

SEP 20 1999

0966

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ



SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

work R. Montgomery
↳ MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES
APPLIED SCIENCES BUILDING

9/14/1999

re: the CALFED Delta Water project

To whom it concerns:

My name is Richard Montgomery. I am a mathematics professor at the University of California, Santa Cruz. But 23 years ago I made my living by teaching whitewater kayaking on the Stanislaus River. That stretch of river is now under New Melones dam. I saw first-hand how a large dam can destroy a local economy, a river, and a whole environment. Back then, a proposition made it onto the state initiatives ballot, Proposition 17. (The year was 1976 I believe.) The proponents of the dam - mostly agribusiness and construction - ran a deceptive television advertising campaign featuring dead fish floating in stagnant water above the large words 'No on 17'. The implication was that a 'no' would help the river, when in fact a 'no' vote mean go ahead and build the dam. A poll after the vote showed that over half of those who voted 'no' thought they were voting **against** the dam.

I fear that a similar campaign, may be going on here. Nowhere in the placards in the back of the room, or in your video is there explicit mention of dams or diversions. However, within the proposal are buried such proposals. These come as enlarged dams, or so-called "off-stream" dams and diversion projects*including a rebirth of the peripheral canal CALFED, according to its documents, has earmarked over 370 million dollars for possible dam enlargement ("storage") and 913 million for diversions ("conveyance"), which translates to over a billion dollars earmarked for further riparian degradation. (See p. 21 of CALFED's Program Summary, Estimated CALFED Stage 1 costs.)

* Millerton
enlargement
project
Shasta Dam
Raise,
Thomes -
Newville Off-
stream project

The issue is completely clear : obstructing and diverting flows, building and enlarging dams decimates riparian environments. CALFED should exclude all dams, including offstream dams and dam enlargement projects, and all new diversion plans (such a 'test' peripheral canal) from Phase 1 of their proposal. Instead they should concentrate on conservation measures, recycling and wetlands restoration.

A final point: I strongly resent the state and federal subsidies which currently go the way of large water users. The considered dams and diversion projects are simply expanded corporate subsidies. Please do not go down that road.

Sincerely,

Richard Montgomery

223 Dickens Way
Santa Cruz, CA 95064

email:

1

rmont@math.ucsc.edu

cc: Gov Gray Davis