



To the California State Water Resources Control Board, and Chair, Felicia Marcus; Vice Chair Frances Spivy-Weber, Dorene D'Adamo, Steven Moore and Tam Doduc:

I just heard about Cal Water's Proposed Emergency Regulations to subject its customers, on the Palos Verdes Peninsula, to mandatorily cut their water use by 36%. Reportedly, this requirement is being imposed by the California Water Resources Control Board, with the Board taking public comment on their Proposed Emergency Regulations by 10:00 AM on May 4th at the above referenced e-mail address.

As a resident of the Palos Verdes Peninsula (the City of Rolling Hills), my family strongly objects to this arbitrary cut in water use on the Palos Verdes Peninsula, in general, and in Rolling Hills, in particular. First, for a measure of this importance, those affected should be given far greater notice than learning about the deadline for comments, one day in advance.

Second, by-and-large, the residents of the Palos Verdes Peninsula are water conservation oriented, in this unique area. The residents do not dump billions (some experts say "trillions") of gallons of water into the sea to protect a "feeder fish". The residents are not for turning California into a sanctuary state, i.e., as a magnet for millions of, primarily, unlawful "immigrants," who consume hundreds of millions of gallons of water per annum, without regard to the drought conditions. The residents tend to be advocates of rainwater harvesting, as a more productive way to have water reserves, than rationing water to the state's legal residents. The residents are supportive of more intelligent water use among California's farmers so they can prosper and continue to be the breadbasket of the nation. And, the residents are far more interested in constructing 40-50 dams (not one dam), instead of constructing a "bullet" train that will serve a relatively limited number of passengers, even if applauded by some the State's labor unions.

The Palos Verdes Peninsula is a precious piece of California real estate, though with a somewhat unstable geology. It hosts an abundance of wildlife. To maintain the beauty of the Peninsula requires an adequate water supply, to avoid drying out the area and making it a higher risk fire area than it is, already. Reduce water available here by 36%, i.e., a much greater rationing than elsewhere in the state and in L.A. County, and the consequences will be dire. A reduction in water supply will have consequences. There will be increased fire risk. There will be damage to the environment, not only in terms of vegetation, but to the wildlife and birds that rely on vegetation for their survival. Loss of bushes and trees will cause an increase in ambient temperature, with a commensurate increase in the use of air conditioning. Telling a highly congested residential community to reduce the times they flush their toilets by 15% today is an inconvenience, not a hardship. My own family already limits the number of times toilets are flushed in our home, in the spirit of water conservation. But, reducing water to a community, whose environment depends upon an adequate water supply could have irreversible negative consequences.

There are countless ways this State can reduce outright water waste and unreasonable consumption of water. The State can get its water conservation priorities "right" without punishing its water conservation oriented communities. Southern California has few places that match the beauty of the Palos Verdes Peninsula. Reducing the supply of water to that "piece" of California real estate, by 36%, when residents are already practicing water conservation is patently unfair.

Respectfully,

Roger E. Hawkins
Rolling Hills, California
