUFACTURING, COOKE	Supplemental wells	\$1,584,000	400	72	42	130	100	744	T538
MANUFACTURING, GRAYS	Supplemental wells	\$12,982,000	400	72	42	130	100	744	T538
MINING, COOKE	Supplemental wells	\$420,000	400	72	42	130	100	744	T538
DENTON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$10,000	400	92	61	150	40	743	T550
LAKE WORTH	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$416,000	400	72	121	130	20	743	T550
BUENA VISTA - BETHEL SUD	Conveyance project (2)	\$8,798,000	360	84	149	150	0	743	T550
CRANDALL	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$6,104,000	360	76	157	150	0	743	T550
IRRIGATION, COOKE	Golf course conservation	\$0	360	92	59	150	80	741	S54
MIDLOTHIAN	Water treatment plant - new	\$30,590,000	360	92	138	130	20	740	S55
TEAGUE	New wells - Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	\$902,000	360	64	125	150	40	739	S56
ATHENS	New wells - Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	\$0	360	64	84	150	80	738	S57
TOM BEAN	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	55	150	40	737	T558
VAN ALSTYNE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	75	150	20	737	T558
LEWISVILLE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$61,985	400	92	55	150	40	737	T558
WORTHAM	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$6,488,000	360	76	170	130	0	736	S61
MOUNTAIN PEAK SUD	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	400	80	105	50	100	735	T562
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER,	Direct reuse	\$10,315,000	320	76	169	150	20	735	T562
IRRIGATION, COOKE	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	400	80	125	50	80	735	T562
BRIDGEPORT	Water treatment plant - new	\$11,576,000	360	84	159	130	0	733	S65
CROSS ROADS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	48	150	40	730	T566
WEATHERFORD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	48	150	40	730	T566
MANUFACTURING, DALLAS	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	48	150	80	730	T566
MANUFACTURING, TARRA	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	48	150	80	730	T566
MANUFACTURING, DENTO	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	47	150	80	729	T570
MANUFACTURING, COOKE	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	47	150	80	729	T570
MANUFACTURING, NAVAR	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	47	150	80	729	T570
PAYNE SPRINGS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	47	150	40	729	T570
MANUFACTURING, KAUFM	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	46	150	80	728	T574
MANUFACTURING, COLLIN	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	46	150	80	728	T574
COUNTY-OTHER, DENTON	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$1,639,000	400	72	126	130	0	728	T574
DALLAS	Main Stem Trinity pump station (Lake Ray Hubbard indirect r	\$142,567,000	360	72	116	100	80	728	T574
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Main stem pump station (additional East Fork) NTMWD	\$0	360	72	116	100	80	728	T574
MOUNTAIN PEAK SUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	46	150	40	728	T574
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA 10-Mile Creek reuse project	\$14,895,000	320	76	122	130	80	728	T574
PARKER	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	80	727	T581
MURPHY	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	80	727	T581
MANSFIELD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	45	150	40	727	T581
ANNETTA	Supplemental wells	\$3,610,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
ANNETTA SOUTH	Supplemental wells	\$3,610,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
LINCOLN PARK	Supplemental wells	\$500,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
MINING, DENTON	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$1,064,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
NEWARK	Supplemental wells	\$2,382,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
PELICAN BAY	Supplemental wells	\$3,940,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
PONDER	Supplemental wells	\$1,902,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
SOUTHWEST FANNIN COU	Supplemental wells	\$9,451,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
WILLOW PARK	Supplemental wells	\$5,633,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	T581
PLANO	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	80	727	T581
SUNNYVALE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	80	727	T581
ITALY	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	80	726	T595
SPRINGTOWN	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	44	150	40	726	T595
SPRINGTOWN	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$4,094,000	280	68	227	130	20	725	T597
BARTONVILLE WSC	Supplemental wells	\$6,016,000	400	72	83	130	40	725	T597
DENISON	Supplemental wells	\$2,416,000	400	72	83	130	40	725	T597
MUENSTER	Supplemental wells	\$2,150,000	400	72	83	130	40	725	T597
MUSTANG SUD	Supplemental wells	\$4,444,000	400	72	83	130	40	725	T597
OVILLA	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	43	150	40	725	T597
MANUFACTURING, WISE	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	360	92	43	150	80	725	T597

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need 400	Feasibility 100	Viability 250	Sustain- ability 150	Cost Effective 100	FINAL SCORE FOR 1,000	Rank
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
ADDISON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	42	150	80	724	T604
COLLEYVILLE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	42	130	100	724	T604
SOUTHLAKE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	42	130	100	724	T604
MANUFACTURING, ROCKW	Manufacturing conservation	\$0	320	92	62	150	100	724	T604
SANGER	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	42	150	80	724	T604
BENBROOK	Supplemental wells	\$4,886,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
BETHEL-ASH WSC	Supplemental wells	\$3,712,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
BOYD	Supplemental wells	\$760,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
CORINTH	Supplemental wells	\$541,600	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
COUNTY-OTHER, FANNIN	Supplemental wells	\$13,498,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
COUNTY-OTHER, TARRANT	Supplemental wells	\$463,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
DALWORTHINGTON GARD	Supplemental wells	\$1,165,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
FERRIS	Supplemental wells	\$1,300,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
FLO COMMUNITY WSC	Supplemental wells	\$2,305,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
HURST	Supplemental wells	\$5,958,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
JUSTIN	Supplemental wells	\$2,188,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
KENNEDALE	Supplemental wells	\$4,732,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
RICHLAND HILLS	Supplemental wells	\$3,381,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
SANGER	Supplemental wells	\$3,360,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
SARDIS-LONE ELM WSC	Supplemental wells	\$7,278,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
TROPHY CLUB	Supplemental wells	\$2,179,000	400	72	42	130	80	724	T604
WILMER	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	61	150	20	723	T625
EAST CEDAR CREEK FWSD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	60	150	20	722	T626
LAKE WORTH	Municipal conservation - basic	\$0	400	92	79	150	0	721	T627
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Lake Texoma - authorized (blend)	\$336,356,000	320	100	150	150	0	720	T628
NORTH RICHLAND HILLS	Conveyance project (1)	\$11,803,000	360	84	125	150	0	719	T629
FORT WORTH	Direct reuse	\$182,699,000	400	100	69	150	0	719	T629
MOUNTAIN PEAK SUD	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$876,000	360	64	145	130	20	719	T629
LIVESTOCK, COLLIN	Supplemental wells	\$304,000	360	64	125	130	40	719	T629
MILFORD	Supplemental wells	\$958,000	360	64	125	130	40	719	T629
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER,	Supplemental wells	\$1,186,000	360	64	125	130	40	719	T629
VALLEY VIEW	Supplemental wells	\$456,000	360	64	125	130	40	719	T629
IRVING	Direct reuse	\$58,628,000	360	80	108	150	20	718	T636
DENISON	Conveyance project (1)	\$13,847,000	360	84	83	130	60	717	T637
LAKE CITIES MUNICIPAL U	Supplemental wells	\$2,355,000	360	64	83	130	80	717	T637
FORT WORTH	Water treatment plant - new	\$100,617,000	360	72	133	130	20	715	T639
CHICO	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	70	150	0	712	T640
NAVARRO MILLS WSC	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$1,200,000	360	64	153	130	0	707	T641
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER,	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$14,103,000	280	48	208	150	20	706	T642
DE SOTO	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	44	150	20	706	T642
GRAND PRAIRIE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	44	150	20	706	T642
DUNCANVILLE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	44	150	20	706	T642
CEDAR HILL	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	43	150	20	705	T646
PALO PINTO MWD #1	Redistribution of supplies	\$0	200	100	175	130	100	705	T646
HEATH	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	320	92	42	150	100	704	T648
OAK POINT	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	320	92	42	150	100	704	T648
ARGYLE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	320	92	42	150	100	704	T648
MANUFACTURING, DALLA	Supplemental wells	\$1,410,000	400	92	42	130	40	704	T648
WILMER	Supplemental wells	\$2,977,000	400	92	42	130	40	704	T648
SOUTHMAYD	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$366,000	360	64	125	130	20	699	T653
PANTEGO	Conveyance project (2)	\$1,072,000	360	84	125	130	0	699	T653
SAVOY	Supplemental wells	\$1,368,000	360	64	125	130	20	699	T653
WILLOW PARK	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$3,558,100	360	76	107	150	0	693	T656
DALWORTHINGTON GARD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	50	150	40	692	T657
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Marvin Nichols Reservoir	\$830,894,000	320	44	177	150	0	691	T658
TARRANT REGIONAL WD	Marvin Nichols Reservoir	\$2,371,116,000	320	44	177	150	0	691	T658
TERRELL	Marvin Nichols Reservoir	\$0	320	44	177	150	0	691	T658
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL	Marvin Nichols Reservoir	\$143,042,000	320	44	177	150	0	691	T658
KELLER	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	47	150	40	689	T662
TROPHY CLUB	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	47	150	40	689	T662
MABANK	Water treatment plant - expansion - reuse sources	\$4,094,000	280	68	189	130	20	687	T664
ROCKWALL	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	40	687	T664
SACHSE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	40	687	T664
ROWLETT	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	40	686	T667
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER,	Conveyance project (3)	\$2,099,000	280	48	208	150	0	686	T667
KENNEDALE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	44	150	0	686	T667
NEW HOPE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	40	686	T667
LAKE WORTH	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	43	150	0	685	T671
BETHEL-ASH WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	400	92	42	150	0	684	T672
CELINA	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	42	150	40	684	T672
CASH SUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	42	150	0	684	T672
DALLAS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	42	150	0	684	T672
IRVING	Facility improvements	\$9,092,000	360	92	42	130	60	684	T672
ANNA	Supplemental wells	\$1,381,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
BETHESDA WSC	Supplemental wells	\$10,476,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
BUENA VISTA - BETHEL SU	Supplemental wells	\$3,732,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need	Feasibility	Viability	Sustain-ability	Cost Effective	FINAL SCORE FOR	Rank
			400	100	250	150	100	1,000	
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
CHICO	Supplemental wells	\$2,239,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
COUNTY-OTHER, ROCKWA	Supplemental wells	\$331,000	400	92	42	130	20	684	T672
EVERMAN	Supplemental wells	\$3,524,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
KRUM	Supplemental wells	\$2,266,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
LAKE WORTH	Supplemental wells	\$1,951,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
LITTLE ELM	Supplemental wells	\$2,004,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
MELISSA	Supplemental wells	\$1,330,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
MOUNTAIN PEAK SUD	Supplemental wells	\$3,458,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
PILOT POINT	Supplemental wells	\$4,002,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
SANSOM PARK VILLAGE	Supplemental wells	\$3,456,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
TOM BEAN	Supplemental wells	\$1,196,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
VAN ALSTYNE	Supplemental wells	\$4,422,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
WOODBINE WSC	Supplemental wells	\$3,852,000	400	72	42	130	40	684	T672
WEST WISE RURAL SUD	Water treatment plant - new	\$4,871,000	280	68	204	130	0	682	693
COUNTY-OTHER, ELLIS	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$7,975,000	360	64	125	130	0	679	694
IRVING	Oklahoma water to Irving	\$194,825,000	320	44	184	130	0	678	695
IRVING	Conveyance project (2)	\$12,879,000	360	84	42	130	60	676	696
WEST CEDAR CREEK MUD	Water treatment plant - expansion - reuse sources	\$28,656,000	200	64	241	150	20	675	697
ANNA	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	160	76	186	150	100	672	T698
HONEY GROVE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	70	150	0	672	T698
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Fannin County project	\$38,471,000	360	76	86	150	0	672	T698
FRISCO	Direct reuse - Frisco	\$31,448,606	360	92	70	150	0	672	T698
ROANOKE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	48	150	20	670	T702
HURST	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	48	150	20	670	T702
MAYPEARL	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	48	150	20	670	T702
NORTH RICHLAND HILLS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	48	150	20	670	T702
BEDFORD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	48	150	20	670	T702
EDGECLIFF	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	47	150	20	669	T707
CELINA	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$15,669,250	360	76	83	150	0	669	T707
ARLINGTON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	46	150	20	668	T709
EULESS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	46	150	20	668	T709
WHITESBORO	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	65	150	0	667	T711
RED OAK	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	20	667	T711
BETHESDA WSC	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$16,334,000	280	48	189	150	0	667	T711
MT ZION WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	130	40	667	T711
FORNEY	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	20	666	T715
FORNEY LAKE WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	20	666	T715
NEVADA	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	43	150	20	665	717
HASLET	Supplemental wells	\$1,873,000	400	72	42	130	20	664	T718
RHOME	Supplemental wells	\$1,182,000	400	72	42	130	20	664	T718
ROANOKE	Supplemental wells	\$2,164,000	400	72	42	130	20	664	T718
WHITE SETTLEMENT	Supplemental wells	\$3,969,000	400	72	42	130	20	664	T718
ENNIS	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$33,960,000	200	56	250	150	0	656	722
MINING, COOKE	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - new wells	\$269,000	400	60	125	50	20	655	723
GAINESVILLE	Direct reuse	\$1,828,000	360	92	98	100	0	650	724
SAGINAW	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	46	150	0	648	T725
CHICO	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$3,005,000	280	48	170	150	0	648	T725
WAXAHACHIE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	46	150	0	648	T725
DECATUR	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	160	76	162	150	100	648	T725
HUTCHINS	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	0	647	T729
MABANK	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	45	150	0	647	T729
R-C-H WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	130	20	646	T731
FORT WORTH	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	0	646	T731
NORTH COLLIN WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	0	646	T731
DANVILLE WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	0	646	T731
MESQUITE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	0	646	T731
ROYSE CITY	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	0	646	T731
TERRELL	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	44	150	0	646	T731
BONHAM	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	360	92	43	150	0	645	738
CROWLEY	Supplemental wells	\$4,014,000	400	72	42	130	0	644	T739
HACKBERRY	Supplemental wells	\$959,000	400	72	42	130	0	644	T739
HUDSON OAKS	Supplemental wells	\$7,518,000	400	72	42	130	0	644	T739
RENO	Supplemental wells	\$2,316,000	400	72	42	130	0	644	T739
ENNIS	Ennis reuse	\$31,779,000	280	56	152	150	0	638	743
WHITE SETTLEMENT	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	400	92	42	100	0	634	744
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL	Direct reuse	\$11,313,000	320	76	87	150	0	633	745
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	200	64	167	130	60	621	746
SABINE RIVER AUTHORITY	Toledo Bend project (Region I entities responsible for 20 per	\$475,648,000	160	80	250	130	0	620	747
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER,	Purchase from water provider (2)	\$0	360	76	42	80	60	618	748
DENISON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	320	92	55	150	0	617	749
KELLER	Supplemental wells	\$711,000	360	64	42	130	20	616	T750
LADONIA	Supplemental wells	\$2,250,000	360	64	42	130	20	616	T750
NORTH HUNT WSC	Supplemental wells	\$2,286,000	360	64	42	130	20	616	T750
PAYNE SPRINGS	Supplemental wells	\$688,000	360	64	42	130	20	616	T750
SPRINGTOWN	Conveyance project (3)	\$2,072,400	280	48	137	150	0	615	754

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of Need 400	Feasibility 100	Viability 250	Sustain- ability 150	Cost Effective 100	FINAL SCORE FOR 1,000	Rank
			Weighted Criteria 1 Total	Weighted Criteria 2 Total	Weighted Criteria 3 Total	Weighted Criteria 4 Total	Weighted Criteria 5 Total	FINAL SCORE FOR PROJECT	
WATAUGA	Conveyance project (2)	\$0	160	84	167	100	100	611	755
FAIRFIELD	New wells - Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	\$573,000	200	36	204	130	40	610	756
DALLAS	Redistribution of supplies	\$0	160	92	105	150	100	607	757
FAIRFIELD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	280	92	84	150	0	606	T758
GAINESVILLE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	320	92	44	150	0	606	T758
CEDAR HILL	Supplemental wells	\$2,808,000	280	68	42	130	80	600	760
COUNTY-OTHER, PARKER	Conveyance project (1)	\$0	160	84	125	130	100	599	761
WATAUGA	Conveyance project (3)	\$0	120	48	180	150	100	598	762
TRENTON	Supplemental wells	\$1,226,000	360	64	42	130	0	596	763
FAIRFIELD	Water treatment plant - new	\$8,218,000	200	56	208	130	0	594	T764
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER,	Conveyance project (2)	\$4,028,000	200	36	208	150	0	594	T764
WALNUT CREEK SUD	Water treatment plant - new	\$11,576,000	280	68	115	130	0	593	766
SHERMAN	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	280	92	46	150	20	588	767
PANTEGO	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$1,072,000	280	48	125	130	0	583	768
ARLINGTON	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$54,618,000	200	56	156	130	40	582	769
BRIDGEPORT	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$14,540,000	200	56	173	150	0	579	770
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Freestone County reuse	\$17,266,000	240	64	102	130	40	576	771
MIDLOTHIAN	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	200	84	89	100	100	573	T772
BLOOMING GROVE	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	280	92	51	130	20	573	T772
MUENSTER	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	280	92	49	150	0	571	774
DALLAS	Additional dry year supply	\$1,750,000	200	80	137	50	100	567	775
DALLAS	Lake Wright Patman - reallocation of flood pool	\$896,478,000	240	40	156	130	0	566	776
ARGYLE WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	280	92	43	150	0	565	777
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Lake Texoma - interim purchase from GTUA	\$0	160	92	108	100	100	560	778
CASH SUD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$7,270,000	280	68	61	130	20	559	779
HICKORY CREEK SUD	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$5,000	280	92	42	130	0	544	780
MANUFACTURING, COOKE	Water treatment plant - new	\$0	120	68	104	150	100	542	781
LEWISVILLE	Water treatment plant - new	\$31,621,000	200	56	155	130	0	541	782
DENISON	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$7,270,000	200	56	111	130	40	537	783
BUENA VISTA - BETHEL SUD	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	200	80	105	50	100	535	784
DALLAS	Conveyance project (1)	\$260,000,000	160	92	83	130	60	525	T785
MELISSA	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	240	92	43	150	0	525	T785
DAWSON	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	240	92	47	130	0	509	787
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Ellis County reuse	\$10,384,000	200	64	88	130	20	502	788
BARTONVILLE WSC	Municipal conservation - expanded	\$0	200	92	43	130	0	465	789
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Toledo Bend project (Region I entities responsible for 20 perc	\$929,822,000	160	44	128	130	0	462	T790
TARRANT REGIONAL WD	Toledo Bend project (Region I entities responsible for 20 perc	\$1,000,766,000	160	44	128	130	0	462	T790
TERRELL	Toledo Bend project (Region I entities responsible for 20 perc	\$0	160	44	128	130	0	462	T790
WEST WISE RURAL SUD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$4,094,000	40	56	233	130	0	459	793
WAXAHACHIE	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	40	36	83	150	100	409	794
DALLAS	Fastrill replacement (Region C component)	\$1,980,278,000	80	52	134	130	0	396	795
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Oklahoma water to NTMWD, TRWD, UTRWD	\$210,353,500	80	44	103	130	0	357	T796
TARRANT REGIONAL WD	Oklahoma water to NTMWD, TRWD, UTRWD	\$448,332,000	80	44	103	130	0	357	T796
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL	Oklahoma water to NTMWD, TRWD, UTRWD	\$97,359,000	80	44	103	130	0	357	T796
HICKORY CREEK SUD	Additional Woodbine Aquifer - Existing Wells	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	799

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN (Short List)

Filtered to take out Conservation and Supplemental Wells
Leaves 176 Projects (\$20.96 Billion)

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of	Feasibility	Viability	Sustain-	Cost	FINAL	Rank
			Need	100	250	ability	Effective	SCORE FOR	
			400	100	250	150	100	1,000	
			Weighted	Weighted	Weighted	Weighted	Weighted	Weighted	
			Criteria 1	Criteria 2	Criteria 3	Criteria 4	Criteria 5	Criteria 5	
			Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	
MINING, JACK	Indirect reuse - Jacksboro for Jack County mining	\$200,000	400	80	208	130	100	918	1
MANSFIELD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$118,016,000	360	92	250	150	40	892	2
PAYNE SPRINGS	New wells - Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	\$378,000	400	72	208	130	80	890	3
ROCKETT SUD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$38,460,000	360	84	250	150	40	884	4
MELISSA	Conveyance project (1)	\$1,916,000	360	84	182	150	100	876	5
CORSICANA	Conveyance project (1)	\$28,160,000	360	92	233	150	40	875	T6
MINING, WISE	Direct reuse	\$0	360	92	173	150	100	875	T6
DENTON	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$265,434,000	360	72	250	150	40	872	8
LEWISVILLE	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$53,666,000	400	60	221	150	40	871	9
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Denton Creek wastewater treatment plant reuse	\$9,506,000	360	92	184	130	100	866	10
MIDLOTHIAN	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$66,150,000	360	72	243	150	40	865	11
EAST CEDAR CREEK FWSD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$14,540,000	360	84	250	150	20	864	12
SPRINGTOWN	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$408,750	400	72	176	130	80	858	13
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Facility improvements	\$2,295,829,800	400	100	167	130	60	857	14
DALLAS	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$1,068,033,000	360	72	234	150	40	856	15
GAINESVILLE	Cooke County project	\$50,280,000	360	100	245	150	0	855	16
IRRIGATION, ELLIS	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$2,487,000	400	72	208	130	40	850	T17
WORTHAM	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$4,662,000	400	92	208	130	20	850	T17
WAXAHACHIE	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$38,452,000	360	84	214	150	40	848	19
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	Indirect reuse	\$0	360	84	172	130	100	846	20
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	Conveyance project (1)	\$50,912,000	400	88	205	150	0	843	21
WALNUT CREEK SUD	Conveyance project (1)	\$10,093,000	360	84	184	130	80	838	22
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL WD	Lake Ralph Hall	\$286,401,000	360	80	207	150	40	837	T23
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL WD	Lake Ralph Hall - indirect reuse	\$0	360	80	207	150	40	837	T23
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Las Colinas reuse	\$14,530,000	360	92	175	130	80	837	T23
FORT WORTH	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$772,646,000	360	92	190	150	40	832	26
WISE COUNTY WSD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$14,540,000	360	84	216	150	20	830	27
LANCASTER	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$2,373,000	360	76	198	150	40	824	T28
SHERMAN	Grayson County project	\$146,071,000	360	64	250	150	0	824	T28
WALNUT CREEK SUD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$50,890,000	360	72	221	150	20	823	T30
MUENSTER	Subordination agreement - future-only sources	\$8,217,000	360	92	241	130	0	823	T30
GREATER TEXOMA UTILITY AUTHORITY	Grayson County project	\$136,016,000	400	64	203	150	0	817	32
COUNTY-OTHER, JACK	Conveyance project (1)	\$4,602,000	400	92	173	150	0	815	33
BURLESON	Conveyance project (2)	\$2,592,000	360	84	180	150	40	814	34
IRRIGATION, DENTON	TRA Denton Creek wastewater treatment plant reuse	\$0	360	92	125	130	100	807	35
LADONIA	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$12,966,000	360	84	208	150	0	802	36
SPRINGTOWN	Water treatment plant - new	\$8,188,000	360	84	227	130	0	801	T37
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Lower Bois d'Arc Creek Reservoir	\$615,498,000	360	76	175	150	40	801	T37
RUNAWAY BAY	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$2,735,000	360	84	204	130	20	798	39
AURORA	Purchase from water provider (2)	\$1,439,000	360	76	208	150	0	794	T40
BLUE RIDGE	Conveyance project (3)	\$2,294,000	360	76	208	150	0	794	T40
M E N WSC	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$3,002,000	360	76	208	150	0	794	T40
TERRELL	Conveyance project (1)	\$32,551,000	400	92	149	150	0	791	43
CORSICANA	Water treatment plant - new	\$32,388,400	360	100	160	130	40	790	44
WESTON	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$27,722,000	360	76	201	150	0	787	45
LITTLE ELM	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$421,000	400	72	104	130	80	786	46
KENNEDALE	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$717,000	400	72	142	130	40	784	T47
MANUFACTURING, DENTON	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$717,000	400	72	142	130	40	784	T47
DAWSON	Water treatment plant - new	\$1,044,000	360	84	208	130	0	782	49
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Tarrant County project	\$59,008,000	360	80	191	150	0	781	T50
NEWARK	Conveyance project (2)	\$2,376,000	360	84	187	150	0	781	T50
GAINESVILLE	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	400	80	149	50	100	779	52
NEW FAIRVIEW	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$2,518,400	360	76	192	150	0	778	53
PILOT POINT	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$443,000	400	72	133	130	40	775	54
SARDIS-LONE ELM WSC	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$9,467,000	360	76	188	150	0	774	T55
CORSICANA	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$19,970,000	360	84	160	130	40	774	T55
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL WD	Facility improvements - reuse sources	\$590,686,000	400	100	83	130	60	773	57
BLACKLAND WSC	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$3,067,000	360	76	185	150	0	771	58
OVILLA	Conveyance project (2)	\$6,169,000	360	84	176	150	0	770	59
WEATHERFORD	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$36,422,000	280	68	250	150	20	768	T60
AZLE	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$20,892,000	360	84	194	130	0	768	T60
AZLE	Water treatment plant - new	\$14,964,000	360	84	194	130	0	768	T60
IRRIGATION, DENTON	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$717,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T63
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, DENTON	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$717,000	400	72	125	130	40	767	T63
LAKESIDE	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$662,000	280	48	208	130	100	766	65
BLOOMING GROVE	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$1,495,400	360	64	208	130	0	762	66
COLLEGE MOUND WSC	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$2,569,000	360	76	175	150	0	761	T67
BENBROOK	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$17,046,000	360	84	167	150	0	761	T67
PELICAN BAY	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$1,430,400	360	76	174	150	0	760	69
GREATER TEXOMA UTILITY AUTHORITY	Collin-Grayson Municipal Alliance System	\$77,366,000	360	100	149	150	0	759	70
WEATHERFORD	Facility improvements	\$545,000	280	76	230	130	40	756	71
MANSFIELD	Water treatment plant - new	\$41,080,000	360	84	160	130	20	754	72
R-C-H WSC	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$2,416,000	360	76	167	150	0	753	T73
ANNETTA	Conveyance project (2)	\$1,522,100	360	84	159	150	0	753	T73
DALLAS	Dallas Water Utilities reuse	\$82,920,000	360	80	102	130	80	752	75
DALLAS	Additional pipeline from Lake Tawakoni (more Lake Fork supp	\$496,243,000	360	100	151	100	40	751	T76
GRAND PRAIRIE	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$33,724,000	360	76	185	130	0	751	T76
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Kaufman County reuse	\$9,761,000	360	92	168	130	0	750	78
SARDIS-LONE ELM WSC	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	400	80	119	50	100	749	T79

DRAFT - PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES FROM THE 2011 REGION C WATER PLAN (Short List)

Filtered to take out Conservation and Supplemental Wells
Leaves 176 Projects (\$20.96 Billion)

Sponsor	Recommended Water Management Strategy Name	Capital Cost	Decade of	Feasibility	Viability	Sustain-	Cost	FINAL	Rank
			Need	100	250	ability	Effective	SCORE FOR	
			400			150	100	1,000	
			Weighted	Weighted	Weighted	Weighted	Weighted	Weighted	FINAL
			Criteria 1	Criteria 2	Criteria 3	Criteria 4	Criteria 5	Criteria 5	SCORE FOR
			Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	PROJECT
RED OAK	Conveyance project (2)	\$8,012,000	360	84	155	150	0	749	T79
GUN BARREL CITY	Water treatment plant - new	\$11,576,000	360	84	175	130	0	749	T79
CROWLEY	Conveyance project (2)	\$621,000	360	84	154	150	0	748	82
DALLAS	Lake Palestine connection (integrated pipeline with TRWD)	\$887,954,000	360	100	187	100	0	747	T83
TARRANT REGIONAL WD	TRWD third pipeline and reuse	\$914,424,000	360	100	187	100	0	747	T83
SOUTHLAKE	Conveyance project (2)	\$9,427,000	360	84	150	150	0	744	85
LAKE WORTH	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$416,000	400	72	121	130	20	743	T86
BUENA VISTA - BETHEL SUD	Conveyance project (2)	\$8,798,000	360	84	149	150	0	743	T86
CRANDALL	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$6,104,000	360	76	157	150	0	743	T86
MIDLOTHIAN	Water treatment plant - new	\$30,590,000	360	92	138	130	20	740	89
TEAGUE	New wells - Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	\$902,000	360	64	125	150	40	739	90
ATHENS	New wells - Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	\$0	360	64	84	150	80	738	91
WORTHAM	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$6,488,000	360	76	170	130	0	736	92
MOUNTAIN PEAK SUD	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	400	80	105	50	100	735	T93
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, TARRANT	Direct reuse	\$10,315,000	320	76	169	150	20	735	T93
IRRIGATION, COOKE	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - existing wells	\$0	400	80	125	50	80	735	T93
BRIDGEPORT	Water treatment plant - new	\$11,576,000	360	84	159	130	0	733	96
COUNTY-OTHER, DENTON	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$1,639,000	400	72	126	130	0	728	T97
DALLAS	Main Stem Trinity pump station (Lake Ray Hubbard indirect r	\$142,567,000	360	72	116	100	80	728	T97
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Main stem pump station (additional East Fork) NTMWD	\$0	360	72	116	100	80	728	T97
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA 10-Mile Creek reuse project	\$14,895,000	320	76	122	130	80	728	T97
MINING, DENTON	New wells - Trinity Aquifer	\$1,064,000	400	72	125	130	0	727	101
SPRINGTOWN	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$4,094,000	280	68	227	130	20	725	102
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Lake Texoma - authorized (blend)	\$336,356,000	320	100	150	150	0	720	103
NORTH RICHLAND HILLS	Conveyance project (1)	\$11,803,000	360	84	125	150	0	719	T104
FORT WORTH	Direct reuse	\$182,699,000	400	100	69	150	0	719	T104
MOUNTAIN PEAK SUD	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$876,000	360	64	145	130	20	719	T104
IRVING	Direct reuse	\$58,628,000	360	80	108	150	20	718	107
DENISON	Conveyance project (1)	\$13,847,000	360	84	83	130	60	717	108
FORT WORTH	Water treatment plant - new	\$100,617,000	360	72	133	130	20	715	109
NAVARRO MILLS WSC	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$1,200,000	360	64	153	130	0	707	110
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, HENDERS	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$14,103,000	280	48	208	150	20	706	111
PALO PINTO MWD #1	Redistribution of supplies	\$0	200	100	175	130	100	705	112
SOUTHMAYD	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$366,000	360	64	125	130	20	699	T113
PANTEGO	Conveyance project (2)	\$1,072,000	360	84	125	130	0	699	T113
WILLOW PARK	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$3,558,100	360	76	107	150	0	693	115
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Marvin Nichols Reservoir	\$830,894,000	320	44	177	150	0	691	T116
TARRANT REGIONAL WD	Marvin Nichols Reservoir	\$2,371,116,000	320	44	177	150	0	691	T116
TERRELL	Marvin Nichols Reservoir	\$0	320	44	177	150	0	691	T116
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL WD	Marvin Nichols Reservoir	\$143,042,000	320	44	177	150	0	691	T116
MABANK	Water treatment plant - expansion - reuse sources	\$4,094,000	280	68	189	130	20	687	120
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, PARKER	Conveyance project (3)	\$2,099,000	280	48	208	150	0	686	121
IRVING	Facility improvements	\$9,092,000	360	92	42	130	60	684	122
WEST WISE RURAL SUD	Water treatment plant - new	\$4,871,000	280	68	204	130	0	682	123
COUNTY-OTHER, ELLIS	New wells - Woodbine Aquifer	\$7,975,000	360	64	125	130	0	679	124
IRVING	Oklahoma water to Irving	\$194,825,000	320	44	184	130	0	678	125
IRVING	Conveyance project (2)	\$12,879,000	360	84	42	130	60	676	126
WEST CEDAR CREEK MUD	Water treatment plant - expansion - reuse sources	\$28,656,000	200	64	241	150	20	675	127
ANNA	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	160	76	186	150	100	672	T128
NORTH TEXAS MWD	Fannin County project	\$38,471,000	360	76	86	150	0	672	T128
FRISCO	Direct reuse - Frisco	\$31,448,606	360	92	70	150	0	672	T128
CELINA	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$15,669,250	360	76	83	150	0	669	131
BETHESDA WSC	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$16,334,000	280	48	189	150	0	667	132
ENNIS	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$33,960,000	200	56	250	150	0	656	133
MINING, COOKE	Overdraft Trinity Aquifer - new wells	\$269,000	400	60	125	50	20	655	134
GAINESVILLE	Direct reuse	\$1,828,000	360	92	98	100	0	650	135
CHICO	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$3,005,000	280	48	170	150	0	648	T136
DECATUR	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	160	76	162	150	100	648	T136
ENNIS	Ennis reuse	\$31,779,000	280	56	152	150	0	638	138
UPPER TRINITY REGIONAL WD	Direct reuse	\$11,313,000	320	76	87	150	0	633	139
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	200	64	167	130	60	621	140
SABINE RIVER AUTHORITY	Toledo Bend project (Region I entities responsible for 20 perc	\$475,648,000	160	80	250	130	0	620	141
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, PARKER	Purchase from water provider (2)	\$0	360	76	42	80	60	618	142
SPRINGTOWN	Conveyance project (3)	\$2,072,400	280	48	137	150	0	615	143
WATAUGA	Conveyance project (2)	\$0	160	84	167	100	100	611	144
FAIRFIELD	New wells - Carrizo Wilcox Aquifer	\$573,000	200	36	204	130	40	610	145
DALLAS	Redistribution of supplies	\$0	160	92	105	150	100	607	146
COUNTY-OTHER, PARKER	Conveyance project (1)	\$0	160	84	125	130	100	599	147
WATAUGA	Conveyance project (3)	\$0	120	48	180	150	100	598	148
FAIRFIELD	Water treatment plant - new	\$8,218,000	200	56	208	130	0	594	T149
STEAM ELECTRIC POWER, WISE	Conveyance project (2)	\$4,028,000	200	36	208	150	0	594	T149
WALNUT CREEK SUD	Water treatment plant - new	\$11,576,000	280	68	115	130	0	593	151
PANTEGO	Purchase from water provider (3)	\$1,072,000	280	48	125	130	0	583	152
ARLINGTON	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$54,618,000	200	56	156	130	40	582	153
BRIDGEPORT	Water treatment plant - expansion	\$14,540,000	200	56	173	150	0	579	154
TRINITY RIVER AUTHORITY	TRA Freestone County reuse	\$17,266,000	240	64	102	130	40	576	155
MIDLOTHIAN	Purchase from water provider (1)	\$0	200	84	89	100	100	573	156
DALLAS	Additional dry year supply	\$1,750,000	200	80	137	50	100	567	157
DALLAS	Lake Wright Patman - reallocation of flood pool	\$896,478,000	240	40	156	130	0	566	158

