

From: Ray Shindler

Date: May 11, 2019 at 4:14:13 PM PDT

To: jolenenacapuy@gmail.com

Subject: errors in the GSP pumping plan article on page 15 of the May 2 article.

Hey Jolene.

Who wrote it? Why isn't the author cited?

It says. "Because established water law in California said they're (irrigators) entitled to certain "rights" including the right to pump pretty much what they alone have determined necessary for their needs."

Answer. California Water law says they (irrigators) only have the right to pump up to the safe yield which is 5,700 afy total from the aquifer. Of course they have to share that amount with the water district and the golf courses. So they only have a water right to something less than 5,700 afy of water. Certainly they have no right to pump what ever they want. They currently pump around 18,000 afy. At least 14,000 afy of that water does not belong to the irrigators. It belongs to the people of the State of California as a public resource. Before the SGMA passed the only way to enforce water law was to take the irrigators to court---adjudication.

The article says "if not for that change in law (SGMA), protracted and expensive litigation would delay significantly any and all efforts to achieve sustainability."

Answer. Adjudication may take 2-5 years. And cost \$2-\$4 million. You find out if the water district has a water right for current use in that process. Not so in the SGMA process. SGMA does not assign water rights. SGMA already has cost \$6 million and will take maybe 20 more years to achieve sustainability. The costs will be many millions more. Adjudication costs less and takes less time.

Under SGMA we will not know if we have achieved sustainability for 20 more years. Until then we just hope it all works out. As Kathy Dice told the ratepayer group at a recent meeting...at some point you just have to have faith it will work out.

Meanwhile the community is in limbo wondering? How will that affect home values and future business opportunities?

What the water district is hoping for, and the key to success, is that the legislature will appropriate millions of dollars to the water district so they can purchase farms to acquire the water they need to supply the town. Without that happening the town is in serious jeopardy. Because the current plan requires proportional reductions. That means in 2040 the water district only ends up with less than 1,000 afy of water.

If you want to make these corrections or just print this feel free to do so. But the author is not qualified to write about water rights and the GSP.

Sincerely,

Ray Shindler