

Here are my comments:

Routt County (Routt and Steamboat hot springs)

1. The area around Routt springs agree with what we see with ASTER anomalies, however using Figure 2 (area of interest) and Figure 4 (area of proposed MT survey) our area is extended to more sections and parcels than the area suggested by Rick. But it will completely agree if we use Figure 3 (location of air photo lineaments). Obviously the area of interest (Figure 2) is an approximation, because the area suggested earlier cover bigger area (extended over sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25 29, 30).
2. Regarding area in the vicinity of Steamboat springs, our results agree with the conclusions of Rick. The area around Routt hot springs has more thermal anomalies.
3. We see some hot spots over Copper ridge, but more hot areas to the west and southwest of Routt hot springs (area identified on the topographic map by hot springs).
4. My suggestion is to increase the area to be covered by MT to include sections 13, and 24 besides 18 and 19 (suggested by Rick). First may be at a low resolution, and then go to higher resolution (depending on the cost).
5. According to my data the two parcels (R8170224) are not private.
6. The area lies within township 6 and ranges 86 and 87 (6N 86 and 6N 87 W), deserves to be revisited.

Dolores County (Rico area)

1. ASTER results agree with Rick's results, however ASTER shown more hot areas surrounding the hot springs area in particular to the south and southwest than Rico area.
2. Paradise and Geyser springs located within non private lands, however there are some private parcels near Paradise and Geyser (North and North east), and more parcels to the south and southwest.

Archuleta County (Pagosa springs)

1. ASTER analysis shown thermal anomalies around the area, however no obvious anomalies around McCabe creek and Reservoir River ranch (anomalies are north of it, west to the spring). Rick stated that no evidence for geothermal over the reservoir ranch. The thermal anomalies are more towards the south from the hot springs, (starts approximately ~ 1 mile). There is abundance of private parcels on the area.
2. Piedra River hot springs area is interesting, but there are quite few private parcels south of the hot springs (~2 miles), and it is not visited last summer.

Conclusions and suggestions

- All the three areas have ASTER thermal anomalies.
- Given the fact that we see ASTER thermal anomalies in all the three areas, there may be a great chance to have better areas not visited during the last summer (e.g. Garfield (South canyon hot springs, and Chafee).
- The second area in Routt County and Piedra River hot springs area in Archuleta County deserve to be visited.
- As Rick suggested we can take the maps of Rick and our maps and discuss them with the professor in Golden.
- Regarding the MT, I suggest to discuss with Anne using Rick's and our results .