

The NCSD board Can be STOPPED from cancelling your vote

Measure A — YES! Measure A — YES! Measure A — YES!

Read your ballot carefully. This is a Referendum against the action of four members of the NCSD board who don't understand how Democracy works. **In June of 1991, they gave their word and unanimously approved an ordinance which guaranteed a Binding election.**

But when our vote was different than they expected, they hurriedly put together a dishonest ordinance (91-64) which would cancel our November vote.

YES! Should their fraudulent ordinance (91-64) be repealed by Referendum Measure A? YES!
A YES vote will repeal their wrongful ordinance. It's that simple.

This May 19th election is the Referendum election.
It is not a re-vote on state water. It can't be!

Question: Where on the ballot does it say anything about state water? **Nowhere!** If the NCSD board were honest, and wanted a re-vote on state water, they should call for a re-vote after 12 months. A re-vote on state water now would be illegal, since it was just on the ballot in November.

Question: Where did Measure A come from? By January, the massive support for the Measure A Referendum was obvious. The signatures were turned in and verified. The Referendum gave the NCSD two choices: #1— Repeal the offending ordinance (91-64) which would allow them to cancel the November vote; or #2— Call an election so we can repeal it for them. They chose the election.

Question: Why is this ballot Measure so confusing?

Normally Mitch Cooney, the San Luis Obispo County Clerk, runs all the elections in the County. But he could not run a Nipomo election in May AND also a County election in June. The NCSD could have waited, but they didn't want to. State law allows them to run a special election, even if it's against themselves. **Since they were running the election, they got to write the wording for the ballot, which they did in a totally confusing and uninformative way—On Purpose.**

Kathleen Fairbanks stated at a water board meeting: "If you make a measure confusing, people will vote no". She, and three of her fellow board members are working hard to cancel your vote, and make it very difficult to get it back. They changed the election schedule after it was legally noticed, and changed the deadline for arguments when no argument was submitted against measure A. The entire election process in Nipomo needs to be returned to normal.

All this started with Ordinance 91-64. Vote YES on Measure A to repeal Ordinance 91-64 and take back control from these four non-elected board members, and their attorney.

A special note needs to be made about NCSD board member Steve Small: We support Steve Small, who has moral integrity, and a sense of community. It must be very difficult to vote against the group. We are fortunate to have Mr. Small on the board of directors.

Question: Why are we hearing about state water again after we voted it down?

The NCSD board and their friends couldn't very well argue against the Referendum. What would they say? "You can vote if it makes you feel good, but we are going to ignore you" "Down with Democracy" "Wave the flag, but ignore the people" They can't say these things, even though they are doing them. So they had to come up with something emotional like Motherhood, or Patriotism, or maybe Air Bags. They chose State Water. They are trying to create a panic— the classic water seller's trick ("last chance", "second class citizens", dripping faucet, etc.).

The state water issue was legally decided in November. You win some and you lose some. That's life. Losing an election is one thing. Losing the vote is entirely something else.

Who are Nipomo Citizens for Democracy. Why are we doing this?

None of us knew each other before the November vote, but we were all upset by the NCSB board's dishonest attempt to cancel the fair and legal election. We decided to prepare and circulate a Referendum petition to stop them. SOMEBODY HAD TO DO IT! The fact that there are only a few of us, that we don't have a lot of money or time, and that we are not very organized is the

way it always ends up when you are trying to restrain greedy money interests. We don't get paid for this, it's not any fun, but if we don't try to stop the NCSB board, NOBODY ELSE WILL. As far as we are concerned, the 472 Nipomo residents who signed the Referendum are also Nipomo Citizens for Democracy, and so is anybody who understands what BINDING VOTE means.

Question: Why does the NCSB board want to cancel our vote?

They want state water, obviously. So do the people who are spending a lot of money telling you that you made a big mistake in November. We want to ask them this question—

November vote: What part of NO is it that you don't understand?

Question: Why is state water information so variable?

We have been inundated with the "official" opinion that state water is cheap, reliable, clean. We are asked to believe all this because the State Department of Water Resources says so. It may seem that the bureaucrats who run the departments at the state (and county) level do so with a godlike level of perfection, skill and caring. And if this were the case, then truly, whatever they told us would be pretty good information. However, manipulation of the truth and creation of panic throughout history, by the administrators and foot soldiers within the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army Corps of Engineers; and by the characters who made billion\$ out of the early southern California deserts and the San Joaquin Valley is legendary. ('Cadillac Desert' by Marc Reisner chronicles many of these stories)

The politicians and engineers who built the dams and water systems are still building. The landowners who profited are still profiting. **It isn't over.** We are being asked, cajoled, actually forced, to be a part of this grand

pyramid scheme in the classic tradition— tax payers and home owners pay off the loans and bonds, while somebody else's land values soar.

The state water hysteria in Nipomo is not about running out of water, it's about land development. When you read "Keep our options open" or "We Want State Water" you are only seeing half the thought. The other half is "So we can turn the Central Coast into Ventura County, or Oceanside, etc."

The losers of the November election have been attempting to distract Nipomo voters by calling many honest, decent, long-time residents names. The 5-8-92 Adobe Press contained an insert that was truly sick. The losers of the November election will sacrifice the sense of community which Nipomo has long felt. They are presenting a sense of panic which is totally unrealistic. Whatever their motivation, they have done a disservice to Nipomo in exchange for their selfish and short sighted interests.

State Water Issues by category—

Cost

County engineering cost estimates have been rising since the November election, and place Nipomo at around \$750 per acre foot for full delivery (which they admit cannot happen). On the other hand, Van Lamm, the lead county engineer on the state water project until just recently, stated at a Nipomo Chamber of Commerce Forum, on May 12, 1992, that Nipomo will pay at least \$1200 per acre foot. This estimate is based on County engineering base costs, with added costs which they do not include. Then, when you multiply \$1200 by 125% (see bonding surcharge below), you get \$1500 per acre foot. And this does not include a \$50 per acre

foot County administrative fee, increases in operating and maintenance costs, or Nipomo's share of future state water system construction costs. The main point remains that compared to present water delivery costs, and compared to desalted sea water, state water contracts will demand an unflinching yearly transfer of many millions of dollars to Sacramento for a supplemental water supply we have no control over the delivery of, and as we have seen, will be cut back during droughts. What a deal! We have watched a number of communities all around the central coast just say no to state water. It simply costs too much.

Other Costs

Nipomo's allocation of 3500 acre feet represents 21,000 new people inside the district boundaries. These people are going to expect you to help pay for their new schools, expanded sewer system, road widening and other county services, etc. And they are going to bring with them a Los Angeles ambience in the form of stop and go traffic, increased air pollution, noise, crime, increased taxes and bonds etc. That's a cost.

David Manriquez, the NCSB board president, claims that all this crowding is inevitable, and wants to personally roll out the red carpet. He suggests that we should gracefully lay down and bring on the steamrollers.

Bonding Surcharge Cost—Here is the wording from the "Transfer of Financial Responsibility Agreement" now in effect in Santa Barbara County: "Each public agency CCWA Member or Associate Member which sells water to customers must impose rates sufficient to yield revenues (after payment of operation and maintenance expenses) equal to at least 125% of the amounts due for the year under the Water Supply Agreement, including the District's administrative costs, by that contractor. That obligation is absolute, and is not excused if, for example, a contractor [e.g., NCSB] experiences a loss in revenue due to conservation; ...

So Nipomo residents won't be paying their actual state water costs, they'll have to pay 125% of those costs.
