

State Water Resources Control Board



We are commenting on whether the approach to ensure that minimum health and safety needs that were attempted to be addressed in the emergency regulations that imposed minimum flows in Deer, Mill and Antelope Creeks should be applied more broadly.

More broadly. We object strongly to have any more of our water being taken from any of the users on the three mentioned creeks. That particular term “more broadly” is a reflection of a dismissal of the importance of the senior water right users and the impact you have caused and would like to continue to enforce. Whether it be in-stream flows for the fish when the water temperature was already too high and your own biologists weren’t finding any fish, or the need for water to be shipped to the Los Angeles area for residences to comply with their HOA agreements in keeping their lawns green, I feel that your goal is to void the existing water rights for the landowners here on these creeks. This is such a serious threat to our farming operations that the state board should expect our opposition in the form of legal action.

Additionally, the fiscal impact that has been stated as “no additional fiscal demands will occur as a result of approving this item” is also incorrect. The emergency curtailment has caused hardship in the form of our crops being unduly stressed early in the summer, the forced sale of cattle, and the extra cost of pumping or retrofitting pumps for those landowners who already had pumps. Not every land owner in the area has access to groundwater, which will be strained. You are wrong to assume that no additional cost will be imposed upon the water users. Our budgets, income and future plans are centered on the delivery of water from these creeks.

Personally, our family has endured much stress from the first curtailment and do not wish to be forced to endure another. Any additional water delivery restrictions would impact our family greatly.

Lance and Mary Bundy

Vina