

Darrell Wood - Edwards (Pres.)
Fred Grunder - Pratt (V Pres.)
John Janssen - Kiowa (Treas.)
Jerry Cullop - Rice (Sec.)
Justin Gatz - Reno
Kent Lamb - Stafford
Phil Martin - Barton
Kerry Froetschner - Pawnee
Tom Taylor - At-Large



RECEIVED
FEB 28 2018
Big Bend GMD #5

Orrin Feril, Manager
125 South Main Street
Stafford, Kansas 67578
ph: (620) 234-5352
fx: (620) 234-5718
gmd5@gmd5.org
www.gmd5.org

In accordance with K.S.A. 82a-1041, Big Bend Groundwater Management District #5 ("District") is pursuing a Local Enhanced Management Area ("LEMA"). On February 15, 2018, the District board presented the key components of the draft LEMA plan at the annual meeting. These components are: 1) end gun removal within entire LEMA area, 2) implement streamflow augmentation at a rate of 15 cubic feet per second ("cfs"); and 3) promote movement or retirement of water rights out of sensitive areas of the LEMA. The draft LEMA document is available for public review and comment. Please use this form to submit comments and concerns to the District by **March 1, 2018**.

Name (optional): Shaine Chadd

Contact Info (optional): chaddmarketing@gmail.com

This is a condensed version of how I feel about the mismanagement of the Rattlesnake Basin. First, I feel that the basin was mismanaged from the beginning by over appropriation, cumbersome programs, which hamper a producers ability to bank water or move water. Some of these ideas even contradict themselves with the proposed LEMA. For example, heard a story this week about a producer wanting to move water by redrilling the well further from the stream. This idea was rejected and the water was piped to its new destination. The proposed LEMA would now reward you for this process. This is just one example of where conservation of water, that would have contributed to streamflow, that has been ignored in the past. Not to overlook the fact that moving water is a huge cost and burden for most producers and, unrealistic as a large contributor to streamflow.

Ideas, like shutting off end guns, is a step in the right direction. Personally, I have no qualms if this happens. Let's not forget that irrigated ground is sold by the acre, and that end guns in the basin cover approximately 26,000 acres. This would most likely result in a land equity loss of approximately \$80,000,000.00 within the basin. With an additional loss of \$20,000,000.00 in land equity in the High Impact Area due to the deflated land values impacted by cuts in the water permits.

Although some of these ideas are valid, and might be needed, setting the financial burden solely on the permit holders including the perfecting of augmentation seems ridiculous. Quivira, as a permit holder by Kansas law states that their permit is no more valid than mine, yet they will not shoulder any of the financial burden, and it appears that they will not share in a reduction of their permit. To the contrary, it appears that their permit has increased through the years. It appears that this contradicts Kansas Water Laws established and unchanged since 1945.

Furthermore, signed MDS contracts, which seem to be black and white to me and mathematically advantageous to the solution, are being ignored as part of the solution. This alone mathematically takes care of the amount of AF of water needed to satisfy the additional AF mentioned at the meeting. But, this idea was not mentioned as an option, only a LEMA and IGUCA were mentioned as options. If these MDS wells are not addressed towards resolving this issue, this is an ethical shortcoming of all management entities and an injustice to all other permit holders within this area. I guess I just don't understand why we can't enforce measures already put in place on this issue. This leads me to believe that there might be some misaligned agenda in the designing of the proposal. This is poor representation for the better good of every user in the basin. It was even mentioned to me by a board member that the proposed cuts including the end gun removal would not contribute to streamflow and was simply a formality to appease the chief engineer or the service. I was told that the service was not in favor of augmentation and that even if put into place, they would not guarantee to use it. Seems like to me, trying to satisfy the service on these issues might be an unfair experiment on streamflow with no guaranteed results. The chief engineer mentioned at the annual meeting that the service rejected a fix to the streamflow issue with no explanation of why. I think this is ridiculous and an unacceptable answer. It was also mentioned that the way they meter water and streamflow was outdated and inadequate management practices. The irrigator has to adhere to the proper use of updated metering.

In conclusion to this short explanation on how I feel on how these issues have been handled within this water basin in which most of us who are extremely concerned, call HOME; we have raised our families here and based our retirement on a lifetime of hard work and dedication to the largest family owned entity in our United States known as agriculture. I speak for myself, my family, and my fellow irrigated farmers that we all want to do what is best for the place we call home, including all the wildlife and the nature that surrounds us. But make no mistake, we don't want to be taken advantage of or misrepresented by our own governing bodies. This misrepresentation could even be the result of our own ignorance.

Leaving these water issues open ended with the proposed backstops in place and a possible looming IGUCA seems to be a really bad idea for the future generations and families, who we hope will carry on this wonderful lifestyle I have enjoyed and am very proud of to inherited from my Dad.

P.S. It is important that the legalities of the proposed LEMA are looked at very carefully. The way I understand it, if the proposed backstops are left in place, there is a possibility that all the cuts that are proposed in the LEMA may be a moot point because the IGUCA that would ensue, if the service is not satisfied, will supercede any of the proposed solutions to streamflow. If the IGUCA is left in play as a part of the LEMA, they would be able to take whatever they want without negotiation from the GMD.

Please let me know if some of these points have been misunderstood.