

Comment Report

37-8502

1. csaxton 9/23/2011 1:31:17 PM POD

Comment: Updated Shape

2. csaxton 9/23/2011 Diversion Rate

Comment: Only the house well was in place during the authorized development period. The second well was drilled in 1995 and then abandoned and replaced in 2002. I can recognize the second well as another point of diversion, but cannot recognize and additional diversion rate that well provides. The field examiners theoretical diversion rate calculation for both the North well and the House well was 0.11 cfs each. Recommend 0.09 cfs for irrigation and 0.02 cfs for domestic use.

3. csaxton 9/23/2011 4:02:09 PM POU

Comment: Updated Shape

4. csaxton 9/23/2011 Acres

Comment: Field examiner reported that Aspen Lakes Canal company water is not connected to the north delivery system and therefore does not co-mingle with irrigation water from 37-8502. Even though 5 acres is identified as irrigated ground, recommend 3 acres within the permitted POU as a PPU does not appear to have been developed.

5. csaxton 9/23/2011 Licensing

Comment: A June 17, 2010 letter from the department requested additional information for licensing purposes. As far as I can tell, the permit holder never responded to the request. Despite that the information requested would be useful, I do not think it is critical to issue the license. A theoretical flow rate calculation is sufficient to license a diversion rate, the recommended diversion rate for domestic use will be the standard rate of 0.02 cfs because no additional information was provided to justify a greater rate. The total diversion rate is limited by the capacity of the well developed during the authorized development period.