



Dear State Water Resources Control Board,

I have some issues I would like to be answered and considered in the new emergency water usage regulations being presented. I and my family actively participate in water conservation on a regular basis and care about water conservation. However, these rules seemed skewed in a way that does not bring to light factual information about families that are already using water saving strategies on a statewide basis as a whole. Although many residential water customers rely on commercial products and food grown in the state of California, we mostly do not (because we know that this does not save water). The regulations proposed do not include methods of reducing possible harassment and fines incurred from local water municipalities, law enforcement, or fire fighters on folks who choose to utilize these strategies. Strategies that include but are not limited to

- Growing your own food. (Saves lots of water)
- Reducing our need to drive to the store and buy unnecessary food products like soda, pre-made meals, treats, and packaged goods.
- Avoiding unnecessary transportation
- Reducing water pressure for residents. (Saves a ton of water)
- Using timers on home food production gardens.per
- Ridding our properties of "LAWNS" and utilizing mulch and other alternatives.

Due to the fact that we grow our own food, we use more water on a meter basis than say someone that relies solely on food and commodities acquired from a market. However, the later uses more water on a statewide basis (a fact already known by the State Water Resource Control Board). Water municipalities, law enforcement, and fire fighters are not schooled in the areas of water conservation and lack the ability to distinguish between those who use these strategies to conserve water and might jump to issuing fines to those who don't deserve it. Since we grow our own food in a very arid climate we have a need to water more than just a few times a week which could bring confusion to those given the task to enforce these regulations. Also, \$500 per day is way too harsh for a residential issue and could lead to financial hardship in some residential families who might have missed a broken sprinkler head or valve caused by individuals working around them and individuals passing on foot who inadvertently kick them. Maybe \$50 per day seems more reasonable for a residential issue that is obviously fixable quickly. As a family, we don't promote the use of lawns but understand that some are pressured by home owner's associations (HOAs) to do so. We hope HOAs are being dealt with in this issue directly as well.

Another issue I have not heard about or referenced. Why are we not putting more pressure on commercial establishments who produce unnecessary food products for which there are numerous here in the state? They have an equal responsibility as well. This needs to be addressed as an act of water conservation. Companies who produce things like for example, soda pop,

candy, frozen deserts, etc. should be being asked to acquire their resources from elsewhere or move their companies completely to states who do not have a water shortage. We are talking drought over several years and this would help greatly. At least limit them in resources accordingly and fine them for abuse at the very least. If it has been so bad for so long why are we letting them operate in our state. Allocate that water to real food for real farmers who produce necessary food. I think here we have a balance issue with demand we need to deal with.

Thank you,
Sam Andrasko
Lakeside, CA