The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ, agency, or commission) proposes an amendment to §293.44.

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF THE FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE PROPOSED RULE

On May 28, 2010, Paloma Lake Municipal Utility District (MUD) Number 1, Paloma Lake MUD Number 2, Parkside at Mayfield Ranch MUD, and Armbrust & Brown, L.L.P., on behalf of Greenhawe Water Control and Improvement District Number 2, Lakeside MUD Number 3, Moore's Crossing MUD, Travis County MUD Number 4, Travis County MUD Number 7, Travis County MUD Number 9, West Williamson County MUD Number 1, and Williamson County Water Sewer Irrigation and Drainage District Number 3 (Petitioner) proposed an amendment to §293.44 to facilitate regionalization and cooperative planning among water districts and other local government entities by providing clear authorization in the TCEQ's rules to provide a mechanism for allowing the cost incurred by a district to construct or acquire capacity in regional water, wastewater and drainage facilities to be bonded or reimbursed so long as that cost did not exceed the cost the district would have incurred to construct the facilities required to provide the same service on its own. The Petitioner stated that the proposed amendment "would further be consistent with the state's policy, as set forth in Texas Water Code, §49.230 to encourage the development and use of integrated area-wide wastewater collection, treatment and disposal systems to serve the wastewater

disposal needs of the citizens of the state whenever it is economically feasible and competitive to do so." The commission approved the petition during its July 28, 2010 agenda and directed the executive director to initiate rulemaking process. This proposed rulemaking is in response to that direction.

SECTION DISCUSSION

The commission proposes to amend §293.44, Special Considerations. The commission proposes to amend the rule by adding §293.44(a)(8)(D) to allow the commission, or executive director on behalf of the commission to approve bonds for oversized facilities serving areas outside the district if the district or a developer in the district has entered into an agreement with certain local government entities and the oversizing is more cost-effective than alternative facilities to serve the district only. The proposed amendment defines regional water or wastewater provider for the purpose of this subparagraph and specifies the information that must be provided by the applicant before the executive director will review the request. The proposed amendment is intended to facilitate cooperation and coordination between water districts for regional water, wastewater, or drainage facilities by allowing a district to fund the *pro rata* share of oversized facilities serving areas outside the district so long as it is the most cost-effective means of providing service. The proposed amendment may, depending on action by each district's board of directors, provide for a district to fund more than the existing rules allow. The commission proposes to amend §293.44 by revising references

to "sewer" and "sewage" to refer instead to "wastewater," to reflect current terminology and maintain uniform usage. Additionally, the commission proposes to amend §293.44(b)(7) to correct a cross-reference to Chapter 291, Subchapter G, Certificates of Convenience and Necessity.

FISCAL NOTE: COSTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Nina Chamness, Analyst, Strategic Planning and Assessment, determined that, for the first five-year period the proposed rule is in effect, no significant fiscal implications are anticipated for the agency or other units of state or local government as a result of administration or enforcement of the proposed rule.

The agency received a petition to provide a mechanism for water districts to finance regional water, wastewater, and/or drainage facilities that can serve areas outside their district as long as the cost of doing so was not greater than building facilities that would serve only that district. The proposed rule amends Chapter 293 to allow water districts to finance the *pro rata* share of oversized water, wastewater, and/or drainage facilities serving areas outside the district if they make agreements with a municipality or a regional water or wastewater provider and if the financing of these regional facilities is more cost-effective than if the district provided facilities for the district alone. If water districts voluntarily enter into such an agreement, they will be required to submit documentation that demonstrates the cost-effectiveness of the agreement.

The proposed rule will affect water districts such as municipal utility districts, special utility districts, water control and improvement districts, fresh water supply districts, or other types of water districts. There are approximately 1,540 active water districts in the state, and all are local governmental entities. The proposed rule is not expected to have a significant fiscal impact on local government since water districts are not expected to enter into agreements for oversized facilities with municipalities or regional providers of water, wastewater, and/or drainage facilities unless, it is cost-effective for them to do so. Municipalities and regional water and/or wastewater providers are also not expected to enter into such agreements unless, it is cost-effective for them. The cost of building water, wastewater, and/or drainage facilities varies widely across the state and depends on the type and size of the facilities as well as construction costs at the time that such voluntary agreements are made.

PUBLIC BENEFITS AND COSTS

Nina Chamness also determined that for each year of the first five years the proposed rule is in effect the public benefit anticipated from the proposed rule will be the cost-effective supply of water, wastewater, and/or drainage services.

Individuals residing in districts that, under current rule, have not financed the *pro rata* share of oversized water, wastewater, and/or drainage facilities serving areas outside the

district may see an increase in costs as a result of the proposed rule. However, any cost increase would be offset by the benefit of having water, wastewater, and/or drainage infrastructure. Under the proposed rule a district's board of directors could only finance such facilities if it is more cost-effective than providing facilities serving the district alone. Individuals that have not yet purchased property are expected to benefit from the proposed rule since it allows more flexibility for development and may make more property available for purchase.

The proposed rule does not affect businesses that supply water, wastewater, and/or drainage facilities. Land developers are expected to receive reimbursement for infrastructure that is not allowed under current rule. The proposed rule is expected to allow developers to sell property more quickly if their land is in a water district where it is cost-effective to enter into an agreement to finance construction of regional, oversized facilities by a municipality or regional water and/or wastewater provider. The fiscal benefit for a land developer will depend on market conditions and can vary widely across the state.

SMALL BUSINESS AND MICRO-BUSINESS ASSESSMENT

No adverse fiscal implications are anticipated for small or micro-businesses as a result of the proposed rule. Water districts, municipalities, and regional providers of water and/or wastewater will have an additional option when financing the development of

water, wastewater, and/or drainage facilities. Small businesses that are customers of a district may see costs increase if districts are not currently financing the *pro rata* share of regional infrastructure. However, any cost increase would be offset by the benefit of having water, wastewater, and/or drainage infrastructure. Under the proposed rule a district's board of directors could only finance such facilities if it is more cost-effective than providing facilities serving the district alone. Land developers may benefit from the proposed rule if voluntary agreements for oversized water, wastewater, and/or drainage facilities allow them to develop land more quickly. The fiscal benefit for a land developer will depend on market conditions and can vary widely across the state.

SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS

The commission has reviewed this proposed rulemaking and determined that a small business regulatory flexibility analysis is not required because the proposed rule does not adversely affect a small or micro-business in a material way for the first five years that it is in effect.

LOCAL EMPLOYMENT IMPACT STATEMENT

The commission has reviewed this proposed rulemaking and determined that a local employment impact statement is not required because the proposed rule does not adversely affect a local economy in a material way for the first five years that it is in effect.

DRAFT REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS DETERMINATION

The commission reviewed the proposed rulemaking in light of the regulatory analysis requirements of Texas Government Code, §2001.0225, and determined that the rulemaking does not meet the definition of a "major environmental rule" as defined by that statute. A "major environmental rule" means a rule the specific intent of which is to protect the environment or reduce risks to human health from environmental exposure and that may adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, or the public health and safety of the state or a sector of the state.

This rulemaking does not meet the statutory definition of a "major environmental rule" because it is not the specific intent of this rule to protect the environment or reduce risks to human health from environmental exposure. The specific intent of this rule is to provide clear authorization in the TCEQ's rules for a determination of a district's allowable cost participation for oversized facilities serving areas outside the district based on a cost-benefit analysis. The rule is not required by federal regulations.

The proposed amendment to Chapter 293 authorizes the executive director to approve bonds for oversized facilities serving areas outside the district if the district or a developer in the district has entered into an agreement with certain local government

entities and the oversizing is more cost-effective than alternative facilities to serve the district only. Further, this rulemaking does not meet the statutory definition of a "major environmental rule" because the proposed amendment would not adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, or public health and safety of the state or a sector of the state. It is not anticipated that the cost of complying with the proposed amendment will be significant with respect to the economy as a whole; therefore, the proposed amendment will not adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, competition, or jobs.

Additionally, this rulemaking does not meet any of the four applicability requirements listed in Texas Government Code, §2001.0225(a). This section only applies to a major environmental rule, the result of which is to: 1) exceed a standard set by federal law, unless the rule is specifically required by state law; 2) exceed an express requirement of state law, unless the rule is specifically required by federal law; 3) exceed a requirement of a delegation agreement or contract between the state and an agency or representative of the federal government to implement a state and federal program; or 4) adopt a rule solely under the general powers of the agency instead of under a specific state law. This rulemaking does not meet any of these four applicability requirements because this rulemaking: 1) does not exceed any standard set by federal law for treatment of water used in public water systems and is specifically required by state law; 2) does not exceed

the requirements of state law under Texas Water Commission (TWC), Chapter 49, Subchapter F; 3) does not exceed a requirement of a delegation agreement or contract between the state and an agency or representative of the federal government to implement any state and federal program on treatment of water used in public water systems, but rather is proposed to provide clear authorization under state law for the approval of bonds in certain circumstances; and 4) is not proposed solely under the general powers of the agency, but rather specifically under TWC, §12.081, which allows the commission to issue rules necessary to supervise districts and authorities. Under Texas Government Code, §2001.0225, only a major environmental rule requires a regulatory impact analysis. Because this proposal does not constitute a major environmental rule, a regulatory impact analysis is not required. The commission invites public comment regarding this draft regulatory impact analysis determination.

Written comments on the draft regulatory impact analysis determination may be submitted to the contact person at the address listed under the SUBMITTAL OF COMMENTS section of this preamble.

TAKINGS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The commission evaluated the proposed amendment to Chapter 293 and performed a preliminary assessment of whether it constitutes a taking under Texas Government Code, Chapter 2007. The primary purpose of the proposed amendment is to clarify the

executive director's authority in approving bonds in certain circumstances and to further the state's regionalization policy.

Promulgation of the proposed amendment would constitute neither a statutory nor a constitutional taking of private real property. There is no burden imposed on private real property under this rule because the proposed amendment neither relates to, nor has any impact on the use or enjoyment of private real property, and there would be no reduction in property value as a result of this rule. The proposed rule allows the district to reimburse a developer through bonds for oversized facilities serving areas outside the district if the district or a developer has entered into an agreement with certain types of local government entities.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The commission reviewed the proposed rulemaking and found the proposal is a rulemaking identified in the Coastal Coordination Act Implementation Rules, 31 TAC §505.11(b)(4) relating to rules subject to the Coastal Management Program (CMP), and will, therefore, require that goals and policies of the CMP be considered during the rulemaking process.

The commission reviewed this rulemaking for consistency with the CMP goals and policies in accordance with the regulations of the Coastal Coordination Council and

determined that the rulemaking is procedural in nature and will have no substantive effect on commission actions subject to the CMP and is, therefore, consistent with CMP goals and policies.

Written comments on the consistency of this rulemaking may be submitted to the contact person at the address listed under the SUBMITTAL OF COMMENTS section of this preamble.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING

The commission will hold a public hearing on this proposal in Austin on March 8, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in Building E, Room 201S, at the commission's central office located at 12100 Park 35 Circle. The hearing is structured for the receipt of oral or written comments by interested persons. Individuals may present oral statements when called upon in order of registration. Open discussion will not be permitted during the hearing; however, commission staff members will be available to discuss the proposal 30 minutes prior to the hearing.

Persons who have special communication or other accommodation needs who are planning to attend the hearing should contact Sandy Wong, Office of Legal Services at (512) 239-1802. Requests should be made as far in advance as possible.

SUBMITTAL OF COMMENTS

Written comments may be submitted to Natalia Henricksen, MC 205, Office of Legal Services, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, P.O. Box 13087, Austin, Texas 78711-3087, or faxed to (512) 239-4808. Electronic comments may be submitted at: *http://www5.tceq.state.tx.us/rules/ecomments/*. File size restrictions may apply to comments being submitted via the eComments system. All comments should reference Rule Project Number 2010-050-293-OW. The comment period closes March 14, 2011. Copies of the proposed rulemaking can be obtained from the commission's Web site at *http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/nav/rules/propose_adopt.html*. For further information, please contact Gregory Charles, Water Supply Division, Utilities and Districts Section, at (512) 239-4638.

SUBCHAPTER E: ISSUANCE OF BONDS
§293.44

STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The amendment is proposed under the authority of Texas Water Code (TWC), §5.103, which provides the commission's authority to adopt any rules necessary to carry out its powers and duties under the laws of the state; and §12.081, which provides the commission authority to issue rules necessary to supervise districts and authorities created under Article III, §52, and Article XVI, §59, of the Texas Constitution.

The proposed amendment implements TWC, §5.103 and §12.081.

§293.44. Special Considerations.

(a) Developer projects. The following provisions shall apply unless the commission, in its discretion, determines that application to a particular situation renders an inequitable result.

(1) A developer project is a district project that provides water, wastewater, drainage, or recreational facility service for property owned by a developer of property in the district, as defined by Texas Water Code (TWC), §49.052(d).

(2) Except as permitted under paragraph (8) of this subsection, the costs of joint facilities that benefit the district and others should be shared on the basis of benefits received. Generally, the benefits are the design capacities in the joint facilities for each participant. Proposed cost sharing for conveyance facilities should account for both flow and inflow locations.

(3) The cost of clearing and grubbing of district facilities' easements that will also be used for other facilities that are not eligible for district expenditures, such as roads, gas lines, telephone lines, etc., should be shared equally by the district and the developer, except where unusually wide road or street rights-of-way or other unusual circumstances are present, as determined by the commission. The district's share of such costs is further subject to any required developer contribution under §293.47 of this title (relating to Thirty Percent of District Construction Costs to be Paid by Developer). The applicability of the competitive bidding statutes and/or regulations for clearing and grubbing contracts let and awarded in the developer's name shall not apply when the amount of the estimated district share, including any required developer contribution does not exceed 50% of the total construction contract costs.

(4) A district may finance the cost of spreading and compacting of fill in areas that require the fill for development purposes, such as in abandoned ditches or

floodplain areas, only to the extent necessary to dispose of the spoil material (fill) generated by other projects of the district.

(5) The cost of any clearing and grubbing in areas where fill is to be placed should not be paid by the district, unless the district can demonstrate a net savings in the costs of disposal of excavated materials when compared to the estimated costs of disposal off site.

(6) When a developer changes the plan of development requiring the abandonment or relocation of existing facilities, the district may pay the cost of either the abandoned facilities or the cost of replacement facilities, but not both.

(7) When a developer changes the plan of development requiring the redesign of facilities that have been designed, but not constructed, the district may pay the cost of the original design or the cost of the redesign, but not both.

(8) A district shall not finance the pro rata share of oversized water, wastewater [sewer], or drainage facilities to serve areas outside the district unless:

(A) such oversizing:

(i) is required by or represents the minimum approvable design sizes prescribed by local governments or other regulatory agencies for such applications;

(ii) does not benefit out-of-district land owned by the developer;

(iii) does not benefit out-of-district land currently being developed by others; and

(iv) the district agrees to use its best efforts to recover such costs if a future user outside the district desires to use such capacity; or

(B) the district has entered into an agreement with the party being served by such oversized capacity that provides adequate payment to the district to pay the cost of financing, operating, and maintaining such oversized capacity; or

(C) the district has entered into an agreement with the party to be served or benefitted in the future by such oversized capacity, which provides for contemporaneous payment by such future user of the incremental increase in construction and engineering costs attributable to such oversizing and which, until the

costs of financing, construction, operation, and maintenance of such oversized facilities are prorated according to paragraph (2) of this subsection, provides that:

(i) the capacity or usage rights of such future user shall be restricted to the design flow or capacity of such oversized facilities multiplied by the fractional engineering and construction costs contemporaneously paid by such future user; and

(ii) such future user shall pay directly allocable operation and maintenance costs proportionate to such restricted capacity or usage rights; or [.]

(D) the district or a developer in the district has entered into an agreement with a municipality or regional water or wastewater provider regarding the oversized facilities and such oversizing is more cost-effective than alternative facilities to serve the district only. For the purposes of this subparagraph, regional water or wastewater provider means a provider that serves land in more than one county. An applicant requesting approval under this subparagraph must provide:

(i) bid documents or an engineer's sealed estimate of probable costs of alternatives that meet minimum acceptable standards based on costs prevailing at the time the facilities were constructed; or

(ii) an engineering feasibility analysis outlining the service alternatives considered at the time the decision to participate in the oversizing was made; or

(iii) any other information requested by the executive director.

(9) Railroad, pipeline, or underground utility relocations that are needed because of road crossings should not be financed by the district; however, if such relocations result from a simultaneous district project and road crossing project, then such relocation costs should be shared equally. The district's share of such costs is further subject to any required developer contribution under §293.47 of this title.

(10) Engineering studies, such as topographic surveys, soil studies, fault studies, boundary surveys, etc., that contain information that will be used both for district purposes and for other purposes, such as roadway design, foundation design, land purchases, etc., should be shared equally by the district and the developer, unless unusual circumstances are present as determined by the commission. The district's share of such costs is further subject to any required developer contribution under §293.47 of this title.

(11) Land planning, zoning, and development planning costs should not be paid by the district, except for conceptual land-use plans required to be filed with a city as a condition for city consent to creation of the district.

(12) The cost of constructing lakes or other facilities that are part of the developer's amenities package should not typically be paid by the district; however, the costs for the portion of an amenity lake considered a recreational facility under paragraph (24) of this subsection may be funded by the district. The cost of combined lake and detention facilities should be shared with the developer on the basis of the volume attributable to each use, and land costs should be shared on the same basis, unless the district can demonstrate a net savings in the cost of securing fill and construction materials from such lake or detention facilities, when compared to the costs of securing such fill or construction materials off site for another eligible project.

(13) Bridge and culvert crossings shall be financed in accordance with the following provisions.

(A) The costs of bridge and culvert crossings needed to accommodate the development's road system shall not be financed by a district, unless such crossing consists of one or more culverts with a combined cross-sectional area of

not more than nine square feet. The district's share shall be subject to the developer's 30% contribution as may be required by §293.47 of this title.

(B) Districts may fund the costs of bridge and culvert crossings needed to accommodate the development's road system that are larger than those specified in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, which cross channels other than natural waterways with defined bed and banks and are necessary as a result of required channel improvements subject to the following limitations:

(i) the drainage channel construction or renovation must benefit property within the district's boundaries;

(ii) the costs shall not exceed a pro rata share based on the percent of total drainage area of the channel crossed, measured at the point of crossing, calculated by taking the total cost of such bridge or culvert crossing multiplied by a fraction, the numerator of which is the total drainage area located within the district upstream of the crossing, and the denominator of which is the total drainage area upstream of the crossing; and

(iii) the district shall be responsible for not more than 50% of the pro rata share as calculated under this subsection, subject to the developer's 30% contribution as may be required by §293.47 of this title.

(C) The cost of replacement of existing bridges and culverts not constructed or installed by the developer, or the cost of new bridges and culverts across existing roads not financed or constructed by the developer, may be financed by the district, except that any costs of increasing the traffic-carrying capacity of bridges or culverts shall not be financed by the district.

(14) In evaluating district construction projects, including those described in paragraphs (1) - (12) of this subsection, primary consideration shall be given to engineering feasibility and whether the project has been designed in accordance with good engineering practices, notwithstanding that other acceptable or less costly engineering alternatives may exist.

(15) Bond issue proceeds will not be used to pay or reimburse consultant fees for the following:

(A) special or investigative reports for projects which, for any reason, have not been constructed and, in all probability, will not be constructed;

(B) fees for bond issue reports for bond issues consisting primarily of developer reimbursables and approved by the commission but which are no longer proposed to be issued;

(C) fees for completed projects which are not and will not be of benefit to the district; or

(D) provided, however, that the limitations shall not apply to regional projects or special or investigative reports necessary to properly evaluate the feasibility of alternative district projects.

(16) Bond funds may be used to finance costs and expenses necessarily incurred in the organization and operation of the district during the creation and construction periods as follows.

(A) Such costs were incurred or projected to incur during creation, and/or construction periods which include periods during which the district is constructing its facilities or there is construction by third parties of aboveground improvements within the district.

(B) Construction periods do not need to be continuous; however, once reimbursement for a specific time period has occurred, expenses for a prior time period are no longer eligible. Payment of expenses during construction periods is limited to five years in any single bond issue.

(C) Any reimbursement to a developer with bond funds is restricted to actual expenses paid by the district during the same five-year period for which application is made in accordance with this subsection.

(D) The district may pay interest on the advances under this paragraph. Section 293.50 of this title (relating to Developer Interest Reimbursement) applies to interest payments for a developer and such payments are subject to a developer reimbursement audit.

(17) In instances where creation costs to be paid from bond proceeds are determined to be excessive, the executive director may request that the developer submit invoices and cancelled checks to determine whether such creation costs were reasonable, customary, and necessary for district creation purposes. Such creation costs shall not include planning, platting, zoning, other costs prohibited by paragraphs (10) and (14) of this subsection, and other matters not directly related to the district's water, wastewater [sewage], and drainage system, even if required for city consent.

(18) The district shall not purchase, pay for, or reimburse the cost of facilities, either completed or incomplete, from which it has not and will not receive benefit, even though such facilities may have been at one time required by a city or other entity having jurisdiction.

(19) The district shall not enter into any binding contracts with a developer that compel the district to become liable for costs above those approved by the commission.

(20) A district shall not purchase more water supply or wastewater treatment capacity than is needed to meet the foreseeable capacity demands of the district, except in circumstances where:

(A) lease payments or capital contributions are required to be made to entities owning or constructing regional water supply or wastewater treatment facilities to serve the district and others;

(B) such purchases or leases are necessary to meet minimum regulatory standards; or

(C) such purchases or leases are justified by considerations of economic or engineering feasibility.

(21) The district may finance those costs, including mitigation, associated with flood plain regulation and wetlands regulation, attributable to the development of water plants, wastewater treatment plants, pump and lift stations, detention/retention

facilities, drainage channels, and levees. The district's share shall not be subject to the developer's 30% contribution as may be required by §293.47 of this title.

(22) The district may finance those costs associated with endangered species permits. Such costs shall be shared between the district and the developer with the district's share not to exceed 70% of the total costs, unless unusual circumstances are present as determined by the commission. The district's share shall not be subject to the developer's 30% contribution under §293.47 of this title. For purposes of this subsection, "endangered species permit" means a permit or other authorization issued under §7 or §10(a) of the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 United States Code, §1536 and §1539(a).

(23) The district may finance 100% of those costs associated with federal storm water permits. The district's share shall be subject to the developer's 30% contribution as may be required by §293.47 of this title. For purposes of this subsection, "federal storm water permit" means a permit for storm water discharges issued under the federal Clean Water Act, including National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits issued by the commission.

(24) The district may finance the portion of an amenity lake project that is considered a recreational facility.

(A) The portion considered a recreational facility must be accessible to all persons within the district and is determined as:

(i) the percentage of shoreline with at least a 30-foot wide buffer between the shoreline and private property; or

(ii) the percentage of the perimeter of a high bank of a combination detention facility and lake with at least a 30-foot wide buffer between the high bank and private property.

(B) The district's share of costs for the portion of an amenity lake project that is considered a recreational facility is not subject to the developer's 30% contribution under §293.47 of this title.

(C) The authority for districts to fund recreational amenity lake costs in accordance with this paragraph does not apply retroactively to projects included in bond issues submitted to the commission prior to the effective date of this paragraph.

(b) All projects.

(1) The purchase price for existing facilities not covered by a preconstruction agreement or otherwise not constructed by a developer in contemplation of resale to the district, or if constructed by a developer in contemplation of resale to the district and the cost of the facilities is not available after demonstrating a good faith effort to locate the cost records should be established by an independent appraisal by a registered professional engineer hired by the district. The appraised value should reflect the cost of replacement of the facility, less repairs and depreciation, taking into account the age and useful life of the facility and economic and functional obsolescence as evidenced by an on-site inspection.

(2) Contract revenue bonds proposed to be issued by districts for facilities providing water, wastewater [sewer], or drainage, under contracts authorized under Local Government Code, §402.014, or other similar statutory authorization, will be approved by the commission only when the city's pro rata share of debt service on such bonds is sufficient to pay for the cost of the water, wastewater [sewer], or drainage facilities proposed to serve areas located outside the boundaries of the service area of the issuing district.

(3) When a district proposes to obtain capacity in or acquire facilities for water, wastewater [sewer], drainage, or other service from a municipality, district, or other political subdivision, or other utility provider, and proposes to use bond proceeds to compensate the providing entity for the water, wastewater [sewer], drainage, or other services on the basis of a capitalized unit cost, e.g., per connection, per lot, or per acre, the commission will approve the use of bond proceeds for such compensation under the following conditions:

(A) the unit cost is reasonable;

(B) the unit cost approximates the cost to the entity providing the necessary facilities, or the providing entity has adopted a uniform service plan for such water, wastewater [sewer], drainage, and other services based on engineering studies of the facilities required; and

(C) the district and the providing entity have entered into a contract that will:

(i) specifically convey either an ownership interest in or a specified contractual capacity or volume of flow into or from the system of the providing entity;

(ii) provide a method to quantify the interest or contractual capacity rights;

(iii) provide that the term for such interest or contractual capacity right is not less than the duration of the maturity schedule of the bonds; and

(iv) contain no provisions that could have the effect of subordinating the conveyed interest or contractual capacity right to a preferential use or right of any other entity.

(4) A district may finance those costs associated with recreational facilities, as defined in §293.1(c) of this title (relating to Objective and Scope of Rules; Meaning of Certain Words) and as detailed in §293.41(e)(2) of this title (relating to Approval of Projects and Issuance of Bonds) for all affected districts that benefit and are available to all persons within the district. A district's financing, whether from tax-supported or revenue debt, of costs associated with recreational facilities is subject to §293.41(e)(1) - (6) of this title and is not subject to the developer's 30% contribution as may be required by §293.47 of this title. The automatic exemption from the developer's 30% requirement provided herein supersedes any conflicting provision in §293.47(d) of this title. In planning for and funding recreational facilities, consideration is to be given to existing and proposed municipal and/or county facilities as required by TWC, §49.465, and to the requirement that bonds supported by ad valorem taxes may not be

used to finance recreational facilities, as provided by TWC, §49.464(a), except as allowed in TWC, §49.4645.

(5) The bidding requirements established in TWC, Chapter 49, Subchapter I are not applicable to contracts or services related to a district's use of temporary erosion-control devices or cleaning of silt and debris from streets and storm sewers.

(6) A district's contract for construction work may include economic incentives for early completion of the work or economic disincentives for late completion of the work. The incentive or disincentive must be part of the proposal prepared by each bidder before the bid opening.

(7) A district may utilize proceeds from the sale and issuance of bonds, notes, or other obligations to acquire an interest in a certificate of convenience and necessity (CCN), contractual rights to use capacity in facilities and to acquire facilities, with costs determined in accordance with applicable law such as paragraph (3) of this subsection and Chapter 291, Subchapter G of this title (relating to Certificates of Convenience and Necessity [Utility Regulations]).