

***Appendix D***  
***Executive Administrator's***  
***Draft Final Report Comments***



# TEXAS WATER DEVELOPMENT BOARD



E. G. Rod Pittman, *Chairman*  
William W. Meadows, *Member*  
Dario Vidal Guerra, Jr., *Member*

J. Kevin Ward  
*Executive Administrator*

Jack Hunt, *Vice Chairman*  
Thomas Weir Labatt III, *Member*  
James E. Herring, *Member*

February 2, 2007

Mr. James K. (Ken) Haney, PE  
Executive Vice President  
HDR Engineering, Inc.  
4401 West Gate Blvd., Suite 400  
Austin, Texas 78745

Re: Research and Planning Fund Grant Contract between the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) and HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR), Freese and Nichols, Inc. (FNI), and R.J. Brandes Company (RJB) for Research Project entitled "Reservoir Site Acquisition Study, Contract No. 0604830615, Draft Final Report Comments

Dear Mr. Haney:

Staff members of the Texas Water Development Board have completed a review of the draft report under TWDB Contract No. 0604830615. As stated in the above-referenced contract, HDR, FNI, and RJB will consider incorporating draft report comments, shown in ATTACHMENT I, from the EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATOR as well as comments from others, into the final report. In addition, HDR, FNI, and RJB will include a copy of the EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATOR's draft report comments in the Final Report.

The Board looks forward to receiving one (1) electronic copy of the entire Final Report in Portable Document Format (PDF) and nine (9) bound double-sided copies. HDR, FNI, and RJB shall also submit one (1) electronic copy of any computer programs or models and an operations manual developed under the terms of this CONTRACT.

If you have any questions concerning this contract, please contact Dr. Barney Austin, the Board's designated Contract Manager for this study, at (512) 463-8856.

Sincerely,

William F. Mullican, III  
Deputy Executive Administrator  
Office of Planning

Enclosure

c: Barney Austin, TWDB

#### *Our Mission*

*To provide leadership, planning, financial assistance, information, and education for the conservation and responsible development of water for Texas.*

P.O. Box 13231 • 1700 N. Congress Avenue • Austin, Texas 78711-3231  
Telephone (512) 463-7847 • Fax (512) 475-2053 • 1-800-RELAYTX (for the hearing impaired)  
[www.twdb.state.tx.us](http://www.twdb.state.tx.us) • [info@twdb.state.tx.us](mailto:info@twdb.state.tx.us)

TNRIS - Texas Natural Resources Information System • [www.tnris.state.tx.us](http://www.tnris.state.tx.us)  
A Member of the Texas Geographic Information Council (TGIC)



Attachment I  
Draft Final Report Comments  
Reservoir Site Acquisition Study

1. This is an excellent report. All Tasks mentioned in the Scope of Work appear to have been completed. The work is well documented. However, the tabular presentation of cost estimate data for the 16 detailed reservoir evaluations could use some clarification. The tables that the following comments relate to are Tables 3.4.1-5, 3.4.2-2, 3.4.3-4, 3.4.4-4, 3.4.5-5, 3.4.6-4, 3.4.7-5, 3.4.8-5, 3.4.9-3, 3.4.10-4, 3.4.11-5, 3.4.12-5, 3.4.13-4, 3.4.14-5, and 3.4.15-6.
  - a) **Typo (?) on Table 3.4.1-5, Pages 3-14 to 3-15, Cost Estimate - Bedias Creek Reservoir.** Environmental Studies and Mitigation Costs are described as "(100% Land Costs)" but no value is listed in the "Cost" column, making it unclear if these costs were included in a different category (or were actually zero).
  - b) **Engineering Contingencies of 35% are included in the Conflicts category for some, but not all, of the reservoirs.** No explanation of why these costs were included in some but not other reservoir sites is included in the report. For a majority of projects (11 reservoirs out of 16), a 35% Engineering Contingencies Cost was included in Conflicts Costs. For three reservoirs (Bedias Creek, Lake Ralph Hall, and Brushy Creek), a 35% Engineering Contingencies Cost was not included in the Conflicts Costs. For one Project (Brownsville Weir) Conflict Costs were estimated to be zero. For another (Tehuacanca), an itemization of Conflict Costs was not provided so it can't be determined if a 35% Engineering Contingencies Cost was included in the Conflicts Costs.
  - c) **Units used in these tables are not clearly identified.** Units listed in these tables include:
    - Ac
    - AC
    - CY
    - Ea
    - EA
    - EACH
    - LBS
    - LF
    - L.S.
    - LS
    - SF

No description of the meaning of these abbreviations is provided in the document. Most of these abbreviations seem evident (for example "AC" probably refers to "Acre", "LF" probably refers to "Linear Foot"), but for clarity, it would be best to use a standard set of abbreviations for these tables and provide the reader with the intended meanings.

2. Page ES-1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, first sentence: The 2007 State Water Plan's recommended sites for designation as unique for the construction of a reservoir include sites that were not identified by the regional water planning groups. Some of the sites were recommended for designation by the TWDB and not the planning groups. Suggest revising the sentence to read as follows: "The 2007 State Water Plan recommends the Legislature consider 17 major reservoir sites identified by Regional Water Planning Groups and the TWDB for protection by designation as unique reservoir sites."
3. Page ES-4, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, first bullet: "Recommended to meet needs or...." should be revised to read "Recommended as water management strategies or....".
4. Suggest including as an appendix the list of all 150 projects that were screened and the results of that screening.
5. Page ES-6 and ES7, Recommendation for designation of 4 additional sites should be qualified by stating that there are other viable sites, these were just the sites that fell out of the screening for which we had study funds available to update the information.
6. Page ES-7, paragraph ES.3.1 – same as comment 2 above
7. Page ES-9, paragraph ES.3.5 – TPWD's list of stream segments are classified as "ecological significant" by the TPWD and should not be references as "recommended for designation as ecologically significant" since the statute provides for designation of river or stream segments of "unique ecological value" and not "ecological significance". Recommend substituting "identified as ecologically significant by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)" in place of "recommended for designation as ecologically significant by the ....".
8. Pages ES-11 and ES-12 and 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet on page ES-13 –Muenster Reservoir is already constructed and therefore should not be recommended for potential acquisition.
9. Page ES-14, last bullet – TWC Section 16.051(g)(2) does not exist, so it can not be expanded. Also, the recommendation suggests including additional entities in the TWC that could not obtain land or easements that would effectively prevent the construction of a reservoir site. However, the majority of the entities listed are already included in TWC, Section 16.051(g) as they are political subdivisions of the state.
10. Appendix B should be revised to remove the header "TWDB Internal Draft, Not for Distribution"