

died in the Senate.

"The flood victims are still victims," said Rich Golb, executive director of the Northern California Water Association, which represents agricultural interests.

"We had the worst flood in the state's history a year ago, and these bonds were intended to keep that from happening again," he said. "The failure of the bonds guarantees that we'll have another flood, more lives will be lost and we'll have more property damage."

To Jeffrey F. Mount, chairman of the geology department at the University of California, Davis, and an expert on flood management, it's more proof of how quickly people forget a river's reach.

"Had we had a spectacular flood this winter," he said, "I suspect the outcome (on the bond) would be different."

Besides killing any hope of a bigger investment in flood prevention, the death of the water bond could delay an Imperial Valley-San Diego County deal that would be the largest farm-to-city transfer of water in California's history.

It also eliminates money for CalFed, a federal-state team trying to solve water supply and environmental problems in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Some blame the bond's defeat on Gov. Pete Wilson. In January, he insisted on a bond that included funding for water recycling, conservation, pollution control and groundwater storage - provisions that were inserted into the proposed flood-control bond.

The governor's demand that the bond also contain money for planning new reservoirs - and Democratic lawmakers' refusal to allow that - finally led to the bill's defeat.

"It got hijacked," said Ron Stork of Friends of the River. "The governor was demanding a more comprehensive water bond. That was his demand, and he took an area where we had consensus, and he imposed a subject where we didn't have consensus."

Wilson spokesman Sean Walsh called claims that Wilson ruined the flood-control bond "outrageous." In a press release, Wilson blamed "no-growth advocates" for persuading Senate President Pro Tem John Burton, D-San Francisco, to reject putting reservoir money in the bond.

The deadlock over including money for reservoir planning infuriated the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency's executive director, Butch Hodgkins. With the bill's death, Hodgkins saw the loss of \$34 million that might have been used to make Folsom Dam better-equipped to handle floods. In all, the water bond included about \$200 million for flood control.

"There was a ton of stuff for both environmentalists and farmers in this bond issue," Hodgkins said. "And they brought it crashing down over a symbol."

This week's frantic negotiations promise to be just a dress rehearsal. The fight over reservoirs now moves to CalFed, whose leaders must decide by December how and when they will pursue new water storage projects.

"The burden we have now," said CalFed Executive Director Lester Snow, "is doing a better job of showing how storage - surface water and groundwater - can be used in a balanced package with conservation, reclamation and transfers."

From CalFed's perspective, he said, there's no doubt that holding back more flood flows, perhaps by pumping them to off-stream reser-

voirs, can help fish and wildlife through the dry times.

Without a bond, Snow said, CalFed must search for ways to fund its water conservation and quality programs, and to strengthen Delta levees. CalFed will consider taxing water users, appealing to Congress or perhaps presenting another bond, he said.

Another contentious piece of the bond was a \$235 million provision for projects to stop seepage in Imperial Valley irrigation canals and to establish underground basins along the Colorado River Aqueduct owned by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

More hung on the \$235 million than the water that might be gained by stopping canal seepage.

The money was included in the bond measure as an enticement to get MWD to allow the use of its 242-mile aqueduct to ship water from the Imperial Irrigation District to San Diego County.

MWD officials argue that the whole state ought to pay to make the Imperial-San Diego deal work because it fits into a larger goal of stretching the state's Colorado River supply, which in turn would take pressure off the ecologically sensitive Delta.

But dozens of environmental groups attacked the Colorado River provisions of the bond as an unnecessary public subsidy.

"This is massive water pork," said Tom Graff, senior attorney with the Environmental Defense Fund.

Slate Sen. Steve Peace, D-El Cajon, now is carrying a bill to provide for the Colorado River deal in the state budget. Walsh said the governor likely would support such a bill.