

Eric Osterling

From: E.J. de Jong <ejdj.wredenranch@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 5, 2022 4:39 PM
To: Eric Osterling
Subject: Comments

My name is Eric John (EJ) de Jong with Lansing LLC, landowner in this GSA.

I ask that the Stakeholder committee be allowed to review this draft as it presents a significant change from the prior draft document. Approving this document in the current form without significant stakeholder input does not provide growers enough opportunity to weigh in.

Please see some of my concerns below

Land Owner defined in draft as Fee Title Owner No Provision for "Farm Unit"

The implication of this definition without specifically allowing for shared usage of water on a "Farm Unit" basis that we had previously requested in written comments will severely impact a large number of farmers in the GKGSA. If a piece of land is farmed that is in a Trust and it is part of a larger ranch that has slightly different legal ownership, and movement of water between the parcels will trigger the transfer provisions and leave behinds noted above resulting in a loss of allocation. This will also adversely affect any farmers that have leased ground and need flexibility to transfer water allocations. If you have a ranch made up of leased parcels with different fee title ownership, any movement of water allocation between them will trigger the transfer losses. This will put small farmers that are leasing ground or farming for a family farm with multiple legal fee title owners at a disadvantage to large landowners in the GKGSA.

Surface Water Rechargers may transfer credits anywhere within the GKGSA without penalty

While this provision may seem like a great incentive to encourage recharging surface water, those entities with existing water rights will have a huge advantage over groundwater only farmers in their ability to capture and recharge surface water. This will only widen the divide between the haves vs. the have nots in the GKGSA. Those who have access to surface water are not restricted to the same limitations in transferring a recharge credit as those who are pumping the Sustainable Yield.

Owners must elect in which order to use the categories of water 30 day prior to the end of each quarter , or default to the order of the Rules and Regulations

This may not seem like a big deal right off the bat, but if you are considering transferring water, the sustainable yield allocation would have the least amount of restriction in transfers. That means you would have to remember 4 times a year to elect to use your categories of water in a different order than the default to have the sustainable yield left over to transfer.

Precipitation is not being included in the Categories of Water to be accounted for in the Online Dashboard

Although the dashboard currently has a placeholder for accounting for precipitation I feel that it should also be listed in the rules and regulations so we can be sure that the precipitation number is available to see and not just netted out of the ET number that gets used. The accounting should be transparent for all users!

