Subject: Request

Date: Friday, July 13, 2007 3:21 PM

From: Annette DeMay

To: <ldobbins@ridgecrestca.com>

Conversation: Request

Laura.

Below is a copy of a memo I wrote to you. I know you talked with the Deckers. Perhaps my justification for requesting alternative informative offers a different perspective than what you discussed with the Deckers.

Please let me know that you received this and have read it.

Thanks for your consideration.

Annette DeMay

DATE July 13, 2007

FROM Annette DeMay, Ridgecrest, CA

TO Laura Dobbins, Executive Editor, The Daily Independent (375-4481

x121)

SUBJECT Request correction per misleading statement in July 11, 2007 issue

This is not a "letter to the Editor;" it is a request for correction about misleading information prominently reported in the paper, with reasons for the correction.

I refer to Chuck Krieger's quote in large bold letters in the water article on page A3 of the July 11 issue. (See the bottom of column 1 in the article headlined "Water officials taken to task".)

Krieger's statement was a hasty and inadequate response to Dr. Donald Decker's thoughtful and somewhat technical presentation. Decker described possible short-term damages to neighboring wells (not in the Water District) and possible long-term damages to the valley water supply, if the current language in the report were approved.

Alarming? What is truly alarming is that despite many questions, no Water Board director, engineer or lawyer revealed any wording in the report that would legally forbid the effects Dr. Decker described. Some directors and the engineer

asked us to believe they would never pump huge amounts of water from too many wells, but they want to approve a report that allows it.

Address Reality? The Water District proposes to pump up to 2,500 gallons per minute from each well. New wells 35 and 36 would be drilled less than 1/2-mile apart in a residential neighborhood (E5, RS) where the current residents depend on non-district wells. Two other Water District wells in the higher density part of this neighborhood will be refitted to pump at the high rate. Krieger in essence asked us to take his spoken word that the Water District will not pump the amounts of water stated in the Report because those amounts are unrealistic; but the report allows them. If they pump only half of the maximum allowed, it would still be too much in the new-well neighborhood based on numbers in the District's own report.

Krieger used graphs and numbers with *averaged* information to *suggest* what we would like to hear. Krieger described drawdown effects—the lowering of the groundwater table, which lowers the level of underground water that can be reached by wells. He stated that drawdown would be greater near the wells than his numbers for the whole valley suggest. Test results in the Report show a drawdown of 17 feet in only 90 days in the vicinity of well 35 (near Las Flores Ave. and Strecker St.) and 18 feet around well 36, if all 7 wells were run at maximum capacity. The Report does not project affects on the water table beyond 90 days. Decker scientifically projected beyond 90 days, which shows a more disturbing lowering of the water table. No wonder the engineer called the projection out to 30 years alarming.

Valid? Dr. Decker's analysis is valid because (1) he used standard, widely-accepted hydrology (ground water evaluation) methods to project information into the future, and (2) he used standard mathematical and engineering methods for drawing his plots, and (3) he used the drawdown rates from the Water District's own report, and (4) he was showing what is possible according to the report not what is now verbally promised but not guaranteed in the Report. So far the Water District has chosen to rely on a single 90-day hydrology simulation in the Report, while it ignores many broader studies that already exist.

Unfortunately, many adults are too familiar with the difference between legally written bad news and comforting promises that are only spoken to us.