From: Russell Schreiber
Sent: Thu, 30 Aug 2012 09:06:03 -0500
To: Dean Hinton; Susan Crawford
Cc: Daniel Nix
Subject: Reuse Project

Dean/Susan.
Daniel and I have given this project some thought and we have also spoken with Brad Castleberry, since we believe he has the pulse of the TCEQ regarding potable reuse.

Here is where we are;
At this level of the TCEQ, they not going to move away from the multiple barrier approach, that being UF,RO,UV and god knows what else. Our approach with a 50/50 blend, conventional treatment with the addition of UV is just too new of an idea to the treatment of this water. The precedent has been set by Brownwood and Big Spring and we will not get the TCEQ to move in our direction without significant evidence that this approach will work and protect the health and safety of the public. As evidenced in our conference call with them on 8/29, they are completely locked in on the advanced multiple barrier treatment, odds are we would still be chasing this idea 2 or 3 years from now.

Therefore, if we are to ever get them to move in our direction, and advance this project we will need detailed evidence of all the alternatives we have under consideration. The pros and cons for each alternative, the time it will take to complete each, the urgency for the project, as well as the costs for each and the economic impact of each. We also need to provide them with technical data that supports our idea and strategy, (National Academia's Press, Water Reuse would be a start)
We need to paint them picture, share with them our thought process and clearly detail to the TCEQ why we are pursuing the blending, conventional treatment alternative. Why we believe this to be the most viable alternative for the City of WF.
Some of this information information should be available in a document from several years ago when this project was initiated.

We believe the best approach to this project would be to complete the requested Preliminary Engineering Report. identifying and discussing in detail all the alternatives we have on the table. Once this document is complete we will be armed with the necessary information to advance our idea and alternative up the ladder at the TCEQ.

Also, due to the urgency and need for the water, we also need to identify all regulatory requirements for the other alternatives (ie Lake Arrowhead, Lake Wichita discharge permits) so that we can begin compiling any data that will be needed. We have a good idea now, but we need to completely vet each so we do not overlook something, such as water rights amendments, intake structure permitting, bed and banks authorizations, water modeling of Lake Wichita since the conservation pool was lowered, etc.

I think we need to get together and discuss this in more detail so we are all rowing in the same direction on this. Please let me know when a good time would be.
Thanks

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