

the fact sheet says the requirement applies to the provider to accomplish the savings, but another section says it applies to all Californians. Clarify in the final regs and explicitly state whether the regulations will leave it up to the supplier to achieve the % target savings or not. Like if I have been living small and behaving conservation oriented, to require me to achieve a std. % savings, the same as someone who has been living extravagantly large and wasteful, is not right. Like if I was consuming 1,800 calories a day and someone near to my residence was consuming 4,000 calories a day, to require us both to reduce our caloric intake by the same fixed percentage, is not fair. You know it and the board knows it. Relative to landscapes, different reductions are appropriate for residences with vastly different acreage in landscape. We all deserve a fair share. but living large has to bear a larger share of reductions. If not done well this regulation has the potential to bring us back to the 99% revolt all over again.

Fair and equitable, that is the word I was looking for, the regs have to be fair and equitable, if the public is to accept them and confidence in State government is to be had. Good luck.