Errata to the Simulation of Groundwater Development Scenarios Using the Transient Numerical Model of Groundwater Flow for the Central Carbonate-Rock Province: Clark, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties Groundwater Development Project (September, 2010).

November 13, 2012

Section 5.1.1.1

Page 5-2, Paragraph 1, Lines 8-11: The statement "In addition, because BLM reviewers believed that the mean parameter values used in the numerical model yielded minimum extents, rather than means, they requested that parameters be perturbed to only estimate the maximum extent of the drawdown cones" is incorrect and should be rewritten as:

> In addition, the reviewers believed that the mean parameter values used in the numerical model yielded mean extents, rather than maximums. As such, they requested that a sensitivity analysis be performed whereby key input parameters would be perturbed to demonstrate how changes in diffusivity could impact the timing and extents of drawdowns.

Additional Discussion on the Correction:

The original statement contained typographical errors and did not accurately reflect the decisions that were made at the time. Discussion regarding this topic between BLM, the Hydrology Technical Group, and SNWA focused around the calibrated model producing the best estimates of potential effects and the need to perform some form of sensitivity/uncertainty runs to show where changes to the hydraulic parameters (hydraulic diffusivity) would produce differences in the timing and extents of drawdowns. Initially, model runs were performed to look at both higher and lower diffusivity cases and these runs produced results that included effects that were both greater than and less than the original calibrated model. However, the presentation of these results became overly complicated. As such, the group decided that showing areas that might be impacted less than what the calibrated model showed, was not particularly relevant for a disclosure of potential effects. Therefore, only the best estimate of potential effects determined with the calibrated model and the sensitivity analysis using the higher diffusivity case were carried forward in the subject report. It is worth noting, that the high diffusivity sensitivity run resulted in a degraded model calibration and therefore the sensitivity run does not represent a fully calibrated model. As such, the calibrated model should be used to predict the effects from project pumping and the high diffusivity run should only be used to identify areas of spatial variability between the calibrated and high diffusivity models.