
RE: [External Email]Lake Rockport Estates

Davison, Matthew - RD, UT <Matthew.Davison2@usda.gov>

Tue, Jun 16 at 4:29 PM

To: Denise Holding <deniseholding@gmail.com>

Cc: Hacking, Kevin - RD, UT <Kevin.Hacking@usda.gov>, Larsen, Karl - RD, UT <karl.larsen@usda.gov>

Hi Denise,

Thanks for your email concerning the new well siting study by Willowstick and ongoing efforts to sort out how to move forward with the project. I have read through the Willowstick report several times now, as well as the previous Loughlin well siting report. Before replying to this email, I needed to coordinate and discuss my concerns with Kevin Hacking (Loan Specialist) and Karl Larsen (Program Director).

When this project was initially approved for funding by USDA RD, the expectation was that drilling a well to the lower portion of the Kelvin formation would produce 100 – 200 gpm. Unfortunately, the test results recorded for the Kelvin well were only 21 gpm. This situation highlights the risks of well drilling and the issue that it's not an exact science and water flows are not guaranteed.

Looking over both the Willowstick and Loughlin well siting reports, and with the unsuccessful results from the Kelvin well drilling output; the data suggests that drilling a new well is more likely to only produce a fraction of what Lake Rockport Estates (LRE) needs. I believe LRE needs close to 170 gpm to support all the future connections, and at least 100 gpm for immediate needs. A new well drilled at the A1 location from the Willowstick siting report is more likely to produce less than 30 gpm than it is to generate over 100 gpm. The A1 location is close to the existing LRE well that when initially drilled was close to 80 gpm and has dropped to 20 gpm. The problems LRE has experienced with the existing well at this location is a strong indicator that a well in this location is not sustainable and will not meet the objectives of the project.

USDA Rural Development is very concerned that drilling another well is unlikely to produce the amount of water that LRE requires. If the board decides to try and drill another well, Rural Development will require LRE to provide convincing justification supporting why another well will produce better results. Without some strong convincing justification supporting such an action, Rural Development will not view this as a viable option and would not receive concurrence to use USDA funding to drill another well.

Certainly, USDA RD will reconsider if new information is presented that supports a better outcome production for a second attempt with drilling a well to produce over 100 gpm.

Respectfully,