



California Water Bond 2018



Short Summary of Major Programs in Water Supply and Water Quality Bond Act of 2018

Safe drinking water and wastewater treatment for disadvantaged communities. \$750 million. Provides safe drinking water and wastewater treatment for disadvantaged communities, especially in the Central Valley.

Wastewater recycling. \$400 million. Recycles wastewater mainly for landscaping and industrial uses

Groundwater desalination. \$400 million. Converts salty groundwater to usable water supply.

Urban water conservation. \$300 million. Leak detection, toilet replacement, landscape conversion.

Agricultural water conservation. \$50 million. Improves inefficient irrigation systems, increasing river flows

Central valley flood management, including flood plain restoration. \$100 million. Makes farms and communities more flood safe, and makes flood plains for habitat friendly. Additional \$50 million for retrofit of a reservoir (probably Bullard's Bar) for better flood management.

San Francisco Bay Wetlands and flood improvements. \$200 million. Improves wetlands in San Francisco Bay to provide flood protection and mitigate sea level rise.

Data management. \$60 million. Better data collection and management: streamflow, etc.

Stormwater management \$600 million for a variety of state agencies. Capture and treatment of stormwater flows improved river and ocean water quality and increasing water supplies

Watershed Improvement \$2355 million to a wide variety of state agencies. Pays for better management of watersheds throughout the state to improve water quality and water supply. Includes \$150 million for the Los Angeles River, as well as \$100 million for the Delta Conservancy, which helps fund the governor's Eco-Restore program. Includes \$80 million for the removal of Matilija Dam, a silted-in dam in Ventura County. \$200 million for ecological restoration and dust control at the Salton Sea. Watershed restoration after fires in the Sierra Nevada and elsewhere receives \$100 million. Funds state conservancies and state parks to better manage watersheds.

Land Management for Water Yield. \$100 million. Removal of invasive weeds which use excessive amounts of surface and groundwater such as tamarisk, yellow starthistle, and Arundo. Estimates of water savings are in excess of one million acre feet per year.

Fisheries restoration. \$400 million. Restoring fish habitat. Supplements necessary streamflows.

Groundwater. \$675 million. Implements the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act., stabilizing groundwater levels in overdraft groundwater basins.

Water and specific habitat improvements for fisheries. \$500 million. Purchase of water for fish and waterfowl.

Completion of fish screens in Central Valley. \$100 million. Will prevent baby fish from being diverted into irrigation systems.

San Joaquin River fisheries Restoration. \$100 million. Restoration of Spring Run Chinook Salmon downstream of Friant dam.

Waterfowl habitat. \$280 million. Helps meet waterfowl obligations under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, and other waterfowl habitat improvement programs.

Bay Area Regional Reliability. \$250 million. Improves interconnections between Bay Area water agencies, making it easier to survive droughts.

Improvement to Friant Kern Canal and other Friant water interconnections. \$750 million. Restores lost capacity to Friant Kern Canal, pays for groundwater recharge programs, water conservation and possibly new water conveyance in the Friant area.

Oroville Dam Spillway Repair. \$200 million. Makes Oroville Dam more flood safe.

The initiative also allows state and federal water contractors to recover the funds they pay in climate change charges due to implementation of AB 32, and use those funds in their own systems for water and energy conservation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.



[HOME](#)

[CONTACT US](#)

Contributions to the water bond can be made out to "Californians for Safe Drinking Water and a Clean and Reliable Water Supply", and can be mailed to River City Business Services, 5429 Madison Avenue, Sacramento California 95841. Thank you for your support!



California Water Bond 2018



Questions and Answers About the Water Supply and Water Quality Bond Act for the November, 2018 Ballot

Updated November 17, 2017

What is the need for more State investment in water resources? What is the role of local water agencies and the federal government in paying for this infrastructure?

The State of California has invested many billions of dollars in water infrastructure. This is because California has three distinct water problems. First, most precipitation falls north of Sacramento, but most water demand for cities and agriculture is south of Sacramento. Second, most precipitation falls in the winter, but most demand is in the summer. Third, most of the population lives near the coast, but most rivers and groundwater are inland.

Although some large cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles, and the East Bay have built large pipelines to move water from east to west, it has taken huge state and federal investments to move store winter and spring runoff, and move water hundreds of miles from north to south and east to west for the benefit of most Californians. The federal government has invested billions of dollars over the past 100 years, but there have not been any major new federal infrastructure investments in California water for nearly 40 years. During this time, the demand for water for vitally important environmental concerns, as well as population growth, have added to the pressures on the existing system.

The state has helped fill the gap by passing a series of water bonds, beginning in 1960, and continuing through 2014. The state has presented the voters with 21 water bonds during that time, and 20 have been approved, totaling many billions of dollars.

Despite this large investment by the state, local water districts have invested even more money in storage, distribution, wastewater recycling, desalting, and many other forms of water management. The state usually acts as a partner to local water agencies, using state bond funds to incentivize local water projects which might have otherwise been built later to be built earlier.

Dozens of publications demonstrate the need for additional investment in water infrastructure. Here are just a few:

Public Policy Institute of California report on water infrastructure funding need:

<http://www.ppic.org/main/pressrelease.asp?i=1464>,

Bay Area Council funding needs study

<http://documents.bayareacouncil.org/bacwppfinal.pdf>

Bay Area Council link to video about SF Bay flooding <http://www.bayareacouncil.org>

Governor Brown's list of infrastructure needs, including \$50 billion for flood control:

<https://www.cnn.com/2017/02/24/california-plans-to-bolster-states-flood-control-efforts.html>

Can California afford this bond?

Yes. The state can afford a new water bond. Taking on new debt is always a serious consideration, however the state's bond rating is steadily improving, and the interest rate we pay is equivalent to a bond with an AAA rating. There is a huge demand for California bonds by the bond market.

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-08-08/california-once-compared-to-greece-now-trading-better-than-aaa>

As described in the 2016 Voter Handbook published by the Secretary of State and the Treasurer, California devotes less than five percent of its general fund budget to servicing general obligation bonds. This is well within the prudent limit for bond expenditures.

<http://vig.cdn.sos.ca.gov/2016/general/en/pdf/complete-vig.pdf> (see page 114 for an analysis of state debt)

Bonds are almost the only way the state invests in repairing its water infrastructure.

What is the history of water bonds in California?

Since 1972 California voters have approved 20 of 21 general obligation bond measures which provided funding for water development. Those in green passed. The bond in pink failed.

Year

1960 burns porter act. Bond. Established state water project.

1970 recreation at state water project; fish and wildlife enhancement

	clean water bond act
1974	clean water bond act
1976	safe drinking water bond act
1978	clean water and water conservation bond
1980	amend safe drinking water bond act of 1976
1984	safe drinking water bond act
	clean water bond act
1986	water conservation and water quality bond
	safe drinking water bond act
1988	water conservation bond act
	clean water and water reclamation bond act
	safe drinking water bond act
1990	water resources bond act
1996	safe reliable water supply bond act
2000	parks, water, air coast bond act
	water bond act
2002	parks, water, air, coast bond act
	water quality supply safe drinking water initiative
2006	water bond act initiative
	Disaster preparedness and flood prevention
2014	water Quality, Supply, Treatment, Storage

Does this measure meet the needs outlined in the Governor's water action plan?

Yes. Governor Brown adopted a water action plan in 2013. It is comprehensive, including all elements of water management, including water for people, agriculture and the environment. This measure funds all elements of the water action plan. An analysis of how this measure conforms to the Water Action Plan is on this website. See the Water Action Plan at

http://resources.ca.gov/docs/california_water_action_plan/Final_California_Water_Action_Plan.pdf

Are all parts of the state included fairly?

Every part of the state will benefit from implementation of this measure. No area is excluded.

How are the water bond funds allocated?

Proceeds from the bonds will be applied to the places of highest need. A table of all the funding categories is found on this website.

What are the principal purposes of the water bond?

The water bond initiative invests in these important programs:

- **Safe Drinking Water and safe disposal of wastewater for disadvantaged and other poor communities.** Many of these communities have no drinking water at all, or unsafe water supplies. This is unacceptable in an advanced 21st Century society like California. Funds for this purpose from previous bond acts will be exhausted by 2018.
- **Implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.** The Legislature passed this landmark act several years ago. This bond act will provide funds to help bring California's groundwater basins into balance. Water from the ground provides nearly 40% of California's water supply, and has been subject to severe overdraft in some regions. This must be corrected.
- **Restoration of the delivery capacity of the Friant-Kern Canal.** This canal, which stretches from Fresno to Bakersfield delivers water to 15,000 farms, and has lost much of its capacity due to subsidence caused by groundwater overdraft. The canal water irrigates

more than one million acres of California's most productive farmland, annually producing more than \$4 billion in gross agricultural production. Much of our long term food supply will be at risk if this problem is not corrected.

- **Wastewater recycling, groundwater desalting, and water conservation.** These proven techniques to increase and extend water supplies are ecologically sound methods of meeting California's water needs.
- **Stormwater management.** Stormwater can pollute rivers and the ocean, by carrying waste into these water bodies. By capturing and treating stormwater in urban areas, water supplies can be increased and pollution reduced.
- **Increased water supplies and improved habitat for fish, waterfowl and wildlife.** By providing more water and improving habitat conditions, these native California species will thrive, and endangered species will recover.
- **Watershed improvement and fire recovery.** Most of our water comes from the watersheds that supply our rivers, streams and groundwater. Better watershed management can improve the quality and quantity of these water supplies, and restore watersheds damaged by fire, improving public safety.
- **Flood management.** By broadening flood plains, flood damage to farms and cities can be reduced. Modifying existing inadequate flood control facilities will also reduce flood risk.
- **Salton Sea.** Without state investment, California's largest lake will dry up, causing huge air quality problems in Southern California due to blowing dust. The Sea's diverse wildlife also needs protection.
- **River parkways and urban streams.** Many cities and towns in California are located on or near rivers and streams. Enhancing these important recreational and habitat features will improve the quality of life in these cities, as well as water quality.
- **Bay Area Regional Reliability program.** This important program will integrate the water supplies of various water agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area.
- **Oroville Dam Repair.** State and federal general funds were used to pay for the flood control and recreational features of Oroville Dam. Restoring the flood control features of the dam is a reasonable purpose of this bond act.

How much water will this bond produce for people?

A great deal. A reasonable estimate of new water supplies provided by this measure is more than 1.5 million acre feet. This is enough water to supply water for three million families. A full analysis of these new water supplies is found on this website. (This link will be active shortly.) Most of this new water will be available in critical drought years, greatly increasing its

value.

How are the needs of fish and wildlife met?

The bond will focus urgently needed resources to the environment. Fish and wildlife need two things to thrive: a good water supply, and protected habitat. The water bond includes funding for a wide variety of projects which provide for both these needs. Funding is provided to acquire water for fish and wildlife, and also to protect and expand wetlands and other water related habitat. A full analysis of the benefits of the bond for fish and wildlife is found on this website.

How does the bond help with flood control and management?

Although much of California is arid, floods are a constant problem throughout the state. There are two responses to this problem. The first is to keep development out of flood plains, to allow floods to pass by developed areas safely. The second is to use levees to channel floodwaters, and to detain flood flows in reservoirs, and then meter them out slowly to provide a water supply benefits.

This measure uses both these methods to avoid and reduce flood damage. It includes repairs to existing flood control reservoirs including Oroville and those in Southern California. It also provides funds to improve and set back levees, so that the floodwater carrying capacity of flood plains is increased.

Are there still funds left over from the 2014 water bond?

For water storage projects, but not for the kinds of infrastructure needs this bond will address. The 2014 water bond included two major categories of funding. The first was water storage projects. Due to provisions in the bond, these funds could not be expended until at least 2018. The California Water Commission is charged with expending these funds. The Commission has received 12 proposals for these funds, but will not award grants until at least 2018. Since these funds are still unexpended, and to avoid interfering with the Water Commission process, this measure does not have an expenditure category for new water storage.

The remainder of the 2014 water bond went to a wide variety of categories of expenditure. The various state agencies charged with awarding these funds have followed the mandate of the

voters to award these funds as quickly as possible. The California Natural Resources Agency keeps track of these expenditures, and states that more than 75% of the funds have been obligated, spent or encumbered. Most of the remainder will be spent by the time this measure goes into effect. You can examine the expenditures of the 2014 water bond at:

<http://bondaccountability.resources.ca.gov/PDF/Prop1/P1AllocBalRpt.pdf?v=1>

Why didn't this go through the legislature?

Proponents of the water bond asked the Legislature to include at least \$3 billion of items in this measure in Senate Bill 5 (DeLeon), the legislative water and park bond. But the legislature decided not to accept this increase in the bond package. For this reason, the supporters of this measure decided to proceed with the initiative.

Senate Bill 5 will appear on the June, 2018 ballot. Although it includes some water elements, it is not a comprehensive water bond. The water bond initiative includes a wide variety of programs which are not covered by Senate Bill 5. There is little overlap between the two measures. The water bond initiative will appear on the November, 2018 ballot.

Who supports the water bond?

The bond will be endorsed by a wide variety of conservation, agricultural, water, environmental justice and civic organizations.

Why should so much money be devoted to meeting the water needs of the Central Valley watershed?

Most of the water California uses originates in the mountain watersheds surrounding the Central Valley, and in the aquifers underneath the valley. While the bond act responds to the flood control, water supply and environmental needs of the coastal and other inland regions of California, it is impossible to deal with the major water problems of California without concentrating on water supply issues in the Central Valley.

Why is money for Oroville Dam repair included? When Oroville Dam was built, the federal government paid for the flood control aspects of the dam. Since the public agencies that receive water from the dam do not receive any flood control benefits, they were not required to pay for

the flood control purposes of the dam. Indeed, by dedicating a large amount of space in the dam to flood control, the water, recreation and power supply purposes of the dam were diminished. The federal government is providing some funds to repair the damage to the dam caused by the 2017 storms, but will not provide enough money to repair the flood control aspects of the dam. It is reasonable for the state to pay for at least part of the flood control repairs.

This is not the only case where general fund money has been used to pay for aspects of the State Water Project that are not the responsibility of the State Water Project contractors. The Davis-Dolwig Act provides state general funds for recreation facilities at the State Water Project. Proposition 84 provided \$54 million for this purpose in 2006.

Does this measure fund the Delta tunnels (California Water Fix)? No. The water bond contains language which prohibits any of the bond funds from being used to pay for the tunnels, and requires that the tunnels be paid for by the water users.

Does this measure benefit Disadvantaged Communities and Economically Distressed areas?

Yes. Nearly half of the funds are either entirely dedicated to these communities, or include provisions which waive matching fund requirements for disadvantaged communities, or grant them high priority in funding. An analysis of the bond act from the perspective of these communities and a table of benefits to disadvantaged communities are both found on this website.

Does the bond act provide seismic safety benefits so that an earthquake will not disrupt water supplies? Yes. The \$200,000,000 provided to upgrade flood control facilities at Oroville Dam will also improve the seismic resistance qualities of the dam. An additional \$100,000,000 is provided to improve flood control reservoirs, mainly in Southern California, to make them more earthquake safe.

Why is so much money provided to the Friant Water Authority? Shouldn't local farmers and irrigators take care of these needs? What about the federal government fixing this federal facility? During the drought, overpumping of groundwater along the Friant-Kern Canal caused the canal to subside, reducing water supplies to up to 15,000 farms covering more than one million acres of some of the most productive farmland in the world. Almost all of these farms are family farms of 1,000 acres or less. . Some of the overpumping was done by farmers

who are not supplied by the Friant-Kern Canal. Capacity in the Madera Canal has also been reduced. Many of the communities along the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals are disadvantaged (see this [map](#) of disadvantaged communities: look at the area between Madera and Bakersfield). Many farmworker would be unemployed if water deliveries from the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals were permanently curtailed. Much of California's fresh fruit, vegetables and milk are grown with water from the Friant Kern Canal.

Given the huge demands on the federal government for recovery from Hurricanes Harvey and Irma, plus the Trump Administration's budget cuts for the Department of Interior, it is very unlikely that they would provide the funds to repair the Friant-Kern Canal.

Any funds that remain from the Friant allocation could go to water conservation and groundwater management in the Friant-Kern service area, to help prevent the subsidence problem from recurring, and to improve the ability to move water within and to the canals.

For decades California has invested in urban water supply improvement projects such as wastewater recycling, flood control, water conservation and desalting. Given our dependence on California agriculture for our food supply, it is reasonable to make investments in our agricultural water supply as well.

What is the impact on other sources of funds for water development?

Funds from other sources such as Proposition 1 (2014 water bond) are diminishing, and the federal government is investing less in water purposes. Providing the funds from this bond act, will reduce pressure on these other sources.

Do bonds create incentives for good behavior by grantees?

Yes. By providing matching funds for such projects as wastewater recycling, water conservation, and groundwater and other types of inland desalination, the bond act will steer local agencies in the direction of investment of these types of projects. The bond will make these projects more affordable for local agencies.



[HOME](#) [CONTACT US](#)

Contributions to the water bond can be made out to "Californians for Safe Drinking Water and a Clean and Reliable Water Supply", and can be mailed to River City Business Services, 5429 Madison Avenue, Sacramento California 95841. Thank you for your support!

Rural County Benefits

November 2018 Water Supply and Water Quality Bond Act

Fire prevention and recovery

The bond act provides more funds for fire prevention and recovery than any other previous state measure. All the following provisions fund fire-related activities. \$100 million for fire recovery and mitigation was included in the bond at the recommendation of RCRC. As appropriate, funds may be spent on fire recovery and fuel reduction on federal lands.

All funds allocated to watershed management agencies can be spent on fire prevention and recovery:

86080. The sum of two billion three hundred fifty-five million dollars (\$2,355,000,000) is appropriated from the Fund to protect, restore and improve the health of watershed lands, including forest lands (including oaks, redwoods and sequoias), meadows, wetlands, chaparral, riparian habitat and other watershed lands, including lands owned by the United States, in order to protect and improve water supply and water quality, improve forest health, **reduce fire danger consistent with the best available science, mitigate the effects of wildfires on water quality and supply**, increase flood protection, remediate aquifers, or to protect or restore riparian or aquatic resources. No grants made pursuant to this section shall be for reservoir maintenance or sediment removal from a reservoir or upstream of a reservoir, except as necessary for field research required pursuant to subdivision (a).

(a) Two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000) to the Sierra Nevada Conservancy for the protection, restoration and improvement of Sierra Nevada watersheds, pursuant to Division 23.3 (commencing with Section 33300) of the Public Resources Code and including the purposes outlined in Section 33320 of the Public Resources Code. Funds shall also be spent for the implementation and to further the goals and purposes of the Sierra Nevada Watershed Improvement Program. Projects eligible for funding under the Sierra Nevada Watershed Improvement Program may include research and monitoring to measure the impact of forest restoration work on water supply, climate and other benefits, including long-term air quality, water quality and quantity, greenhouse gas emissions, carbon storage, habitat, recreational uses, and community vitality. Projects funded under the Sierra Nevada watershed Improvement Program shall be based on the best available science regarding forest restoration and must be undertaken to improve water supply and quality, protect and restore ecological values and to **promote forest conditions that are more resilient to wildfire**, climate change, and other disturbances. **The Sierra Nevada Conservancy may make grants to federal agencies if it determines such grants are the most efficient way to implement the intent of this division on federally managed lands.**

(x) (1) The sum of fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000) is appropriated from the Fund to the Sierra Nevada Conservancy for the purpose of awarding grants within the jurisdiction of the Conservancy to eligible entities as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 86166 for the purpose of reducing the threat of wildfires which would negatively impact watershed health. Projects may be for the purpose of hazardous fuel reduction, postfire watershed rehabilitation, forest management practices that

promote forest resilience to severe wildfire, climate change, and other disturbances, and development of local plans to reduce the risk of wildfires that could adversely affect watershed health. Preference shall be given to grants which include matching funds, but this preference may be reduced or eliminated for grants which benefit disadvantaged communities or economically distressed areas.

(2) The sum of fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000) is appropriated from the Fund to the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection for the purpose of awarding grants in areas outside the jurisdiction of the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to eligible entities as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 86166 for the purpose of reducing the threat of wildfires which would negatively impact watershed health. Projects may be for the purpose of hazardous fuel reduction, postfire watershed rehabilitation and restoration, forest management practices that promote forest resilience to severe wildfire, climate change, and other disturbances, and development of local plans to reduce the risk of wildfires that could adversely affect watershed health. Preference shall be given to grants which include matching funds, but this preference may be reduced or eliminated for grants which benefit disadvantaged communities or economically distressed areas.

86084. (b) (1) Funds appropriated pursuant to this chapter may be used for protection and restoration of forests, meadows, wetlands, riparian habitat, coastal resources, and near-shore ocean habitat; to acquire land and easements to protect these resources and avoid development that may reduce watershed health, and to take other measures that protect or improve the quality or quantity of water supplies downstream from projects funded in whole or in part by this chapter. **Forest restoration projects, including but not limited to hazardous fuel reduction, post-fire watershed rehabilitation,** and forest management and tree planting using appropriate native plants shall be based on the best available science regarding forest restoration and must be undertaken to protect and restore ecological values and to promote forest conditions that are more resilient to wildfire, climate change, and other disturbances.

(2) Fuel hazard reduction activities on United States Forest Service lands in the Sierra Nevada and similar forest types shall be generally consistent with objectives of the Sierra Nevada Watershed Improvement Program and the best available science, including United States Forest Service General Technical Report 220 as it may be updated.

Central Valley Fish Advisory Committee recommends expenditure of \$400 million for fisheries restoration projects. Section 86106(f)(1)(C) states:

(C) In proposing projects, the committee shall take into account the entire life cycle of the fish species to be benefitted, and shall consider the interaction of the effects of each project within a river basin with projects in other river basins. **The committee shall also consider adverse impacts resulting from poor watershed health, including severe wildfire and extensive tree mortality.**

86178. Agencies implementing this division shall give special consideration to projects that employ new or innovative technology or practices, including decision support tools that support the integration of multiple strategies and jurisdictions, including, but not limited to, water supply, **wildfire reduction,** habitat improvement, invasive weed control, flood control, land use, and sanitation.

Safe Drinking Water and Wastewater Treatment \$750 million

Many rural communities lack funds to develop safe drinking water and safe methods of disposing of wastewater. The water bond includes \$500 million for safe drinking water systems and \$250 million for wastewater disposal systems.

Economically distressed areas

At the request of RCRC, many programs in the bond act give high priority to grants to benefit economically distressed areas (EDAs), as well as disadvantaged communities. Matching fund requirements are waived for economically distressed areas

86010. (a) For the purposes of awarding funding pursuant to this chapter, a local cost share of not less than 50 percent (50%) of the total costs of the project shall be required. The cost-sharing requirement may be waived or reduced for projects that directly benefit a disadvantaged community or an economically distressed area.

86083 . In making grants pursuant to this chapter, agencies shall give high priority to applications that include cost sharing, and to grants that benefit disadvantaged communities and economically distressed areas whether or not they include cost sharing.

86151(c) Any agency providing funds pursuant to this division to disadvantaged communities or economically distressed areas may provide funding to assist these communities in applying for that funding, including technical and grant writing assistance. These funds may be provided to nonprofit organizations and local public agencies assisting these communities.

Technology assistance is provided free for wastewater recycling and desalination projects in EDAs.

Economically distressed areas get high priority in the following grant programs:

Desalination
Water Conservation
Central Valley Flood Protection
Groundwater management and SGMA implementation

86163(b) In the appropriation and expenditure of funding authorized by this division, priority will be given to projects that leverage private, federal, or local funding or produce the greatest public benefit. All state agencies receiving funds pursuant to this division shall seek to leverage the funds to the greatest extent possible, but agencies shall take into account the limited ability to cost share by small public agencies, and by agencies seeking to benefit disadvantaged communities and economically distressed areas.

Reduced cost sharing by small communities

86155. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, a local public agency with a population

of less than 100,000 and a median household income of less than one hundred percent (100%) of the state average household income shall be required to provide matching funds of no more than thirty-five percent (35%) for a grant for a project entirely within their jurisdiction. State agencies making grants to these local public agencies may provide funding in advance of construction of portions of the project, if the state agency determines that requiring the local public agency to wait for payment until the project is completed would make the project infeasible.

(b) Nothing in this section prohibits a state agency from making a grant to a disadvantaged community or economically distressed area that does not require cost sharing.

Property tax payments preference

86179.4. In awarding grants for land acquisition, the Wildlife Conservation Board shall give preference to organizations that voluntarily pay property taxes.

Central Valley Flood Plan Implementation \$150 million

Lake Tahoe Stormwater Management \$40 million

Integrated Regional Water Management Coordination \$5 million

Grants to Resource Conservation Districts and agricultural land protection \$60 million

Resource Conservation Districts are eligible to compete for all other funds in the bond act.

Salton Sea recovery and dust prevention \$200 million

Weed reduction and other land treatment for water conservation: \$100 million

Groundwater: Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Implementation: \$640 million

Repair of Oroville Dam \$200 million

Removal of sediment below Oroville Dam: \$21 million

Butte County emergency communications equipment \$1 million

Why is funding for repair of Oroville Dam included in the Water Supply and Water Quality Initiative?

The Corps of Engineers paid for the flood control elements of Oroville Dam in the 1960's. Including flood control at Oroville was detrimental to the State Water Project (SWP). From the point of view of the SWP, keeping Oroville full (no flood reservation) would improve water supply, energy production, recreation and fish and wildlife preservation (improved cold water pool). Including flood control was something Pat Brown insisted on, after his experience with the Feather River flood of 1955.

The State Water Project contractors were never responsible for flood control, since they are actually harmed by its inclusion in the Oroville project. There is no logical reason they should have to pay for flood control at Oroville.

The state's failure to properly design and maintain the flood control features (spillway and auxiliary spillway) should not impose costs on the State Water Project contractors. The Federal Emergency Management Agency will pay for part of these costs, but the rest will be state costs. The final cost of flood control repairs will be around one billion dollars. The State Contractors will be forced to bear part of these costs, but it is certainly reasonable for the state general fund to share some of these costs. In many previous bond acts, the state general fund has always been the source of state flood control money.