

From: David Sloan
Sent: Wed, 4 Mar 2015 23:45:39 +0000
To: Russell Schreiber (Wichita Falls); Daniel Nix (Wichita Falls); Mark Southard (mark.southard@wichitafallstx.gov); Shawn Garcia
Subject: Proposed Changes to DPR Conditions
Attachments: winmail.dat

Russell, et al:

I prepared the attached list of proposed modifications to the DPR conditions prior to our meeting with TCEQ in January. These were focused on changes related to the incorporation of raw water from Lake Kemp. As we discussed yesterday, this is probably the ideal time to ask for any other changes we think are appropriate, based on the 8 months of operational history and the addition of UV disinfection. I made another pass through Enclosure A and identified a few areas for consideration. I think we should be selective in adding things to the list, focusing on those items we think TCEQ might be in a position to accept, and which make life easier or cheaper for the City. I would suggest consideration of the following items:

4.f. E. coli at RRWWTP effluent. I understand this was the reason for a shutdown earlier this year, and some relief on this requirement may have avoided the problem. Although we can definitely argue this is mitigated by the addition of the UV disinfection, I think it will be a tough sell to TCEQ.

4.h. Salt rejection reduction. I propose this wording be adjusted in the second sentence to read "...until the salt rejection returns to within 10% of the unit's acceptable..." not to change the requirement but to address what I consider to be confusing wording.

4.m. Fast response lab testing for Crypto/Giardia. The City is paying a premium for the fast response on this testing, but this does not prevent release of tainted water to the distribution system as even the fast response will come after the water is distributed. The protection comes from the multiple barriers which have been provided against Crypto/Giardia cysts, to which we have now added UV disinfection. These tests only document after the fact that these organisms do not exist in the finished water, and they never will as long as the systems are functioning properly, which is verified by a number of means. It seems reasonable to relax this to "normal response" and forgo the premium.

15. Daily pipeline inspections. Given the lack of problems with the pipeline to date (I assume) is there any desire to reduce the frequency of the pipeline inspections, perhaps to once or twice per week?

25. p. Additional reference to fast-response Crypto/Giardia.

Please let me know if any of these or other items should be added to the list of requested changes. Weather permitting, I should be available to discuss on Thursday.

David W. Sloan, P.E., BCEE
Senior Process Engineer
Board Certified Environmental Engineer

[cid:image003.jpg@01CB1912.AEAE37F0]

WATER / WASTEWATER TREATMENT & REUSE
4055 International Plaza, Suite 200 | Fort Worth, TX, 76109
817 735 7277 voice | 817 528 4442 cell
email: dws@freese.com<mailto:dws@freese.com>

This electronic mail message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This message, together with any attachment, may contain the sender's organization's confidential and privileged information. The recipient is hereby notified to treat the information as confidential and privileged and to not disclose or use the information except as authorized by sender's organization. Any unauthorized review, printing, retention, copying, disclosure, distribution, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please immediately contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of the material from any computer. Thank you for your cooperation.

Redaction Log

Redaction Reasons by Exemption

Reason	Description	Pages (Count)
		1(1)