

From: Dennis Westcot [<mailto:westcot-sjrga@sbcglobal.net>] **Sent:** Friday, September 14, 2012 9:56 AM **To:** Leila A. Khatib; Meyerhoff, Richard **Cc:** Daniel Cozad **Subject:** Comments on the Animal Drinking Water Draft Report

Richard and Leila:

I have completed a first review of the draft animal drinking water. My detailed comments are in the document in track changes. Here are my overall observations:

1. I think the document is getting us to where we need to be but it still needs work to be supportive of the position it is recommending.
2. The Executive Summary is useless and needs to be rewritten. I don't know what was intended here but it is poorly written, fragmented and of little value in getting across the concepts of not completely looking at EC or TDS and concentrating more on the individual ions.
3. Section 1 is simply a cut and paste from the beneficial use study and has nothing to do in explaining or interpreting Table 1. Table 1 is well done except that it needs to highlight the ones that are specific to animal drinking water. Section 1 also needs to conclude with a short discussion of the lack of specificity in the basin plans for protection of animal and wildlife drinking water.
4. Table 1 needs a lot of editing as it is impossible to utilize it at the present time (my comments are in the track changes in the attached document).
5. Section 2 is in better shape (see my specific comments in the track changes). I would like to see if we could work into this section a review of the Wisconsin and Wyoming documents. Even though they are not Extension Bulletins as such, they were prepared for the two states and set out the recommended guidance based on a more recent review than many of the Extension Bulletins. If you need the documents, please let me know.
6. Section 3 is in good shape. This may be where you might want to consider the Wyoming document since it was done as part of a rule-making process; is specific to animal drinking water and not an extension document (I will let you decide where it fits best).
7. Section 4 is in very good shape. I have a few comments in track changes but none are major. You might want to bring in the guidance that was prepared by Saskatchewan as it is a more detailed example and review than the Canadian Plan Service efforts and forms the basis

for the Canadian criteria.

8. Section 5 is very well done. It needs some editing (see my comments in track changes) but is in basically good shape. I agree with the conclusion of the academic literature review and I think these need to be considered by K/J as to whether they will be part of the report recommendations.
9. Section 6 is OK but I would like to see K/J consider many of the recommendations from the academic literature review such as focus on the individual ions rather than EC and TDS. This needs to be discussed.
10. References. There is huge inconsistency in how they are presented between the various sections. Needs to be cleaned up. There are many missing references (you can look at my notes in the track changes).
11. Overall I think we are close to moving this to completion if K/J can get a well written document put together. I recommend that we try to utilize this document, along with the Wyoming, Wisconsin and Saskatchewan reviews as the basis for our recommendation. I would like to see K/J make those recommendation to CV-SALTS.

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

Dennis W. Westcot Project Administrator San Joaquin River Group Authority 716
Valencia Ave. Davis, CA 95616-0153 Phone: (530) 758-8633 FAX: (530) 297-
2603 e-mail: westcot-sjrga@sbcglobal.net