

**From:** [James Prikryl](#)  
**To:** [Yilma, Haimanot](#)  
**Subject:** FW: follow up on Dewey-Burdock questions  
**Date:** Friday, August 03, 2012 12:24:44 PM

---

**From:** Bradley Werling  
**Sent:** Friday, August 03, 2012 9:25 AM  
**To:** James Prikryl  
**Subject:** FW: follow up on Dewey-Burdock questions

---

**From:** Ronn Smith [<mailto:rsmith@imlinc.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 02, 2012 4:21 PM  
**To:** Bradley Werling  
**Subject:** follow up on Dewey-Burdock questions

Bradley,

Another clarification: the disturbed acreages I used in the fugitive dust emissions inventory do account for the land application option. I misunderstood what Powertech had supplied to me. The deep-disposal-well option shows net exposed acreage of generally less than 100 acres each year. The land application option (which you have) shows net exposed acreage on the order of 270 acre each year. While these larger numbers account for land application of treated water, they assume that 95% of the affected area will not be exposed (due to irrigation and crop growth as we discussed).

	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4	YR 5	YR 6	YR 7	YR 8	YR 9	YR 10	YR 11	YR 12	YR 13	YR 14
Land App	273.13	271.78	275.30	278.82	282.35	285.32	288.16	272.34	265.31	264.62	263.93	263.24	262.95	262.91
DDW	82.50	81.14	84.67	88.19	91.72	94.69	97.52	81.71	74.68	73.99	73.30	72.61	72.32	72.28

I apologize for the misinformation.

Ronn