

Saxton, Craig

11-2-09: Andrea said should be able to

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2009 10:19 AM
To: Courtney, Andrea
Subject: RE: Objection Question B35

License w/o Fear of Objection

Settlement for 35-2066A-B

Affecting License

C.S.

Thanks Andrea. Don't kill yourself over this. We can sit on these licenses if there is any question. I was just curious. See, now I have a new backlog to knock out...that would be about 3000 permits that need licenses issued ☺

Thanks,
c

From: Courtney, Andrea
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2009 8:45 AM
To: Saxton, Craig
Subject: RE: Objection Question B35

Craig~
Good morning. I didn't forget about you. I'm looking into this one right now...
Andrea

From: Saxton, Craig
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2009 9:46 AM
To: Courtney, Andrea
Subject: Objection Question B35

Hey Andrea,

I have two permits (35-13337 & 35-13338) that are ready to be licensed. We have held off on them because we are waiting till 35-2066A & B are partially decreed. The only link between these rights are diversion rate limiting conditions;

35-2066A and 35-13337 share the same POD(s)

35-2066B and 35-13338 share the same POD(s)

So I looked at the last order setting a status conference for 35-2066A & B and I see that these two are wrapped up in a group of rights objected to by Aberdeen-Springfield.

What I want to know is what is this blanket objection by Aberdeen-Springfield all about. More directly, is the outcome of this going to possibly change the elements of 35-2066A & B, or is this more of one of those, "we want to add a condition to your water rights"?

I am just trying to determine if there really is any reason that we should hold off on licensing 35-13337 and 35-13338. The only thing that would affect that is if the objection could result in finding the diversion rate for the 35-2066 splits being changed, or if the rights should be disallowed.

I am not asking you to make that determination, I just want to know what the objection is all about.

Thanks,
Craig