

DISTRICT COURT WATER DIVISION NO. 6, COLORADO Court Address: Routt County District Court P.O. Box 773117 Steamboat Springs, CO 80477	
CONCERNING THE APPLICATION FOR WATER RIGHTS OF: THE CITY OF STEAMBOAT SPRINGS, IN ROUTT COUNTY, COLORADO	<p style="text-align: center;">COURT USE ONLY</p> <hr/> Case Number: 03CW86 Div.: Ctrm.:
KEN SALAZAR, Attorney General SUSAN SCHNEIDER, Assistant Attorney General* 1525 Sherman Street, 5 th Floor Denver, CO 80203 (303) 866-5046 Fax: (303) 866-3558 susan.schneider@state.co.us Registration Number: 19961 *Counsel of Record	
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COLORADO WATER CONSERVATION BOARD TO THE WATER COURT	

In December 2003, the City of Steamboat Springs (“Steamboat Springs” or “Applicant”) filed an application for a Recreational In-Channel Diversion water right for its proposed recreational boating course in Case No. 03CW6 (“the RICD”). Pursuant to section 37-92-102(5) & (6), C.R.S., the Colorado Water Conservation Board (“CWCB” or “Board”) must submit findings and recommendations to the Water Court.

Several parties requested a hearing before the Board as provided in sections 37-92-102(6)(a). On May 26 and 27, 2004, the CWCB held a hearing in Steamboat Springs, pursuant to the CWCB’s Rules Concerning Recreational In-Channel Diversions, 2 CCR 408-3 (“RICD Rules”), and section 37-92-102(5) & (6). The CWCB heard comments and oral testimony from the parties, the CWCB Staff, the Applicant and the public. Also, the Board accepted and reviewed dozens of submissions by the Applicant, the parties, and the CWCB Staff regarding this Application. A second hearing was held on September 20, 2005, pursuant to the water court’s order.

The Board's findings and recommendations are based on all of the information presented to the Board. The Board considered all of the issues related to the factors that the Board is required to consider, and the Board's findings and recommendations are based on the careful balancing of future needs of the State with the Applicant's desire to provide reasonable recreational opportunities.

The Board submits this document to the Water Court as its written findings and recommendations concerning the RICD.

FINDINGS and RECOMMENDATIONS

Each finding and recommendation, or any subpart, is severable and stands on its own, even if the water court strikes any finding or recommendation, or any subpart. The Board finds and recommends, as follows:

- 1) Adjudication and administration of the RICD will not impair Colorado's ability to fully develop and put to consumptive beneficial use its compact entitlements because the amount of the claimed RICD can either be used downstream of the RICD or contribute in part to the delivery obligation of Article 13 of the Upper Colorado River Compact;
- 2) There is adequate access adjacent to the RICD reach given the location of the river trail and associated parking;
- 3) The applicant did not demonstrate to the Board's satisfaction that the reach of the Yampa River identified in the application is an appropriate reach for the RICD for all of the beneficial uses claimed;
- 4) Exercise of the RICD will not cause material injury to any CWCB instream flow water rights;
- 5) The adjudication and administration of the RICD as claimed does not promote maximum utilization of Colorado's water resources because: (a) the Applicant is claiming more water than is necessary for a reasonable recreation experience, and thus wastes water; (b) the RICD claimed flows are inefficient and wasteful as a matter of fact because evidence presented to the Board showed that a reasonable recreation experience exists at flows significantly lower than those claimed, and because different flow amounts can provide a reasonable recreation experience for different recreational activities (e.g. kayaking, rafting, tubing); and (c) there may be future upstream junior diversions and storage that could be limited or precluded by the RICD as claimed. Provided that the water court grants an RICD decree for appropriate minimum amounts, the Board finds that the use of water flowing through the RICD reach for recreational purposes does and will promote maximum utilization of Colorado's water resources;
- 6) The applicant did not demonstrate to the Board's satisfaction that the RICD structures efficiently divert, capture, and control water without waste in the river's natural course and location.
- 7) The Applicant did not present adequate evidence that verifies that the amount of water claimed by the Applicant in the proposed decree is the minimum amount necessary for the recreational experiences sought. This information is

needed by the CWCB to determine whether maximum utilization is promoted pursuant to Section 37-92-102(6)(a)(v), C.R.S.

- 8) The Board finds that the claimed RICD flow rates are not for the minimum stream flows necessary to provide a reasonable recreation experience for the recreational uses identified in the application because there was credible evidence before the Board that lower flows can provide a reasonable experience of the recreational uses sought.

Thus, because the Applicant did not fully satisfy the Board with respect to the factors identified above in paragraphs 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8, the Board recommends that the water court deny this application.

Submitted this 23rd day of September, 2005.

JOHN SUTHERS,
Attorney General

CASEY SHPALL, #11538
Deputy Attorney General
Natural Resources and Environment Section
Attorneys for CWCB