

Memorandum

To	Region H Regional Water Planning Group	Page	1
Subject	Comments Received from RWP Group Members Regarding Draft IPP		
From	Jason D. Afinowicz, PE		
Date	February 2, 2010		

This memorandum lists comments received from Planning Group members between January 6, 2010 and February 1, 2010 regarding the Draft IPP for Region H. Comments are presented by chapter.

Executive Summary

- Section ES.2.1 - Add reference for Figure ES-1.
- Section ES.4.2 – Clarify COH infrastructure strategies.
- Section ES.9 – Clarify what projects make up the given capital cost.
- Table ES-6 – Add note defining “Local Supplies”.
- Table ES-6 – Correct misnamed basin, clarify use of “current allocations” vs “current contracts”.
- Table ES-7 – Correct omitted footnote for Houston Bayous Permit.
- Table ES-7 – Correct cost and start year for Montgomery County MUDs 8 and 9 reuse.
- Correct references to “WUG Contracts” within ES.

Chapter 1

- Section 1.4.4 – Correct statement on ownership of Lake Conroe Supplies.
- Section 1.4.5 – Correct number of reservoirs included in the BRA System; clarify discussion of surface water supplies in the Brazos River Basin and San Jacinto-Brazos Coastal Basin.
- Section 1.4.6 – Minor clarifications regarding BRA contracts used to enhance reliability.
- Section 1.4.7 – Correct surface water percentage.
- Table 1-10 – Reconcile Brazos Basin Run-of-River values with section 1.4.5.
- Table 1-11 – Edit footnote 2 to clarify contracted portion
- Section 1.5.5 – Add statement indicating that groundwater for agriculture tends to have year-to-year contracts.

Chapter 2

- Section 2.3.2 – Correct minor typographical error for Brazoria County.

Chapter 3

- Table 3-4 – Clarify Brazos Basin Run-of-River supplies.
- Section 3.3.1.2 – Clarify volumes and Dow supply for Fort Bend County.
- Section 3.3.1.4 – Correct statement on ownership of Lake Conroe Supplies.
- Section 3.3.1.6 – Add clarification to return flow and water right permit amounts, remove “main stem” in referring to BRA/COE system, clarify sediment conditions used to determine yield numbers.
- Section 3.3.2.4 – Clarify section on mining supplies.
- Section 3.3.7.2 – Clarify Dow’s use of contract water.
- Table 2-12 – Clarify footnote 2, clarify BRA supplies and totals.
- Section 3.4.3 – Add text to clarify simplification of process by which COH’s own needs, as well as contract needs, are met in the RWP.
- Section 3.4.3.1 – Clarify text regarding water source for League City.
- Section 3.4.4 – Clarify how CWA supplies have been handled in the RWP.
- Table 3-14 – Add footnote indicating that groundwater supplies for the water authorities are their own supplies and not a contract volume from a higher-level WWP.
- Table 3D-1 – Update information from BRA DCP.

Chapter 4

- Section 4.3.3 – Add language to clarify water rights.
- Section 4.3.4 – Clarify interruptible supplies mentioned in section.
- Table 4-5 – Correct grammatical error.
- Table 4A-2 – Correct selected 2001 WMS.
- Table 4A-2 – Minor corrections to entry for Montgomery County MUDs 8 and 9 reuse.
- Table 4A-2, Table 4A-3 – Change name for COH infrastructure strategy to mirror chapter text and technical memoranda. Clarify cost and use information for Luce Bayou.
- Table 4A-3 – Indicate that Luce Bayou conveyance is only intended for TRA to COH transfer.
- Appendix 4B – Minor update to BRA supplies, reconcile land impact acreages.
- Tech Memo 4B19 – Add statement reflecting that WHCRWA will take water from COH’s Northeast Water Purification Plant in 2020.
- Tech Memo 4B32 – minor clarifications to Montgomery County MUDs 8 and 9 reuse.
- Tech Memo 4B32 – add clarifying statement indicating that the strategy is contingent on TCEQ granting a bed-and-banks permit and that the approval of SJRA and COH would be required to secure or use the permit.
- Tech Memo 4B32 – Attach the project PER.
- Tech Memo 4B36 – Correct supply volume.
- Tech Memo 4B40 – Add clarification regarding WWPs who would receive desalinated water.
- Tech Memo 4B42 – Update brackish desalination memo using information provided by Montgomery County MUDs 8 and 9.
- Implement revisions to WUG-level cost estimates.
- Table 4C-2 – replace with a detailed breakdown of capital and annual costs at the WUG level.
- Appendix 4D – Add text to clarify that modeled strategies for the decadal analysis are from the 2006 RWP. Elaborate on TRA to SJRA transfer mechanisms and note which strategies are no longer recommended for the current planning round.
- Integrate CIP cost data provided by COH for transmission projects.

Chapter 5

- Section 5.3 – Elaborate on explanation of Table 5-2.

Chapter 7

- Section 7.1.6 – Correct section to say Little River Off-Channel Reservoir is an alternative strategy
- Section 7.3.1 – Clarify that TPWD document included in Appendix 7C is the most recent data available.