

Memorandum

Date: March 21, 2012

To: Cherie Palmer

From: Craig L. Saxton

Re: Permit 37-8306

The field examiner indicates that the use is on-stream storage and that there is no diversion. The application says they were going to divert it from the old stream to a new channel and then back into the old channel. It is unclear as to if the pond was built in the old channel or the new channel, but I think we can say that there is only one channel through the property.

So, if we are sure it is on-stream storage, then the purpose of use should be **Aesthetic Storage**. There is no diversion rate associated with **Aesthetic Storage**, rather we would only show a diversion volume.

Since whatever channel the water is flowing through now is the natural channel, we would not identify an **Aesthetic** use and therefore no diversion rate.

The field examiner found the storage to be 0.05 AF which is small enough that I suggest we round up to 0.1 AF.

So I think we should drop the diversion rate, add a diversion volume of 0.1 AF, and change the purpose of use to Aesthetic Storage.

The application for permit specifically states that there is a plan to excavate a small pond so I think we can recommend Aesthetic Storage without an amendment as that was the original plan in the first place.

3/30. Shelley Keen thought an amendment was necessary since the permit has been clearly changed from what was originally intended: off-stream vs in-stream.