

**CALIFORNIA CLEAN WATER ACTION**  
**VOTE ENVIRONMENT**  
**STATE ASSEMBLY CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Candidate Richard Holober District 19<sup>th</sup> Assembly District

Address 1818 Gilbreth Road, Suite 236 Party Democrat  
\_\_\_\_\_

City/State/Zip Burlingame, CA 94010 Phone 650-692-5544

Contact Person: Dominic Chan, Campaign Manager Fax 650-692-5548

E-mail info@holober.com

**Part I. Please answer each question below in 100 words or less.**

1. What do you consider your greatest environmental achievement?

As a San Mateo County Community College District Trustee, I've made sure our three colleges are Peninsula green building pioneers, including building all new facilities to LEED certification standards. Our co-generation plants remove 6,000,000 pounds of carbon dioxide emissions annually, decreasing energy consumption by 56%. Our low cost faculty and staff housing at College of San Mateo rents at about 50% of market rate, and takes 165,000 commuter miles off the road each year. We're planning another rental housing project at Cañada College.

Environment California named our district as a statewide role model for environmental design in its "Greening the Bottom Line" report. As Board President, I accepted the 2008 Sustainable San Mateo County award for our college district's leadership in environmental stewardship.

2. Name two environmental priorities you would actively address once elected

- Making Toxic Polluters pay for clean up costs. As legislative advocate for the California Nurses Association I campaigned for the No on Proposition 37 side in 2000, to protect the state's ability to levy mitigation and clean up fees on toxic polluters. We must strengthen laws to hold polluters accountable for cleaning up our water, air and land.
- Protecting our coastal areas and bay front areas from overdevelopment, stopping privatization of public access coastal lands, eliminating pollution of bay and ocean by sewage spills, toxic water runoff, plastic and other ocean litter, and oil spills by banning use of bunker fuel in or around ports and by requiring double hulling of freighters.

*CALIFORNIA CLEAN WATER ACTION  
VOTE ENVIRONMENT  
STATE ASSEMBLY CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE*

3. What are your funding priorities for a new state water bond?

My priorities for a water bond include projects that improve water conservation and efficiency, water recycling and reclamation, treatment, cleanup and prevention of groundwater contamination, improving water storage and transportation through use of underground aquifers for storage and clean up of contaminated aquifers, and other projects to protect the safety of our water supply.

4. Under what circumstances would you consider opposing a state water bond?

I would be strongly disposed to oppose a bond that focused on the creation of new dams and new conveyance systems, such as a peripheral canal, and that did not place a funding priority on water conservation and clean up on groundwater contamination.

5. What actions to address or adapt to climate change will you prioritize once in office?

I support strict enforcement of AB 32 greenhouse gas emission standards to reduce reliance on petroleum based fuels. As Executive Director of the Consumer Federation of California, I actively supported AB 493 (Ruskin) which would have created financial incentives for purchases of vehicles zero emission vehicles paid for by surcharges on cars that emit high levels of carbon emissions. I was a principal supporter of Proposition 87, an oil severance fee proposal, which would have funded alternative energy research and development. California should be a world leader in the growing green technology economy. We should promote the development of improved battery technology for vehicles and plug in hybrids, and more use of dispersed wind energy generation using technologies that are not harmful to wildlife.

**Part II.** The following are some issues to which the legislature should be sensitive. What will be your position on each? Please check the appropriate answer; if you wish, you may provide an explanation of your position (no more than 100 words).

The Department of Toxic Substance Control has been tasked by the Governor to develop a "Green Chemistry" initiative on which to base a new green economy. One suggestion in this process has been that the state ban "bad actor" chemicals that are already known to cause serious harm to human health or the environment, such as, but not limited to, those on the Prop 65 list. Do you agree with this proposal?

Support     Oppose

*CALIFORNIA CLEAN WATER ACTION  
VOTE ENVIRONMENT  
STATE ASSEMBLY CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE*

I support the green chemistry initiative. While it is being developed, it should not be used by then Schwarzenegger administration as a rationale for opposing urgently needed laws that protect us from dangerous toxins. For example, I actively lobbied for AB 706 (Leno) which would ban toxic brominated and chlorinated fire retardant chemicals from furniture and bedding. We must take action now on this legislation.

2. Assembly member Kerkorian has introduced AB 2153, the Water Efficiency and Security Act of 2008, a bill that would require new developments to fully offset their additional water use through on-site efficiencies and contributions to water efficiency measures in the region. Do you support or oppose this bill?

Support     Oppose

I also support the provision of AB 2153 that requires a portion of developer mitigation to benefit disadvantaged communities, to assist consumers with limited financial resources available to support water conservation project costs.

3. According to the Department of Public Health, more than 900 drinking water wells contain nitrates in concentrations exceeding safety standards. A major source of nitrate contamination is the commercial application of fertilizer on crops. Would you support an increase in the mill fee on commercial fertilizers, with part of the funding used to address groundwater contamination by nitrates?

Support     Oppose

4. More than 500 California water bodies are listed as impaired under the Clean Water Act. One of the major contaminants is mercury, which is both a legacy pollutant (used in large quantities for gold mining) and an ongoing discharge from abandoned mines, storm water drains, wastewater facilities, and industrial sources. In 2005 the State Water Quality Control Board instructed the Bay Area and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Boards to include a requirement in their mercury cleanup plans (or TMDLs) for San Francisco Bay and the Delta to investigate and implement strategies “to address public health impacts of mercury in San Francisco Bay/Delta fish, including activities that reduce actual and potential exposure of and mitigate health impacts to those people and communities most likely to be affected by mercury in San Francisco Bay-Delta caught fish, such as subsistence fishers and their families.” (Resolution 2005-0600) Would you support legislation to make exposure reduction strategies a mandatory part of the clean up plans developed for mercury and other bioaccumulative toxins throughout the state as a means of protecting low income communities and communities of color?

Support     Oppose

*CALIFORNIA CLEAN WATER ACTION  
VOTE ENVIRONMENT  
STATE ASSEMBLY CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE*

I applaud Clean Water Action for your victory in getting the State Water Resources Control Board to adopt tough new standards for preventing and cleaning up mercury contamination of San Francisco Bay.

5. In 2007, SB 966 (Simitian) was signed into law, directing the Integrated Waste Management Board to establish guidelines for voluntary take back programs at pharmacies and other accessible sites for residents to safely dispose of non-controlled medications as a means of preventing them from being released into our water systems. Would you support mandatory programs for big chain pharmacies and/or manufacturers selling medications in California in future?

Support     Oppose

6. Would you support legislation requiring state funding programs to set aside a minimum amount of funding to address the needs of disadvantaged communities?

Support     Oppose

As a lifelong advocate for economic justice, I am very concerned about the disparate and harmful impacts that environmental degradation, pollution and toxic exposure have on low income populations and minority communities. I supported SB 115 (Solis) and legislation by Senator Martha Escutia to establish a process for implementing our state's environmental justice mission. I support laws such as AB 1390 (Firebaugh) which requires that 50% of funding for programs to reduce vehicle emissions benefit those communities with the highest exposure to air contaminants, including low income and minority communities.