

From: [Bryce Contor](#)
To: [Koreny, John S.](#)
Cc: [Raymondi, Rick](#)
Subject: Re: Responses to comments on ESPAM2 final report sections
Date: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 4:31:38 PM

John -

I'm assuming Rick will post this question and reply on the web. Please see my responses with >>> interleaved.

On Mon, Feb 14, 2011 at 5:52 PM, Koreny, John S. <John.Koreny@hdrinc.com> wrote:

Hi Bryce-

Thanks for your responses and the careful notation so we can follow it. Much appreciated. I will go through these and put together an email in case I have questions.

There is one area of the hydrogeology section under IIIB where I have requested a change and, if I understand correctly, it appears that the report is not being changed.

>>> Your first comment under IIIB was a question, which I thought I answered. You asked what we meant by "basin discharge" and I responded that the location cited did not state "basin discharge," it stated "annual discharge of the Snake River." I committed to double check and make sure that is what the figure represents.

>>> Your second comment I marked "NC," indicating that it was a section of the report where nothing had been changed between ESPAM1.1 and ESPAM2 and therefore the IDWR instructions were to not change the report. However I also noted it "C" which indicates we will consider changing the section.

| I also submitted edits on this for the ESPAM 1 report to Ms. Cosgrove.

>>> I'm sure Cosgrove considered it carefully.

| I would appreciate that you consider it again.

>>> As indicated, I intend to consider changes.

If it stays in the report- I think it needs to come before the committee for discussion.

From Bryce:

Hydrogeology Section

1) *First paragraph under III B, comment " When you mean basin discharge- do you mean...:"*

a) *The wording is "Annual discharge of the Snake River."*

b) *We will double check the figure to be sure that is what it shows.*

2) *First paragraph under III B regarding cumulative discharge "this is a vague statement... controversial... not well supported:"*

a) *NC*

b) *C*

Koreny Comment 2/14/11

The report under Section IIIB Hydrogeology states, "This indicates that despite significant changes in water use during the last several decades, there has been little change in basin outflow. A possible reason for the stability of the slope of the cumulative graph in Figure 3 is that human activities have apparently had a greater temporary impact on aquifer storage than on basin outflow."

There are a couple things to note about this.

Fist- the sentences are confusing. What do they actually mean. Is the basin outflow the "aquifer" basin or the Snake River basin?

>>> My understanding that "basin" generically means both surface water and groundwater, unless it is explicitly restricted by an adjective.

What human activities- in the basin or on the aquifer? Irrigation- dam building?
There are way too many generalities here and not enough specifics. This is a

controversial topic- and the report should be specific so that we can understand exactly what is being said.

>>> Point well taken. This is why my original response was to consider changing the section.

Second- the annual flow in a river that has 5 MAF of storage and a huge snowpack has little to do with evaluating storage in the aquifer or human activities. All it shows is that the annual outflow in the basin remains constant on a decadal average. It doesn't show how or where the water was used. If you want to talk about aquifer storage- then you should also present or reference metrics about aquifer storage (like ground water levels).

>>> As a 30,000-foot overview I think the original description is informative and accurate. However we will consider changing the section.

Third- one shouldn't use an annualized cumulative graph for this type of evaluation. It's not precise enough to support the conclusion.

>>> Change in slope of a cumulative graph is often a useful tool to identify phenomena which can't be readily seen in a time series chart. Nevertheless we will consider changing the section.

Fourth- this topic should be in a scenario report- not the modeling report.

>>> That may be right.

Fifth- to be objective- if the writer is going to give one possible conclusion- they should give all of the most-possible reasons. There are other equally compelling conclusions that could be drawn from the graph.

>>> You may be right.

I would appreciate if you would reconsider this. I can wait to see the next version and comment on that if needed.

John

John Koreny

HDR ONE COMPANY | *Many Solutions*

500 108th Ave NE | Suite 1200 | Bellevue, WA 98004

Phone: [425.450.6321](tel:425.450.6321) (direct) | Fax: [425.453.7107](tel:425.453.7107) | Email: John.Koreny@hdrinc.com

www.hdrinc.com

From: Bryce Contor [mailto:bcontor.uidaho@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 3:43 PM

To: Koreny, John S.

Cc: Rick Raymondi

Subject: Responses to comments on ESPAM2 final report sections

Attached are responses to your comments on sections of the ESPAM2 final report.

Bryce

--

Bryce Contor
Research Hydrologist
Idaho Water Resources Research Institute
University of Idaho
Idaho Falls Center
[\(208\) 282-7846](tel:2082827846)

--

Bryce Contor

Research Hydrologist
Idaho Water Resources Research Institute
University of Idaho
Idaho Falls Center
(208) 282-7846