

John Goodrich

I believe that your DEI statement suffers from major flaws.

I am referring to the first two bulleted paragraphs which read as follows:

- Embed a commitment to equity and environmental justice, including principles for meaningful engagement, in our decision-making processes to produce equitable outcomes for all Californians, particularly disadvantaged communities and California Native American tribes.
- Expand and enhance outreach, education, external communications, and knowledge sharing opportunities through inclusive language and targeted, culturally-responsive engagement."

As to the first paragraph, regardless of the ambiguity of the prior expression up to "to produce equitable outcomes for all Californians, particularly disadvantaged communities and California Native American tribes" What are "equitable outcomes?" Does that mean you'll adjust restrictions necessary for compliance with our laws, so that they don't apply equally to all? If so, that is corruption itself. Secondly, if "equitable outcomes" mean that some individuals receive greater income or lesser costs than others, who is to be the arbiter of that? Third, it is not clear what "particularly disadvantaged communities" are. Is this a racial classification? If so, it is unconstitutional. Second, who gets to decide who's "disadvantaged" and who is not? That choice should not be in the hands of an unelected bureaucrat. If the regulations are not sufficiently specific that they define who is "particularly disadvantaged," they are fatally ambiguous and should not be part of regulatory authority. Fourth, California Native American Tribes are NOT "particularly disadvantaged communities (otherwise they wouldn't be separately called out). So if California Native American Tribes are not a "disadvantaged community," why does this regulation call for special treatment of them? As before, such regulations need to be specific, or they are fatally flawed. We do not want bureaucrats to be able to select winners and losers....which generally leads to corruption and hostility to the rule of law.

In all of this, the questions of what is an "equitable outcome" is extremely difficult to determine. It is certainly not a determination to be left to an unelected bureaucrat. If you want to regulate special treatments which have specific results, you have to spell them out. Otherwise the regulation is fatally flawed and is a ground for discrimination created by an unelected bureaucrat. There is no reasonable justification to provide that power for corruption in the hands of an unelected public employee.

As to the second bulleted paragraph, "Expand and enhance outreach, education, external communications, and knowledge sharing opportunities through inclusive language and targeted, culturally-responsive engagement.

Whatever is meant by "inclusive language and targeted, culturally-responsive engagement?" The nature of laws and regulations which are ambiguous is that they give rise to unelected bureaucrats doing what they want. That's why the most important goal in drafting laws and regulations is specificity. This paragraph lacks any kind of specificity.

I am opposed to this section on DEI. I am opposed to poorly drafted ambiguous regulations, under the guise of which unelected bureaucrats can create winners and losers using the untrammelled power of the State and leading to the possibilities of government corruption.