

APPENDIX L

COMMENTS ON DRAFT REPORT

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

**Table L-1
Summary of Public Comments and Responses**

Commenter	Comment	Response
NCTMWA	Requested the removal of groundwater strategy for NCTMWA as recommended strategy.	Groundwater is no longer a recommended strategy for NCTMWA.
	Requested consideration of a gravity channel option for the Lake Creek diversion strategy.	This option is discussed in Appendix G as part of the Lake Creek diversion strategy.
	Considers the Lake Creek diversion strategy as a viable strategy for NCTMWA.	Added discussion in Section 7.2 of the report stating that the Lake Creek diversion project could be considered as an alternate for the Abilene-NCTMWA interconnection. This project is also discussed in Appendix G.
Throckmorton	Clarify that the Ft. Belknap contract is for emergency use only.	This was clarified in Section 7.1 and strategy tables.
	The population for the counties that were adjusted are not apparent in Section 2 and Appendix A.	Added a table in Section 2 with the revised population total by county and modified Appendix A.
Breckenridge	Comments on the facility description and schematic for Breckenridge's water treatment plant.	Changes were made to Table 5.1 and Appendix E.
David Bell WCTMWD	Requested consideration of an alternate pipe route for the Abilene-NCTMWA strategy through Anson.	Discussion was added on this alternate route in Appendix G, under the Abilene-NCTMWA strategy.
	WCTMWD is studying water quality at Cedar Ridge lake site and suggests that the quality is better than presented in the report, making this strategy more economically feasible.	Water quality data to date indicate that advanced treatment will be needed for water from Cedar Ridge site. Discussion was added to Section 7.4, under the Cedar Ridge strategy, that additional studies are on-going and the findings of these studies may result in changed recommendations.
	WCTMWD has entered into new contracts with Breckenridge and Abilene.	The new contract amounts were included in the demands on WCTMWD, resulting in greater needs for WCTMWD.
	Concerned that the salinity in Hubbard Creek Lake is overstated.	Modified text in Section 2.3.
	Requested clarification of source of data for Table 2.9.	Added footnote to Tables 2.9 and 2.10.
	Report could provide greater focus on counterproductive grant issuance.	This is mentioned in Section 3. No other changes made.
Kathy Webster WCTMWD	District looks forward to discussing the issues of subordination of water rights with the Authority.	No changes made to report.

Table L-1 (continued)

Commenter	Comment	Response
Gary Mahon 3P Water Group	Would like to include a proposed project to use water from Eastland County WSD to participants of the 3P Water Group.	This project was included in Appendix G and cost estimates were added in Appendix H.
Brown County WID #1	Corrections to Lake Brownwood's priority date and BCWID #1's customers.	Changes were made to Table 4.5 and Figure 2.6
Abilene	Would like clarification that there are on-going studies of the Cedar Ridge project, and conclusions regarding its feasibility be delayed until the results of these studies.	Discussion of additional studies was added in Sections 7.2 and 7.4.
	Abilene is supportive of regional interconnections.	No changes made to report.
	Clarified that Abilene has not received a formal request for water from the city of Lawn. Requested that the strategy for Lawn be modified to read "purchase potable water from others".	Changed references to agreements or implied agreements. Strategy refers to "purchase water from local supplier".
Nathan Davis Cisco	Concerned that Cisco was identified in the Emergency Action Plan as being at moderate to high risk for supplies, yet strategies for Cisco are not included in the main report.	Cisco was added as needing back-up supplies in the main report. Strategies for Cisco are discussed in Appendices F, G and H.
Phil Taylor Stephens County Rural WSC	Concerned that the supply amount from Breckenridge to Stephens County Rural WSC did not reflect monthly contract limits accurately.	Modified the supplies from Breckenridge to better reflect peak needs during summer months and contract limits of 12 MG/month. Supply increases over time because total demands increase, allowing full use of contract amount during non-peak months. This change resulted in an immediate supply need for Stephens County Rural WSC.
Kleber Denny Terra Associates	Would like a net present worth analysis of the salt water control projects discussed in Appendix I.	Data presented in Appendix I was obtained from the 2001 Brazos G plan. A 50-year cost analysis was added to Table 1 using costs developed for the Brazos G plan.
H ₂ WR, Inc.	Disagrees with the suggested length of time needed for salt removal in Possum Kingdom Lake through salt control projects.	Deleted reference to number of years needed for salt reduction.

TWDB COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Response to TWDB comments:

1. Population and Water Demand Projections:

Comment: There appears to be a discrepancy between the population projections and water demands for Brown, Stephens and Throckmorton Counties.

Response: Population for the Midway Group participants were revised as part of the scope of work for this study. The justification for the increases is stated in Section 2.1 of the report, “Each of these entities projected higher growth for their service areas than reported by the TWDB. This is due in part to increases in week-end residents and the projected conversion from seasonal to permanent residents.” These population estimates were used to develop demands for the Midway Group participants, which are primarily located in Stephens, Shackelford and Throckmorton Counties. The revised populations for these counties are shown in Table 2.3 and Figure 2.2.

Brown County population projections are shown to increase through 2030, then remain steady through the remainder of the planning period. No changes were made to the TWDB-approved population for Brown County. Municipal demands for Brown County increase through 2030 (as reflected by population) and remain the same from 2030 through 2060.

2. General comment: Include discussion of public meetings in the report and describe public comments and revisions to the report that were made in response to these comments.

Response: Section 11, Public Participation was added to the final report. This appendix, Appendix L, presents the comments received on the draft report and the responses.