

From: "John Ashworth" <JAshworth@lbg-guyton.com>
To: <bill.roberts@twdb.state.tx.us>
Date: 10/5/2006 4:14:29 PM
Subject: Water plan comments

Bill, thanks for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan. You guys have done a great job on this one; don't know how you did it without me, ha. I have just a few suggestions pertaining to Volume II which I will list in page order.

Page 67 - Existing Water Supplies - line 7&8 - Change "There are three aquifers in the regions" to "There are three aquifers in this region".

Page 67 - Existing Water Supplies - line 12 - Add Las Moras Creek to the list of principal sources of surface water.

Page 184 - Figure 7.8 caption - The note in the caption should probably say "Note that in Andrews County where the ---".

Page 192 - Last sentence in text - "The Far West Texas Regional Water Planning Group recommends a water management strategy for the Capitan Reef Complex Aquifer, XXX redevelopment of an ---".

Page 201 - Text - I think it is important to let the reader know that the Hueco and Mesilla aquifers are not hydrologically connected.

Page 306-309 - In the discussion on "sustainability of water resources", it states that "The sustainable management of surface water and groundwater resources is different for each type" (3rd paragraph). This statement is true with respect to the manner in which it is addressed. However, it might be beneficial to include a paragraph which discusses the inter-relationship between surface water and groundwater, and how groundwater management decisions might impact surface water supplies. Example - the lowering of water levels in an aquifer might negatively impact spring flows that originate from the aquifer and thus potentially reduce base flow in adjacent streams and rivers. Paragraph 5 briefly mentions this in regard to how the Edwards BFZ is managed. Region J specifically defined groundwater availability in terms of its interconnectedness with surface water.

Appendix 7 - I am really glad to see that TWDB staff continue to refine the boundaries of the aquifers. Previous and up to the days of Ashworth and Flores (1991), we had the notion that aquifer boundaries were partially restrained to the primary areas in which the aquifers were being used; this conceptualization thus resulting in the three lobes in the Igneous aquifer, the more confined boundary of the Bone Spring-Victorio Peak aquifer, and others. It's appropriate that the new boundaries are being redefined in terms of hydrogeology. I am pretty much in agreement with most of the changes that are being proposed, although I am not totally sold on adding the Concho Alluvium branches to the Lipan aquifer (but I can live with it). I also like the name change given to the Pecos Valley Alluvium. However, I'm not convinced that the no-flow boundary between the Monument Draw and Pecos Troughs should have been eliminated. West-East cross sections (TWDB Rept. 125 for example)

show no connection. Also significant outcrops of Triassic in this area are shown on the Geologic Atlas Sheet. I do have to admit that I have not looked closely at how the aquifer is handled in the GAM. Otherwise, all is well in the secret and occult world of underground water.

Thanks for letting me rant. You folks keep up the good work.