

# LATE COMMENT

## commentletters

**From:** Larry Hanson <larryjhanson@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 04, 2015 10:00 PM  
**To:** commentletters  
**Subject:** Comment Letter – Emergency Conservation Regulation



California River Watch PO Box 817 Sebastopol CA 95472 [www.ncriverwatch.org](http://www.ncriverwatch.org)

May 4, 2015

**To: Comment Letter – Emergency Conservation Regulation**

Dear SWRCB:

These comments are arriving a little late. I did not notice the “pm” vs. “am” for the 10 o’clock time. I hope you can still consider our comments.

We have read your regulations and agree with how you are implementing policies and the levels of effectiveness you expect on the 20% of users.

Our criticism is how your are giving a bye to the agriculture industry which is, as you know, uses about 80% of water use. We assume you have given this bye is because providing food is very important to our basic survival as well as inextricably linked to our economy. However, many segments of the industry don’t rise to the importance of the necessity of food need. There is much waste due to inappropriate crops such as almonds. There are crops that are not food at all but alcoholic beverages. There is waste due to improper irrigation methods. There is improper management due to hoarding or, just the opposite, over-use due to the “use it or lose it” policy.

What this gets down to is that your goal of 25% of the 20% of water users and ignoring 25% of the 80% of the ag industry is quite trifling. The effect of your admiral effort to have water conserved if fully effective in this water crises amounts to about 5% savings. Alternatively, if this reasonable (at least at this point of the drought’s effects) reduction of 25% were applied to all users of California’s water, the effect would approach 25% water conservation.

We think that taking in the severity of having only 5% of snow pack, only a fraction of water storage, very little rain or forecasted rain, diminishing stored water capacities, sinking ground levels, etc. that your agency responsible for the water resource for all Californians would be promoting a more robust plan proactively and not hoping for the best that the climate will change for the better and alleviate the necessity of doing the more responsible plan.

A much more robust plan that incorporates the usage of agriculture’s water is what CRW seriously recommends

you do. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Larry Hanson, Manager

California River Watch

[www.ncriverwatch.org](http://www.ncriverwatch.org)

[us@ncriverwatch.org](mailto:us@ncriverwatch.org)