



*Item 24
Submitted by staff*

RECEIVED

MAY 1 / 2010

MPWMD



SIERRA CLUB

FOUNDED 1892

May 17, 2010

FAXED to: 831-844-9560

Dear Chair Doyle and Members of the Board:

RE: Agenda Item 24. CONSIDER ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION NO. 2010-07 EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE SAFE, CLEAN AND RELIABLE DRINKING WATER SUPPLY ACT OF 2010

Sierra Club California respectfully requests that the Monterey Peninsula Water Management Board not adopt the resolution to support this \$11.1 billion State water bond loaded down with special-interest projects slated for the November ballot. **The bond provides no benefit to Monterey Peninsula and the MPWMD should not take a position on it.**

This bond would obligate the state to pay back more than \$800 million in bond debt every year for the next 30 years. These payments would further stress our general fund, providing \$800 million less for schools, parks, social services, police protection and fire services.

Much of the money in the bond is focused on the Delta and dams that would benefit only a few people. However, all taxpayers would be required to pay back the bonds. There is nothing specific and no guarantee that Monterey Peninsula would receive funding for a new water supply for our residents.

Since 1996, California voters have approved over \$14.3 billion in water-related bonds. The Sierra Club supported and voters approved Proposition 50, a \$3.4 billion water bond in 2002, and Proposition 84, \$5.4 billion water and parks bond in 2006. To this day, \$7.1 billion of those bond dollars have not been spent and the money hasn't been properly accounted for. Shouldn't the state spend this money prior to asking the voters to authorize more water bonds?

Furthermore, the bond would provide a massive subsidy to corporate interests and wasteful and polluting technologies, including new dams. Instead of focusing on sustainable long-term water supply and water quality policies. Dams are the most expensive and least efficient means of managing water supplies. More dams mean more environmental destruction.

California already has nearly 1,500 dams that divert water and threaten endangered fish populations, including salmon. Pacific Coast salmon populations are nearly extinct. The bond doesn't fund real solutions to California's water problems. Only 2 percent of bond funds are set aside for conservation programs, the most cost-effective way to improve the long-term sustainability of our water resources. What's more, because the bond prioritizes funding for dams, the water quality and conservation programs wouldn't receive bond funding until years after its passage.

For this reason, environmental groups like the Sierra Club, Planning and Conservation League and Friends of the River oppose the bond. It's the wrong approach at the wrong time.

Thank you for consideration of our request.

Sincerely,



Rita Dalessio
Ventana Chapter chair