

Trey Buzbee

From: Trey Buzbee

Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 11:22 AM

To: 'Dunn, David'

Subject: Phase I Reports

One other item I noticed on Study 5: Are you planning stamp the reports with an engineers seal?

How are the other reports coming along?

Trey Buzbee

From: Trey Buzbee
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2008 11:23 AM
To: 'Dunn, David'
Subject: Phase I, Report 4 Comments

1. Page 1 – First paragraph, first sentence, “area shown in Figure 1 on page 2.” Possibly add underlined text to sentence.
2. Table A-1 – define demand units, I assume it is acre-feet.
3. Table A-5 – units? Acre-feet?
4. Table A-6 – units? Acre-feet?
5. “Trinity aquifer” used in Study 4; “Trinity Aquifer” used in Study 5; be consistent with other aquifer names throughout each of the 5 reports
6. Table ES-2 – define the green square object in the table
7. Table C-2 – define MGD; did not notice it defined anywhere else in the document, but may have overlooked.
8. Table C-2 – units for “Supply” column
9. Table C-3 – use of “(Acre-Feet)” vs. “(Ac-Ft)”, consistency
10. Table C-4 – see comment #9, “(acft/yr)”
11. Table C-5 – see comment #9
12. Table C-6 – units for supply column
13. For all reports – what year are cost dollars estimated in? Is this pertinent to the report?

Trey Buzbee

From: Trey Buzbee
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2008 3:10 PM
To: 'Dunn, David'
Subject: Phase I, Report 3 Comments

David,

More comments... please contact me if need clarification. Trey

1. Page ES-1: reference for Brazos G Regional Water Planning Group & 2011 Brazos G Regional Water Plan
2. Page 8 – #1, Define MCL
3. Page 8 – #4, Define TCR
4. Page 8 – #5, Define SWTR
5. Page 10 – #6, Define IEWSTR
6. Page 18 – Section 4.0, Define GIS
7. Page 19 & throughout paper – Grammar rule for spelling out numbers; I believe 10 and below is spelled out in text and 11 and above are written as numbers – “6 PWS”, “4 of these”, “5 miles”, etc.
8. Page 19 – TCR referenced
9. Page 21 – third paragraph, need spaces between MCL amounts and _____ ug/L.
10. Page 26 – Grammar rule for numbers in report text
11. Page 27 – last paragraph, “do” is in bold, why?; grammar rule for numbers
12. Page 28 – second paragraph, grammar rule for numbers
13. Page 30 – grammar rule for numbers
14. Page 31 – Is there a “Staff WSC”? I did not find it on the map for the study area.
15. Page 32 – first paragraph – Did you mean to reference “Section 4.0” as opposed to “Section 5.0”?; grammar rule for numbers
16. Page 44 – “cut costs”, Would “reduce costs” read better?

Scope Comments:

1. There are a few recommendations in the “Summary Section”. Should recommendations be a separate section in the report? It is mentioned in the Scope.
2. Where are the relevant treatment plants and storage locations mentioned or mapped? This is not clear to me in the body of the report.
3. Where is the infrastructure elements that would tie into existing utilities mentioned or mapped? This is not clear to me in the body of the report.

Trey Buzbee

From: Trey Buzbee
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2008 12:19 PM
To: 'Dunn, David'
Cc: David Wheelock
Subject: Comments on Brazos G Phase I Studies, 12-02-08

David,

David Wheelock and I prepared the additional comments below with regard to the Phase I Studies. We may have additional comments on the Phase I Studies after tomorrow's meeting.

Please let me know if you have questions of us.

Thanks David,
Trey

Comments from Trey Buzbee

For all five reports – Suggest incorporating a “Recommendations” section that clearly articulates any recommendations made based on the study. My impression is that each Study has recommendations captured throughout various sections.

Study 1

1. What is the overall result of the study? The study indicates an ongoing drought of at least equal severity of the 1950s for the Upper Basin Reservoirs; cumulative flows are less from the period 1993 – 2008 as compared to 1943-1956 (Fig. 1-1). Tomorrow's presentation indicates that the ongoing drought is more severe. Will the report reflect what is stated in the presentation? Is the reduction of 7% to 62% a reduction in the firm or safe yield for the respective reservoirs? What does this mean from a planning perspective for Brazos G?

Study 2

1. See comments below

Study 3

1. Where is / are “relevant treatment plant(s)” included on the report maps?

Study 4

1. No additional comments at this point.

Study 5

1. See comments below

Comments from David Wheelock

Study 1 – Updated Drought of Record – Upper Basin Reservoirs

- 1.1 The study report makes estimates of the safe yield of the reservoirs upstream of Possum Kingdom. This is consistent with the Brazos G RWPG's position to use safe yields for those entities who operate reservoirs in safe yield mode. Water Services suggests that the firm yields for the reservoirs also be reported in the Study Reports – thereby providing consistent methods and information throughout the planning region. Additionally, the scope of work states that firm yields will be computed. (If for some reason only safe yields are to be reported, it is suggested that you obtain input from Matt Nelson that the report is consistent with TWDB needs and requirements regarding this item.)

Editorial suggestion: bring forward the short discussion of safe yield from page 28 (first paragraph, fourth sentence) to the front of the report.

- 1.2 Evaporation Data (January 05 – June 08 period, Section 2.5.2). Report states that evaporation data from TWDB was not available for the study area during this time period and data from Lake Proctor was used. Suggest that a

discussion be added regarding the availability of evaporation data within the study area, and why Lake Proctor data is appropriate for use. For instance, evaporation data for that period is available at Possum Kingdom Reservoir, which is closer to the study area. Perhaps add a comparison of the Proctor evap data to the PK data.

- 1.3 Sedimentation Data and Reservoir Volume. Is there any discussion of sedimentation rates and source of data? Suggestion is made to present the date and source of volumetric surveys used for each of the reservoirs in the study.
- 1.4 Priority Call Agreements. Table 4-1 identifies the existing priority calls agreement for FPH and Hubbard Creek Reservoir and presents safe yields with and without the priority calls agreement. In the Millers Creek Reservoir section, yields with and without a priority calls agreement are presented. Since no priority call agreement exists for Millers Creek Reservoir, suggestion is made to either remove the results for the with-priority-call agreement, or add discussion that no such agreement exists.

Study 2 – Groundwater Availability – Nolan County area

2.1 Water Quality. Scope of work says water quality of the alternatives will be considered – not sure where or how water quality was evaluated in the report. Suggest discussion be added.

2.2 Oak Creek Reservoir. Section 7.0, page 32. Yield is calculated with "subordination rights to Oak Creek" – suggest more information be provided what this would entail. Also, is the calculated yield firm yield or safe yield?

Study 5 – Water Management Strategies for McLennan County

5.1 Scope of work states additional water management strategies for the City of Waco will be explored, as well as coordination with Waco and surrounding communities to identify preferred strategies. Report does not mention any strategies for Waco – suggestion is to confirm with Waco that the report is sufficient.