

RESPONSE TO TWDB COMMENTS

Letter dated October 12, 2000

Comments:

1. **Required TWDB Tables 9 and 10:** These tables were sent to TWDB on October 13, 2000 and added to Appendix D of the plan.
2. **Drought triggers for ground water:** Triggers by aquifer and associated responses were identified and added to Appendix F. Changes were made to the text in Section 5.8.1.
3. **Unmet needs: Table 5-23 was added in Chapter 5.** This table lists needs greater than 10 acre-feet/year that cannot be met with identified strategies and the reason why this need is not fully met.

RESPONSE TO TWDB COMMENTS

Letter dated November 6, 2000.

Comments on TWDB-required tables.

1. Table 3: Water Demand by MWP

a. Minor errors corrected as needed.

b. Lakes Thomas, Ivie and Spence are considered a system in the Region F plan.

Contacted Mr. Craig Caldwell of TWDB to obtain a MWP alpha number for the CRMWD system. Alpha number for CRMWD system is 168408. Specific alpha numbers for each of CRMWD's well fields were used accordingly.

2. Table 4: Current Water Supply Sources

a. Corrections were made to basin numbers, etc. as noted on Table. Changed irrigation local supply in Martin County to Mason County as reported in the TWDB data files. Corrected supplies for Lake Thomas and additional supply from CRWMD system.

3. Table 5: Current Water Supplies

a. Corrections were made to basin numbers, etc. as noted by TWDB on Table. Changed irrigation local supply in Martin County to Mason County as reported in the TWDB data files. Identified entities with contracts that expire during the planning period. Supplies after the expiration date were assumed "0" on Table 5. This affected the cities of Robert Lee, Stanton, Grandfalls, Santa Anna, Early, Brownwood, and Bangs.

b. The city of Paint Rock does not meet the requirements for inclusion as a water user group (population is less than 500).

c. West Odessa is not a separate municipal entity (unincorporated).

d. Paint Rock and West Odessa are included in County-other.

e. Comment noted.

4. Table 6: Current Water Supplies by MWP

a. Comments noted and changes made as needed.

b. CRMWD system alpha number is 168408..

RESPONSE TO TWDB COMMENTS

5. Table 7: Comparison of Supply and Demands

- a. Comments noted and changes made as needed.

6. Table 8: Comparison of Supply and Demands by MWP

- a. Comments noted and changes made as needed.

7. Table 11: Potentially feasible water management strategies

- a. Comments noted and changes made as needed. Added entities with expired contracts: strategy is to renew contract at existing amount.

8. Table 12: Recommended water management strategies

- a. Comments noted and changes made as needed. Added entities with expired contracts: strategy is to renew contract at existing amount.

b. No strategies were identified for needs of 10 acre-feet/year or less. This need is within the accuracy of the planning numbers and may not reflect a true need. Also strategies were not identified for some needs that go away with conservation.

9. Table 13: Recommended water management strategies by MWP

- a. Comments noted and changes made as needed.

RESPONSE TO TWDB COMMENTS

Letter dated November 8, 2000

Section 1 Comments:

Environmental Review

1.a. A description of the environmental factors is presented on page 5-3 and 5-4 in the IPP. This description identifies the potential environmental factors. A statement was added regarding in-stream flows. For most strategies there is insufficient information to perform a detailed environmental review. It is stated on page 5-4 and with each strategy that a more detailed environmental assessment will be required if the project is selected for implementation. Where appropriate, and if the information was available, the potential environmental impact descriptions for identified strategies were expanded. A footnote was added to the strategy matrix in Appendix E denoting the components of the sensitive environmental factors.

1.b. In-stream flow considerations were evaluated only for projects that will require a new or amended water permit. Strategies that utilize existing permits do not require in-stream flow analyses.

Water Conservation

1. Municipal conservation strategies. It is our understanding that this comment is intended for future plans. No changes were made to the current plan.

Surface Water

1. Discrepancies:

- a. TWDB Table 4 was corrected to reflect correct yields in the plan.
- b. Water right numbers are not required in TWDB Table 4. Water right numbers for the major reservoirs are listed in the plan in Table 1-13 on page 1-35. Where appropriate, water rights numbers for local supplies are noted either in the source ID or comment column in Table 4.

Section 2 Comments:

None

RESPONSE TO TWDB COMMENTS

Letter dated November 15, 2000

Section 1 Comments

Groundwater

1. Trinity Aquifer. The discussion of the Trinity Aquifer was modified to reflect that this is a major aquifer in the state even though it has only a minor contribution to supply in Region F.

2. Ellenburger San Saba Wording was modified to reflect comprising geologic units.

3. Figure 3-1. Legend was modified to reflect “retrievable storage”.

4. Hickory availability. The ground water availability numbers reflect the percentages shown on Figure 3-1 as applied to the retrievable storage. On page 3-20, it states that 50% of the total amount of water in storage in the Hickory aquifer is retrievable. The availability percentage is then applied to this amount. For example, in Mason County the total amount of water in storage is 14,659,000 acre-feet. Of that amount, 50% is retrievable (7,329,500 acre-feet). The annual availability from storage in the Hickory in Mason County is 75% over 100 years ($0.75 \times 7,329,500 / 100 = 54,971$ acre-feet/year). Minor word changes were made in the text to clarify the calculation of ground water availability.

5. Typographic errors. Corrected.

6. Figure 5-2. Axes labels were corrected.

7. Maps on ground water quality. These figures will be printed in color for the adopted plan. This should provide adequate clarification.

8. Table 3-5 and Figure 3-1. See response to comment #4. Changed Table 3-1 column title from “annual retrievable storage” to “annual supply from storage”.

9. Permian Clearfork Group. The Permian Clearfork Group is considered an “unclassified aquifer” by TWDB. We can clarify this in the text, but on all TWDB tables supplies from this formation will be listed as “other aquifer”. No changes to text made.

RESPONSE TO TWDB COMMENTS

Water Uses

1. Rounding errors.

These rounding errors apparently occurred for totals listed in the proposed revisions that were submitted to the TWDB. Specific population or water demands for the entities (water user groups) are the same as submitted to the TWDB. All numbers in the tables have been rounded to whole numbers. No changes were made to the totals.

2. Figure 1-10 reference. Text was changed to reference Figure 1-1.

3. Acre-feet conversion. Text was changed to exact number.

Section 2 Comments

1. Table 2-3: This table has a column that lists each county and all user groups are sorted alphabetically by county name. No changes made.

2. Bibliography. This reference could not be found on the TWDB web site reference list. It was not used for the plan and was not added to the list of references.

RESPONSE TO TWDB COMMENTS

Letter dated November 14, 2000

This letter recommends consideration of policy recommendations supported by the RWPG chairmen. Attached is the letter for Region F RWPG's consideration. Most of the six recommendations are included in some form in Chapter 6.

Letter dated November 20, 2000

Request to add language to cover small users and projects that do not involve new sources of water.

There already was such language in the plan. The suggested TWDB wording on page 2 was added to Chapter 5, Section 5.2.