



Members of the State Water Board,

I'm writing to comment on the proposed Emergency Water Conservation Regulations that you will be considering at your July 15th meeting. I serve as an elected board member for an urban water supplier in Yuba County. However, this letter is my personal opinion as I have not been authorized to represent my District in this communication.

We have a serious drought going on in our State right now and I appreciate your board attempting to take a leadership role and ensure that California's are conserving as much water as possible. However, I do have several concerns about your proposal and felt the need to write and share them:

1) California is a very diverse State with extremely diverse communities, water sources, and delivery systems. Some of those systems are under incredible strain from the drought and some less so. As a result, I believe a "one size fits all" set of water conservation regulations applied to everyone across the State is the wrong approach. Instead, please consider providing guidance instead of regulation and leave the details of the conservation requirements to each local water provider. The local provider is in the best position to understand their individual challenges and what restrictions are most appropriate to their situation.

2) I believe your proposed restriction that states: "Watering of outdoor landscapes that cause runoff to adjacent property, non-irrigated areas, private and public walkways, roadways, parking lots or structures." allows too much room for interpretation. I understand, and agree with, the goal of the restriction, but I believe the way it's worded could lead to unintended consequences. Per the drought response of my local District, I've already cut my watering back to the required three days per week during the specified hours. However, it's almost impossible not to get some overspray on the sidewalk and gutters adjacent to my lawn. I'm concerned that your proposed requirement is vague enough that many people who are conserving could end up being fined. If you must issue Statewide requirements, please consider modifying this requirement so that it is black and white and leaves no room for unintended consequences.

3) I understand this is a serious matter and therefore demands a fine that makes people take the restrictions seriously. However, I believe that a \$500 fine for a first time offender, especially given the vagueness of some requirements, to be extremely excessive. Please consider a much lower fine, especially for a first time offender. Even better, please consider delegating the responsibility for establishing the fine to the each local agency.

Thanks for your consideration,
Gary Bradford
Plumas Lake, CA