

**Proposition 3 is not the
way to protect our water**

**Charlotte Allen
For Sierra Club California**

Why The Sierra Club Opposes Proposition 3

- It's a “Pay-to-Play” proposition
- It's a regressive drain on the General Fund that benefits billionaires
- It has inadequate oversight
- It allows cap-and-trade funds to be spent on programs that don't reduce greenhouse gases

Prop 3 is “Pay-to-Play”

- “it's a laundry list of financial handouts without the legislative oversight one would expect” – San Jose Mercury News <https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/09/19/editorial-reject-prop-3-8-9-billion-pay-to-play-water-bond/>
- Why is Ducks Unlimited such a major donor? The single biggest chunk of Ducks Unlimited's revenue comes from Federal and State habitat support. Ducks Unlimited runs a Revolving Land Acquisition Program. Prop 3 allocates \$280 million to acquire and restore waterfowl habitat.

The Big Payers Get the Big Payouts

- Billionaire Stewart Resnick has donated \$100,000 to Prop 3 and in return expects to get hundreds of millions in infrastructure repairs and upgrades for his Kern water bank.
<https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/09/19/editorial-reject-prop-3-8-9-billion-pay-to-play-water-bond/>
- House speaker Rendon's office says “the top 10 donors identified on the FPPC website are the ones whose interests are fulfilled by the initiative's allocations. I would note in particular those donors who are interested in the \$750 million to fix the Federal Bureau of Reclamation's Friant-Kern Canal”

Resnick's Kern Water Bank Hopes to Expand at Taxpayer Expense

- Estimates put the cost of repairing the Friant-Kern canal at about \$350 million. So why does Prop 3 have \$750 million allocated for canal repair?
- The extra \$400 million can be used for “water conveyance capital improvements.... Resulting in greater groundwater recharge”
- The Kern Water Bank issued an EIR in January 2018 detailing plans to put an extra 500k acre feet annually from the Kern River into the Water Bank. This is enough water for 1 million households. Some canal improvements and extensions would certainly come in handy to move this much water around.

<http://www.kwb.org/store/files/108.pdf>

Under Prop 3, Taxpayers Would Bail Out Big Ag and Big Water

- The \$350 million in damage to the Friant-Kern canal was caused by big ag over-pumping groundwater. The \$200 million in damage to the Oroville Dam was caused by shoddy engineering and lax oversight. Repairs should be paid for by the big ag interests and big water agencies who own and have benefited from these projects, not by taxpayers who have received no water from either of these sources.
- Prop 3 would cost California's General Fund \$430 million a year for the next 40 years. This is more than half the amount California spent on fighting fires in 2017. Prop 3 will take money out of the General Fund that is critically needed for other purposes.
- We just passed a \$4 billion dollar water bond in June and haven't even begun to spend the money. Do we need to put another almost \$9 billion on the state credit card?

Who Would Keep an Eye on The Prop 3 Spending?

- Prop 3 spending would not have to go through Legislative oversight, so the public can't oversee how funds are spent or if the programs are effective.

The California League of Women Voters recommends a NO vote on Prop 3 because it “Fails to provide for adequate project oversight and financial accountability.”

<https://lwvc.org/vote/elections/ballot-recommendations/no-prop-3-water-bond>

Prop 3 Raids The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund

Proceeds from California's cap-and-trade system for greenhouse gases are supposed to go towards projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. But Prop 3 redirects some of these funds back to water agencies for water conservation measures that could be funded in other ways.

Will Prop 3 Really Help Disadvantaged Communities?

- The \$8 billion dollars in interest on the Prop 3 bond that will come out of the taxpayers' pockets and reduce the amount California can spend on health, education, housing, and transportation is more than ten times the \$750 million dollars the bond allocates to safe drinking water for disadvantaged communities.
- When the Monterey Amendment handed over control of the Kern Water Bank to Resnick, it was supposed to “Improve water quality for disadvantaged communities and the watershed throughout the planning horizon.” Instead, the depletion of groundwater by big ag has caused these same disadvantaged communities to run completely out of water. These waterless communities are once again being used as an excuse for a huge subsidy for Resnick, the principle presumably being that if we give him control of more of California's water, he will allow some of it to trickle down into the faucets of the disadvantaged.