

From: James Logan [mailto:james.logan@onerain.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2009 6:33 AM
To: Kevin Stewart; Ilse Gayl; Mike Zucosky
Subject: RE: Rain Site Evaluation Report

Kevin,

I believe the sentence should read something like this:

In general site locations for rain catch are very good; it is apparent that care was taken in selecting these sites. However, there are 18 sites that currently have issues that were identified through our site evaluations. Those sites and their issues are rated 1, 2 and 3 and are described below.

James Logan
OneRain, Inc.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kevin Stewart [mailto:kstewart@udfcd.org]
Sent: Wed 2/11/2009 2:39 PM
To: Ilse Gayl; James Logan
Subject: FW: Rain Site Evaluation Report

Ilse and James,

Jake failed to complete a sentence on p.12 of 15. I missed catching this when I first skimmed the report. Any idea what he was about to conclude here?

K

From: Jake Emerson [<mailto:jake.emerson@onerain.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 2:45 PM
To: Kevin Stewart
Cc: Ilse Gayl; James Logan
Subject: Rain Site Evaluation Report

Kevin and Chad,

Attached is OneRain's rain gage evaluation report. We evaluated all 130 rain sites in the District system both in the field and through data analysis. The results of this evaluation are attached. The final recommendation is that 6 sites are not very good, and we should consider moving them. All-in-all the system does a very good job of measuring rainfall at gages. Now we just need to talk about measuring *between* the gages!

The appendix is 12MB, so I made it accessible via our ftp site. We will also be sending a hard copy of the complete report in the mail.

<ftp://public:1publica@primary.onerain.com/UDFCD/>

Best regards,

Jake

Jake Emerson
Director, Field & Integration Services
OneRain, Inc.
The Rainfall Company