

# LATE COMMENT

commentletters

---

**From:** Joe Litchfield <litchfield.joseph@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 05, 2015 2:11 PM  
**To:** commentletters  
**Subject:** 36% Reduction Complaint



To Whom It May Concern,

As a resident of Rolling Hills Estates that has been, and will be taking further steps to conserve water due to the shortage, I feel it is not fair that we are subject to a 36% reduction where others are 4%, or they were at 25% and now are 15% (City of Los Angeles, for example). I understand that the majority of our water use is irrigation and personally we have already done a significant amount to reduce water use, but based on the current system I am lumped into all of my neighbors and would have to appeal if I wanted a reduction on my property. If I was previously a "water waster", the 36% reduction wouldn't be as hard, but since we already took steps to reduce water use, and our reduction is based on 2013 use, I now have to nearly cut off irrigation altogether and all of my landscaping will probably die (of which we planted native / drought tolerant landscaping, but even those have limits with no water), and some of my neighbors would be able to reduce 36% and probably not even tell a difference! We all want the same thing, but the higher reduction rate for our area seems excessive, and the method of application of the reduction factor is flat out unfair and is especially detrimental to those of us who were trying to conserve water before this emergency existed. I feel this is probably an unintended consequence of the measures meant to reduce water use, but there is still time for the State and Water Companies to fix it.

We would like our reduction to be consistent with other areas (City of Los Angeles, for example) at 15% to be fair.

Sincerely,

Joe Litchfield  
Rolling Hills Estates, CA