I offer two comments for your consideration.

John J. Schinkle P.E.
9 Parador Rd.
Los Lunas, NM 87031-6470

While the report demonstrates a conscientious effort on the part of the researchers, two critical aspects essential for reaching valid conclusions should be given much greater recognition.

1.) Uncertainties associated with estimates of ground-water recharge rates, ground-water discharge rates and evaporation are substantial given the paucity of data with respect to geography and time. Uncertainties are acknowledged throughout the report, but the uncertainties may be much greater than perceived. The modeling necessarily involves various assumptions such as the saturated hydraulic conductivity of bedrock, and the computations rely on measurements limited to a 1-year period taken at a limited number of sites. Uncertainties may be huge and can only be improved with a quantum increase in data and analyses.

2.) It is recognized that significant variance in rainfall and evaporation from year to year and location to location is to be expected. A paramount consideration in this study should be the potential consequences of continuos withdrawal of substantial volumes of groundwater during periodic draught cycles, sometimes having a 20-year duration or longer. Consequences would be most severe during these recurring draught events, and this should be paramount in any decision involving withdrawl of large fractions of ground-water in perpetuity.

Editorial comments:

a.) The report states that "Within intermediate-flow systems, springs typically discharge near the intersection of the alluvial fan and the valley floor near the range front." However, Figure 16 depicts intermediate springs discharging at the range front interface with the alluvial fan. The latter characterization is probably more typical.

b.) A list of acronyms would be helpful.

c.) The format of the final Glossary item should be edited.

John Schinkle
jjschinkle@earthlink.net