



The State Board's and Cal Water Company's response to the drought implements practice rules that, in many cases, not only t achieve immaterial reductions in water consumption, but also don;t mesh with real life situations. The results can be conduct counter to achieving actual long-term water consumption reductions

For example, we were planning to undertake a home remodel starting in June. We will be cutting our water usage back more than 50% (perhaps as much as 75%) since most landscaping will not be watered during construction. However, the contractor is subject to various requirement about dust control, and will be required to water down areas, resulting no doubt in water leaving the premises, and other violations of practices. Its a beauracratic catch-22 that one hand of the government is telling us to cut water using specific practices, and the other hand of the government is telling us to use water in a manner that will violate other hand's practices. But this gets even worse. Our remodel landscaping plan will result in significant reductions in water use in the future. If we can't do our remodel because of the new practices, we are not sufficiently incentivized to make changes, and instead will just follow rules about not washing off our cars, or or water our water sucking landscaping at specific times.

With homeowners having such different situations, providing at least one safe harbor from the practices for homeowners that achieve the desired water cut back makes sense. Homeowners may have very creative ways to conserve water that meets their peculiar needs. If we can achieve these results, why must the Board or Cal Water Company control the specifics of our conduct, especially enforcing rules we can not achieve because of other government rules?

The Board's own website indicates that urban usage accounts for only 10% of the water usage (environmental is 50%, agriculture the other 40%). A 25% saving from urban users means a whopping 2.5% reduction in Sate water usage (sarcasm intended). Its particularly galling to see someone eating a burger that takes about 634 gallons of water to produce or a computer that took about 40,000 gallons to produce (both numbers provided be Stanford University Department of Environmental Engineering and Science Feb. 2012), Do you understand how many days we can turn a hose 24/7 to achieve the water usage? These are feel good rules designed for political benefit that achieve no meaningful reduction in water usage, but inconvenience too many that don't fit the cookie cutter rules. I have no problem providing incentives for people to conserve water so we all do our share. However, applying arbitrary practices that do little to achieve that objective, rather than rewarding people for actual reductions in water consumption, strikes me as poor public policy. We Californians should and can do better.

Alexander Shipman  
15 Caballeros  
Rolling Hills, CA 90274

CC: Governor Brown  
Steven Moore  
Shannon C. Dean