

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 29, 2013
To: Water Right File 29-7869
From: shemenway
Re: Field Report Narrative and Recommendation

Well #1 (west) was drilled 3/20/1990 with proof submitted on 1/4/1992. Well #2 (East) was drilled in 1995, and well #3 was drilled in 2001. Both wells #2 & 3 were drilled after the development period, and should not be included on water right 29-7869. Currently all 3 wells are tied into the same flow-through system.

In the Order for water right 29-8162 there is a sworn historical use statement from Mr. Katsilometes that the system was producing 80 gpm (0.18 cfs), and then between 1990 - 1995 he stated that he installed a 7.5 Hp pump in well #1 to increase the capacity to 200 - 230 gpm. The 1/14/1992 proof of beneficial use stated a 3.0 Hp pump, at 50 psi, with a dynamic pumping level of 31 ft.

At the time of the 8/9/1995 field examination, no pictures were included, and the write-up was incomplete. For this reason a repeat exam was conducted on 2/10/1998, where instead of finding only 1 pool (pool #3 designated in the pictures) like the original system had, the system now had hot pools, a swimming pool, and a cold plunge. The flow system discharges to an outlet, which flows over and then open discharges to the river.

At the time of the 8/9/1995 field examination, both well #1 and well #2 were on the system. No physical measurements were collected at the time of the field examination, only theoretical calculations. For this reason, I would recommend including only well #1 on water right 29-7869 at 80 gpm (0.18 cfs) as stating in Mr. Katsilometes sworn statement. By using the proof of beneficial use information: 3 Hp, 50 psi, and 31 ft dynamic pumping level, a theoretical calculation would result as 0.13 cfs, which would be in the range that was sworn in the Order.

I recommend allowing 80 gpm (0.18 cfs) for water right 29-7869, and only having well #1 as the point of diversion.