

Fax

To: GMD #4 2 EMA
C/O Ronda Hutter

From: Jon Frirsen

Fax: 785-564-6777

Pages: 3

Phone:

Date: Sept 11 2017

Re:

CC:

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

• Comments:

Please acknowledge the receipt
of this Fax by E-mail
to

jfrirsen@st-tel.net

DATE: September 9, 2017
TO: RHONDA HUTTON
SUBJECT: GMD #4 LEMA MANAGEMENT PLAN
FROM: JON FRIESEN
WATER RIGHT OWNER
P.O. BOX 763
COLBY, KS 67701

RESPONSE TO QUESTION #3:

Whether the geographic boundaries are reasonable

It is my personal belief that if the Chief Engineer was to adopt this plan, it would be a tragedy for property right owners in the State of Kansas. This was never a local grass roots plan for which a LEMA was designed.

- 1) These are personal water rights that were bought and paid for over time granting us the right to use water that the State owns for beneficial use according to what is stated on each and every water right.
- 2) Every owner of this water right should be able to have his or her voice heard through a public vote if that right is going to be altered by any way other than an impairment or an improper use of that right.
- 3) After reviewing video tapes of the GMD 4 board meetings that were held to put this plan in place, and attending various informational meetings and the four "Advisory Committee of the Upper Republican" meetings held by the Kansas Water Office, it was apparent that, the actual users were not being heard and their opinions being validated, and that this was being pushed by the State to get something done using our local GMD.
- 4) GMD 4 Board actions follow more or less exactly what the State was stating without question. So while this plan looks good on paper, it does not reflect what is happening in the field.

- 5) The need to get something done was driven from the Governor's 50-year plan. There are townships being reduced to 15.3 inches annually that have 125 plus years of water while townships of 25 ft. have no restrictions, and townships of 40 to 70 feet of water will be allowed to pump 15.3 inches annually which could in 30 years be placing domestic users in jeopardy. This does not make sense.
- 6) I cannot see how the Chief Engineer could call this a plan representing public interest. It is time to send this back to the board of GMD 4 and say you must do a better job and send it to the GMD 4 voters to make the final decision.
- 7) Oral comments were given during the public hearing in Colby by Lane Letourneau an employee of the Division of Water Resources, gave testimony to the Division of Water Resources to quantify the issue of public interest, telling me that this hearing was just a formality. The problem making matters more apparent was that he was making his personal opinions public. A State Employee should not be doing this.

My personal thoughts are, and I'm on record of saying this, today's technology can give us a chance to reduce water use and we should do that. I have already done so myself, and my water use records will show that, but this plan is nothing more than a shift of water use from one place to another and will not save water. If we are going to do something then all water rights in the district should share alike and reduce, and the LEMA or WCA programs should be available for those who choose to participate.