

From: Russell Schreiber
Sent: Wed, 1 Aug 2012 16:39:50 -0500
To: tdh@cpbwf.com
Cc: Daniel Nix; Crawford, Susan
Subject: Re: Phone Conversation

Thanks for the info.

Daniel is reviewing it this afternoon and he and I will be getting together to discuss.

Would everyone be available for a conf call late Friday??

I'm looking for a direction to go with this project. Do we have enough of the questions answered to know.

If not, how do we get the answers to our questions so that we can select a path forward.

Let me know your availability.

Thanks

On Wed, Aug 1, 2012 at 1:50 PM, Dean Hinton <tdh@cpbwf.com> wrote:

Below my signature are my notes in typed format regarding the phone conversation Red Weddell and Ada Lichaa had last Friday afternoon.

Let me know if you want to discuss this further.

T. Dean Hinton, P.E.

Corlett, Probst & Boyd, PLLC

4605 Old Jacksboro Highway

Wichita Falls, Texas 76302

O [940/723-1455](tel:9407231455), F [940/397-0549](tel:9403970549), C [940/631-0144](tel:9406310144)

TX P.E. #58872

OK P.E. #24372

TBPE Firm F-279

Notes re: phone conversation with James (Red) Weddell; 1:30 7/27/2012

Discussion was based on June 29, 2012 letter to Susan Crawford. Order of discussion is generally in the order it appears in the letter.

1. Page 2, paragraph 1. Discussed the sentence “the exceptions previously granted to the City in our letter dated July 31, 2002 are no longer valid”. The prior sentence mentioned the requested alternate treatment scenarios and this sentence implies that the alternate treatment scenarios affected the removal of the exceptions. He agreed that if the Zenon 500-B or 1000CP5 membranes were available, we could still use them with the granted exceptions.

2. Page 3

a. Presedimentation basin – discussed the additional baffling required and that we probably couldn’t obtain a baffling factor of 1.0. He agreed and understands that they would need to accept a baffling factor less than 1.0

b. Discussed providing 24 samples and having samples that cover all four seasons and that the year’s worth of sampling would be complete in February. Told him that based on the samples so far, we expect to be in bin 1; bin 2 at the worst. He asked me to call Bill Melville regarding the faster sampling procedure we were using to see how it affects the bin classification(**I am awaiting a return call**). Normally the 24 samples are over a 2 year period and he wants to make sure the calculations are accurate when done over a 1 year period.

c. Treatment Scenario B. He asked if we would be running the Jasper plant at full capacity or less. I told him our blend would be at most 50% River Road water (let me know if you disagree).

3. Page 5

a. First paragraph brings up that they will consider making a Bin Classification based on 12 months of data. He said that a lot of this depends on what Bill Melville tells us regarding the calculations (see 2.b. above)

b. The conversation then ventured off into what Brownwood is providing. He said they are meeting a 5.5 log crypto removal using UF, UV, RO, carbon adsorption and UV.

This led to a discussion of the 4 log virus, 3 log giardia and 5.5 log crypto (times two) requirement. He agreed that it is possible that we may have a 4/3/2 (virus/giardia/crypto) (times two) requirement once we have our data in February. Enclosure A of the letter (last paragraph) implies that this would need to be done in a second WWTP. He agreed that we could possibly increase our log removal via process modification within the existing plant to obtain the additional removal required but that they still want the 2x requirement met. He said that if we would submit the process modifications that we want to use they will consider them.

I asked if the 2x requirement was for redundancy and that if (for example) we had to meet a 2 log (times two) crypto requirement, could we do it with three processes that provided 2 log removal with the greatest removal process out of service. He (and Ada) seemed receptive to this concept and he said he would get back with me on this via email after meeting with the rest of the group.

4. Enclosure B – we discussed the method 537 they require for pharmaceutical indicators/chemicals of human origin. I sent him a copy of Daniel's list of methods UL uses and he is to get back with me via email regarding it.

Other items discussed but not in the letter:

Environmental buffers – they agreed that they can be replaced by treatment methods.

Alternative treatment methods – he said to send him a list of the alternative treatment methods (not within microbial toolbox) and any backup data for them to review

Side note....they expect perchlorate to be regulated by 2014. They just don't know what levels will be the MCL.

Any discharges into lakes will not have to be 3 miles upstream. Apparently someone in our last meeting in Austin mentioned 500 feet from the intake; he will verify.

They emphasized that they wanted to be sure there wouldn't be a health and safety issue with a reuse project. Red mentioned he looks to the Health and Safety code 341.0315.a first regarding issues like this. Both he and Ada mentioned that they are very concerned that we provide multiple barriers.

They have the Brownwood project in review now. Alicia, Red and Jack are reviewing plans.

I now have Ada's permission to contact Red directly via phone/email so long as he documents everything back to her.

--

Russell Schreiber P.E
Director of Public Works
City of Wichita Falls Texas
940 761 7477