

Board of Directors

Linda Adams
Mike Chrisman
Rick Frank (Treasurer)
A.G. Kawamura
Thomas McKernan
Sunne Wright McPeak
(President)
William Reilly
Raymond Seed (Secretary)

The Delta Vision Foundation is the successor to the Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force, the independent body established under Governor's Executive Order S-17-06. Our goal is to maintain the visibility and viability of final recommendations of the Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force, and encourage the public policy process to utilize those recommendations. The Foundation issues reports and participates in policy processes, but takes no formal position on legislation. The Foundation provides information to help policy makers act to restore the Delta and provide a more reliable water supply for California.

Delta Vision Foundation
(415) 419-5133
www.deltavisionfoundation.org



October 26, 2011

Delta Stewardship Council
980 Ninth Street, Suite 1500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Delta Plan, Chapter 9 Finance Plan Framework to Support Coequal Goals

Dear Chairman Isenberg and Members of the Council:

For too long, the State has lacked a clear plan and strategy for funding and financing the critical improvements to fix the Delta and achieve the Two Co-Equal Goals as now described in the *Delta Vision Strategic Plan* and the 2009 water legislation. The Delta Vision Foundation applauds the Council's initial efforts to frame the funding and financing needs for Delta solutions.

The Delta Vision Foundation directors and staff reviewed the *Fifth Staff Draft Chapter 9 of the Delta Plan* and convened a roundtable discussion among a broad cross-section of stakeholders on October 12th to review and discuss funding and finance issues. The enclosed DVF comments highlight the need to accelerate discussion of funding and finance such that it can inform planning and decision making already underway. The finance plan framework requires for more specific discussion of the funding needs, clarification of the available funding and financing mechanisms, and explicit definition of the critical linkages to achieve the Two Co-Equal Goals.

We recognize that DSC staff will be releasing the *Sixth Staff Draft Delta Plan* shortly and wanted to get these comments to you as early as possible. We are prepared to review the *Sixth Staff Draft of Chapter 9* and update the enclosed comments as appropriate. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 419-5133 or charles@deltavisionfoundation.org if you have any questions about the enclosed comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Charles L. Gardiner".

Charles L. Gardiner
Executive Director

Cc: California Water Commission

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

DELTA STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL, DRAFT DELTA PLAN CHAPTER 9 Finance Plan Framework to Support Co-Equal Goals

PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW

This document provides comments on the *Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan Chapter 9 Finance Plan Framework to Support Coequal Goals* prepared by the professional staff team for the Delta Stewardship Council (DSC). It is intended by the Delta Vision Foundation that these comments be available to the DSC, other policy bodies, and stakeholders to incorporate into all relevant policies and plans.

California cannot afford to fail to invest immediately, sufficiently, and fairly in implementing the *Delta Vision Strategic Plan*. The *2011 Delta Vision Report Card* addressed this issue as one of the major recommendations as follows:

Report Card Recommendation: Refine Funding and Financing Plan
Additional work is needed to refine a fair and prudent funding and financing plan for implementing all components of the *Delta Vision Strategic Plan*. The Administration and Legislature need to consult one another and stakeholders to delineate an appropriate process to accomplish this task. There needs to be greater clarity as to the meaning and practical interpretation of the concept of “beneficiaries” pay. This concept needs to be coupled with a commitment to the principle of collecting revenues statewide only to the extent that statewide interests are served. In addition to General Obligation Bonds, which are appropriate to fund and finance, public-interest improvements, the use of Revenue Bonds backed by user fees should be optimized in a refined plan to assist with facilities that benefit primarily beneficiaries or specific water users. Further, the Administration should prioritize the sequence of projects to fund and finance with General Obligation bonds when submitting capital budgets to the Legislature to ensure that the highest needs are addressed first in time.

COST OF WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IN PERSPECTIVE

The Legislative Analyst’s Office has estimated that California’s unmet investment need in water-related infrastructure and ecosystem management is on the order of \$100 billion over the next 20 years.¹ These investments include funding from Federal, State, regional, and local government sources. While \$100 billion appears to be a daunting number when considering the State’s recent economic challenges, State leadership and stakeholders must consider the following to put funding needs in proper perspective:

¹ Funding Public-Purpose Water-Related Activities, Legislative Analyst’s Office, April 28, 2011

- California’s investment need is relatively modest compared to the size of the economy. California is the 8th largest economy in the world with an annual Gross Domestic Product of \$1.9 trillion.²
- Investments for Ecosystem Restoration and Water Supply Reliability are also relatively small compared to current annual expenditures. Approximately \$20 to \$30 billion is spent annually for water services and water-related program.³
- Water rates are lower than other household utility costs. Average monthly household water and wastewater rates are less than average costs for other utilities such as electricity, cable/satellite, cell phone (see Attachment 1).

California’s investment need is substantial, but well within the capacity of California businesses and residents to support a vibrant economy and high quality of life. However, gaining the commitment of elected officials and voters for this level of funding will require clear descriptions of the needs, programs, projects, benefits, and real costs in simple, relevant terms for the state as a whole and for individuals.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT DELTA PLAN CHAPTER 9 (FINANCE PLAN)

The following represent preliminary comments and recommendations to the Delta Stewardship Council and others regarding the approach for developing a workable funding and financing plan. While funding and finance issues are complex and controversial, they must be defined and discussed in real terms at the same time as the Delta Plan and other planning activities are underway to ensure that realistic plans and programs are approved and funded.

Establish and Maintain Linkages

The *Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan* overall and *Chapter 9 Finance Plan to Support Coequal Goals* fail to link strategies and actions for a workable solution. Below is the *2011 Delta Vision Report Card* recommendation that addresses this issue and provides the most important input to the Delta Stewardship Council for the substance of the *Delta Plan*.

Report Card Recommendation: Link Strategies and Actions for a Workable Solution

The Administration must understand the rationale and importance of linked actions as set forth in the Delta Vision Strategic Plan and direct responsible agencies to maintain those linkages. It is only through integrated implementation that the State can implement workable solutions to California’s water resource management problems and achieve the Two Co-Equal Goals. Specifically, the following linked actions are fundamental: (a) existing and new facilities must be required to operate consistent with Delta ecosystem restoration; (b) optimization of conservation and efficient water use must be required of any user, exporter or diverter of water from the Delta watershed; and (c) new “water banking” surface and groundwater storage facilities must be coupled to expanded conveyance (particularly to an isolated facility). Actions can and must be legally linked through: adopting comprehensive plans (by Delta Stewardship Council, California Water Commission, State Water Resource Control Board, Delta Protection Commission, and Delta Conservancy) with

² <http://econpost.com/californiaeconomy/california-economy-ranking-among-world-economies>

³ Delta Stewardship Council, *Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan*, August 2, 2011, page 207.

integrated actions certified as the environmentally-preferred alternative; adding explicit intent language and linkage requirements to bond covenants and contracts; and enacting clarifying legislation, if needed. The Administration must accelerate planning and engineering for construction of storage to capture water truly surplus to the environment as a linked and companion component to conveyance, as explicitly recommended and underscored in the Delta Vision Strategic Plan. The current and past Administrations have been focused primarily on advancing the isolated conveyance component of the Delta Vision Strategic Plan recommendations through the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan process to the neglect of other essential parts of the solution. Further, it is important to require any entity benefiting from new facilities to apply the most responsible water resource management with performance goals and metrics.

Define Terminology

Clear, consistent, and commonly accepted terms and definitions should be used in all reports, discussions, and recommendations. For example, funding and financing are two distinct terms that are frequently used interchangeably or with overlapping meanings.

Other terms, such as beneficiary pays, have been presented and used as concepts without detail, which has allowed general conceptual agreement but avoided the specific discussions of who the beneficiaries are and the mechanisms for their payment. The following are terms that warrant more precise and expanded definitions to improve the discussion of funding and financing issues, policies, and recommendations. A complete definition would include a description, a complete listing of examples, a listing of what is not included in the definition, and a description of the mechanisms for applying it to the *Delta Plan*.

Specifically, the Finance Plan should list and describe funding and financing mechanisms and for which types of activities each is appropriate.

- **Funding**
 - Federal Appropriations (Supported by Federal Taxes and Fees)
 - State General Fund Appropriations (Supported by State Taxes and Fees)
 - User Rates (through Contracts)
 - Dedicated Fees and Surcharges
 - Dedicated Taxes and Assessments
 - Donations
- **Financing**
 - Pay-As-You-Go
 - Revenue Bonds
 - General Obligation Bonds
 - Public-Private Partnerships
 - Private Investment
- **Alternatives to State/Federal Funding to Accomplish Objectives**
 - Incentives
 - Regulations/Requirements/Conditions

The Finance Plan should also include specific definitions of the following terms to be sure that all decision makers and stakeholders share a common understanding of terminology.

- Funding
- Financing
- Beneficiaries
- Stressors
- Public Benefits
- Water Rates
- Contracts
- User Fees
- Public Goods Charge (or alternate term)
- Enterprise Funds or Special Funds

Describe Plans and Activities for Funding

The Finance Plan must define the major activities to be funded and define broad allocation of responsibilities. The plans, activities, and projects should be listed and described broadly in three categories:

- Planning – Science, Data, Information, Planning and Prioritizing, and Stakeholder Input
- Actions – Acquisition, Construction, Operation, and Maintenance
- Management and Measurement – Monitoring, Enforcement, and Adaptive Planning

The allocation of responsibility for the plans and activities should be described in at least the following categories:

- State Responsibilities
- Federal Responsibilities
- Regional Responsibilities (e.g., Water Users, Dischargers, and Flood Management Agencies)
- Local Government Responsibilities (Cities and Counties)

Estimate Costs

Any reasonable discussion of funding and financing must be based on realistic projections of costs for all plans and activities. The costs must be estimated now, regardless of the status of planning activities, and updated as planning work proceeds. Without connecting costs to the plans and activities, decision makers will reach ill-informed conclusions and set unrealistic expectations for accomplishment.

Specifically, cost estimates must include capital, operating, administrative, and regulatory/mitigation costs. At a minimum, costs should be forecast through 2030. At this point, costs can be forecast for major expenditure areas such as ecosystem restoration, conveyance, storage, levee systems and emergency response, economic development, water quality, regional self-sufficiency, and others. For example, the FloodSafe Program has developed preliminary cost and allocation estimates for implementing the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (\$13 to \$16 billion, with approximately 50% of that cost to be paid by the State). Each major expenditure category should also list linked benefits, such as habitat restoration, water reliability and quality, etc., so that linkages are clear and explicit. For comparison, it would be valuable to have cost

estimates for failing to act, such as recovery costs from a catastrophic flood or earthquake in the Delta.

Adopt Guiding Principles

The guiding principles described in Chapter 9 of the *Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan* are a mixture of approach, definitions, concepts, and principles. The two tenets described on page 205 (“beneficiaries pay” and “stressors pay”) are closer to principles that guide the funding and finance of Delta solutions. For example, “beneficiary pays” is a concept that has been presented and acknowledged since at least the early days of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. The DSC staff should develop and recommend specific affirmative language of a beneficiary pays principle (see below). The DSC staff should rewrite Chapter 9 to explicitly describe the funding and finance principles to be adopted by the Delta Stewardship Council and/or recommended for adoption by the Governor and Legislature. The following are suggested Finance Plan guiding principles for adoption by the Delta Stewardship Council, the Governor’s Administration, and the Legislature.

1. Funding Source Alignment

Principle: The State should align funding sources and financing with investments that benefit the sources of those funds – local and regional fees should support local or regional projects; State funds should support improvements with public and/or statewide benefit, to the extent that statewide benefits are not required by mitigation or regulatory requirements.

Rationale: Delta solutions will require joint investment by State/Federal agencies and Regional/Local government. Aligning the sources of funds with the implementation responsibilities and benefits will increase efficiency and accountability.

2. Funding Certainty and Stability

Principle: The State should adopt funding and financing strategies and mechanisms that provide long-term, stable funding sources.

Rationale: Reliable, long-term funding stability is necessary to ensure steady progress toward the Two Co-Equal Goals over the next 50 to 100 years.

3. Program Linkages

Principle: State investments should be conditioned on fundamental linkages to support the Two Co-Equal Goals through bond covenants and contracts: (a) existing and new facilities should be required to operate consistent with Delta ecosystem restoration; (b) optimization of conservation and efficient water use should be required of any user, exporter, or diverter of water from the Delta watershed; and (c) new “water banking” through surface and groundwater storage facilities should be coupled to expanded conveyance.

Rationale. Only through integrated implementation can the State develop workable solutions to California’s water resource management problems and achieve the Two Co-Equal Goals.

4. Investment Priorities

Principle: The State should establish clear, objective priorities for investment to maximize progress toward the Two Co-Equal Goals.

Rationale: With substantial needs and limited resources, the State and beneficiaries must make choices. An objective evaluation of benefits, costs, and impacts will help identify the actions that warrant immediate, near-term, and long-term investment.

5. Accountability for Results

Principle: The State should establish clear lines of responsibility and accountability, rigorous and transparent reporting and oversight requirements, and clear, measurable performance measures for planning, action, and management activities.

Rationale: Agencies and stakeholders responsible for delivering public infrastructure initiatives must be held accountable.

6. Delivery Efficiency

Principle: The State should encourage cost-effective and timely delivery of projects and incentivize innovation in design by defining the purpose, function, and performance objectives for each program or project to stimulate competition of ideas and price in bidding.

Rationale: The public expects prompt, effective, and efficient implementation of Delta solutions. Competition inspires innovation and cost-effectiveness.

7. Procurement Fairness and Transparency

Principle: The State should ensure that all public infrastructure initiatives have efficient and fair bidding processes and contractual agreements that are based on clear, comprehensive guidelines and full public disclosure.

Rationale: The processes facilitating the development of public infrastructure initiatives must be fair, transparent, and efficient.

8. Budget Assurances

Principle: The State should include legal requirements and other mechanisms to ensure that taxes, fees, and other revenues collected for specific purposes are appropriated and spent to achieve those purposes and to ensure that financing mechanisms are only used to fund long-term investments.

Rationale: Taxpayers and users expect results for dollars invested toward specific programs and projects.

9. Beneficiaries Pay

Principle: Where the State is the provider of infrastructure and services, the State should identify all specific beneficiaries of capital investments and operational costs and establish the appropriate funding and financing mechanisms to apportion and recover costs for each class of beneficiary.

Rationale: California's water infrastructure is driven by individual and business needs (residential, agricultural, commercial, industrial, and energy). For water users, cost recovery mechanisms should be based on volume of water and ensured through contracts and water rates. For other beneficiaries, whenever possible, cost recovery mechanisms should be based on similar approaches that reduce reliance on the natural resources of the Delta. All beneficiaries should be identified and included as funding sources.

10. Stressors Pay

Principle: Whenever possible, the State should identify human activities that stress the natural systems of the Delta and apportion regulatory and restoration costs to the stressors through volume-based or impact-based fees.

Rationale: California’s natural systems are stressed by many and diverse human activities, most of which are managed by State and Federal regulatory processes. Volume-based or impact-based fees encourage reduction of the activities stressing the Delta.

Refine Chapter 9 Structure and Approach

As currently drafted, Chapter 9 is a general description of an approach to funding and financing. The Chapter should be reorganized and rewritten to provide specific needs and recommendations for funding and financing, including the following:

- Funding and financing principles for adoption by the Council and recommendation to the Governor and Legislature.
- Listing of State, Federal, regional, and local plans and activities through 2030 to achieve or make measurable progress toward the Two Co-Equal Goals.
- Capital, operations, administrative, and regulatory/mitigation costs of the plans and activities through 2030 and displayed by responsible State agency, Federal agency, and regional and local governments.
- Existing and recommended sources and amounts of necessary funds through 2030.
- Recommended mechanisms and procedures for achieving each of the funding and financing principles.

Only with these elements can the Governor and Legislature begin legitimate discussions of the funding and financing necessary to achieve the Two Co-Equal Goals. Therefore, Chapter 9 should also include the next steps necessary to further refine the plans, costs, and funding and finance mechanisms such that funding and finance strategies and mechanisms are tied to specific objectives, performances measures, programs, and actions.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT DELTA PLAN CHAPTER 9 (FINANCE PLAN)

The following are the specific Delta Vision Foundation comments on *Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan Chapter 9*:

1. The references in the “policies and recommendations” (page 205, line 14) and proposed “Guiding Principles” (page 206, lines 16-17, 26-28) reveal the lack of linkages among the “critical mass” actions recommended in the *Delta Vision Strategic Plan* and the importance of certain components to the solution.
 - a. Specifically, the *Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan* policies and recommendations referenced on page 205, line 14 need to be revised and re-ordered to reflect the “loading order” of strategies and the linking (coupling) of solution components: conservation and efficiency together with ecosystem restoration, storage and conveyance, levee reconstruction and flood risk protection, protection and enhancement of the Delta as an evolving place, water quality protection, science and governance. Please note that the *Draft* list mixes “actions” and “outcomes” and probably should be rewritten to

make the distinction: water quality protection is a result of the actions; governance and science are inputs to the actions.

- b. The Guiding Principles 4th bullet (page 206, lines 16-17) should acknowledge that construction of storage is an essential component of the solution for Delta ecosystem improvement and not referenced in a manner to imply that it is for reliability only.
2. The Guiding Principles 6th bullet (page 206, lines 26-30) should include storage, levee reconstruction, and through-Delta conveyance.
3. The *Delta Plan* needs to make a distinction between “funding” and “financing.” Funding is the source of funds to pay for improvements or facilities (such as user fees, State General Fund, project revenues through contracts, or Federal funds). Financing is the mechanism by which funds are paid (one time or over time) to retire debt (such as Special Fund into which fees are paid and accrued, General Obligation Bonds, or Revenue Bonds) incurred to make improvements or construct facilities.
4. The Guiding Principles need a logical framework for “aligning revenues with responsibilities” such that specific funds are used to support investments that benefit primarily the source or payors of the funds: local fees should support local or regional projects; State funds should support improvements with public and/or statewide benefit. While this concept needs more discussion and development, it is an important additional element to be included in the Guiding Principles.
5. There is a need for focus on innovation in design and implementation (ecosystem restoration and facilities construction) and incentives for performance for funding. There is no mention of these essential aspects of cost-effective and timely delivery of projects. This means that projects need to be described in terms of function and performance to stimulate competition of ideas as well as price in bidding. The concept of “design-build” used for transportation projects needs to be introduced into water facilities projects.
6. There is a need for accountability for timely performance by all the agencies with responsibilities. The Immediate Needs (page 8, lines 28-25) section appears to place a priority on funding the bureaucracy with no sense of urgency, instead of delivering results for the proposed \$50 million operating budgets. Funding of these agencies should be pursuant to performance and real progress, which requires detailed work plans with a schedule of deliverables in a critical path.
7. The recommendation for use of Proposition 1E funds (page 210, lines 34-41) needs to be revised to significantly increase the amount of Proposition 1E funds used immediately to construct a “strategic levee system” and improve through-Delta conveyance.
8. The section on Public Goods Charge (page 212, lines 9-18) needs to be carefully considered as to the appropriateness and a clear policy on collecting statewide fees only for statewide and/or public purposes. With the kind of linkages recommended in the *Delta Vision Strategic Plan* and summarized in the *2011 Delta Vision Report Card*, local water districts (beneficiaries) would be required contractually to optimize conservation and water use efficiency in order to receive the benefits of improved conveyance and storage and could decide if they wanted to use existing funds or increase customer charges to pay for those kinds of projects. This would be far more efficient than the statewide collection of fees into a “big pot” and an allocation process back to local agencies. There is always a “friction loss” in that kind of process.

9. The section on Prioritized Levee Investments (page 212, lines 19-26) needs to be expanded to acknowledge the role of levees in protecting water quality for both habitat and export needs and the proposed benefit/cost analysis methodology needs to be substantively revised to reflect this value.
10. Funding and financing mechanisms must incorporate legal requirements for integrated actions as set forth below.

In conclusion, the *Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan Chapter 9* needs work on both substance as delineated above and structure (organization of the headings and sections to be logical and coherent).

Attachment 1 COST OF WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IN PERSPECTIVE

This attachment provides additional background details on the following:

- Cost of Water Services in California
- Water Infrastructure Investment
- Unmet Funding Needs for Water and the Environment
- Water Rates and Other Household Utility Costs

Cost of Water Services in California

The Delta Stewardship Council compiled estimates of the annual expenditures for water-related activities and services across California. As shown in Chapter 9 of the Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan, annual water-related expenditures exceed \$20 billion per year.¹

While \$20-30 billion per year of water-related services appears to be a substantial cost, the water services support an overall California economy of \$1.9 trillion dollars.

The annual water-related service costs average to \$675 per person including water, wastewater, flood control, and ecosystem management for California's 37 million residents.

Water Infrastructure Investment

Although there is likely no tally of the total value of California's water-related infrastructure for water, wastewater, flood control, and ecosystem management, California and the Federal government have made significant investment over the past one hundred years, including \$6.4 billion to build the State Water Project (SWP)² and \$3.4 billion for the Federal Central Valley Project (CVP).³ Local and regional investment in storage, distribution, collection, and treatment facilities and flood management far surpass the investment in the SWP and CVP.

California continues to invest in water-related activities and ecosystem restoration. Over a ten-year period through 2009, the State invested approximately \$3 billion in Delta-related programs.⁴ Since 1970, the state's voters have authorized more than \$23.4 billion in water-related general obligation bonds, mainly for water quality and drinking water purposes. About 84 percent of the total amount authorized in these bonds (\$19.6 billion) has been authorized since 2000.⁵

Unmet Funding Needs for Water and the Environment

The Legislative Analyst's Office has estimated the State's total unmet needs for water and wastewater infrastructure over the next 20 years at approximately \$100 billion, as follows:

¹ Delta Stewardship Council, Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan, August 2, 2011, page 207.

² Financing Water Infrastructure, Legislative Analyst's Office, August 26, 2009

³ San Luis Unit Capital Construction Costs, Government Accounting Office, GAO-08-307R, November 7, 2007.

⁴ Financing Water Infrastructure, Legislative Analyst's Office, August 26, 2009

⁵ Financing Water Infrastructure, Legislative Analyst's Office, August 26, 2009

- Drinking water infrastructure: \$39 billion (over a period of 20 years).
- Wastewater infrastructure: \$29.9 billion (over a period of 20 years).
- Flood infrastructure: \$26 billion (over a period of 20 years).
- Delta ecosystem restoration: \$3.6 billion, plus \$46 million/year over 50 years in ongoing demands for Bay Delta Conservation Plan implementation.⁶

In 2006, the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) estimated that California needs to invest \$16 billion annually in water-related infrastructure.

- Levees/Flood Control \$4.2 billion
- Urban Runoff \$5.5 billion
- Wastewater \$2.3 billion
- Water \$4 billion

In their 2006 Infrastructure Report Card, ASCE noted that “In the past 40 years, our capital investment has plummeted precipitously. In the 1950s and 60s, California spent 20 cents of every dollar on capital projects. By the 1980 that figure dropped to less than five cents on the dollar. Current estimates put infrastructure investment at around a penny on the dollar. This despite ever-increasing demands presented by population growth and economic development. Much of the state’s public infrastructure was designed and built to serve a population half the size of California’s 35 million residents. And the state is still growing strong.”⁷

Water Rates and Other Household Utility Costs

Water and wastewater rates in California remain a high value for consumers. A brief comparison of household water and wastewater rates with rates for other utilities and services demonstrates that value for Californians and capacity for the additional investment necessary to achieve the Two Co-Equal Goals.

Average Monthly Household Costs For Select Services	
Electricity ¹	\$100
Cell phone ¹	\$78
Cable/satellite ¹	\$70
Water/Wastewater ²	\$63 (water = \$32, wastewater = \$31)
Garbage ¹	\$30
Source:	
¹ Association of California Water Agencies	
² Average rates for the eight largest cities in California, 2009/2010, 50 Largest Cities, Water/Wastewater Rate Survey, Black & Veatch, 2010.	

⁶ Funding Public-Purpose Water-Related Activities, Legislative Analyst’s Office, April 28, 2011

⁷ ASCE California, 2006 Infrastructure Report Card, A Citizen’s Guide.

Attachment 2
ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS, OCTOBER 12, 2011

Joya Banerjee	S. D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation
Linda Best	Contra Costa Council
Mark Biddlecomb	Ducks Unlimited
Michael Bowden	Rail, Intermodal, Marine (RIM) Logistics
Liz Braddick	CWA Board of Directors, CCWF Board
Byron M. Buck	State & Federal Contractors Water Agency
Keith Coolidge	Delta Stewardship Council
Pamela Creedon	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Stan Dean	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Ane Deister	Cardno ENTRIX
Anton Favorini-Csorba	California Legislative Analyst's Office
Randy Fiorini	Delta Stewardship Council
Craig Geldard	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
David J. Guy	Northern California Water Association
Doug Haaland	California State Assembly, Republican Caucus
Allison Harvey Turner	S. D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation
Doug Johnson	California Invasive Plant Council
Luana Kiger	USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service
John Kingsbury	Mountain Counties Water Resources Agency
Cynthia Koehler	Environmental Defense Fund
Tina Cannon Leahy	Assembly Water, Parks & Wildlife Committee
Richard G. Little, AICP	Keston Institute for Public Finance and Infrastructure Policy
Felicia Marcus	Natural Resources Defense Council
Michael Marsh, CPA	Western United Dairyman
Steve McCarthy	California Senate Republican Policy Group
Jeffrey Michael, PhD	University of the Pacific, Eberhardt School of Business
Jonas Minton	Planning and Conservation League
James Nachbaur	California Legislative Analyst's Office
Barry Nelson	Natural Resources Defense Council
Valerie Nera	California Chamber of Commerce
Dennis O'Connor	California Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water
Mary Piepho	Delta Counties Coalition/Contra Costa County, Board of Supervisors
Timothy H. Quinn	Association of California Water Agencies
Jason Rhine	California Outdoor Heritage Association
Chris Scheuring	California Farm Bureau Federation
Susanna Schlendorf	Office of Assemblywoman Joan Buchanan
Jeremy Smith	State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
Melinda Terry	North Delta Water Agency
Brian Thomas	Southern California Water Committee/Public Financial Management, Inc.
Doug Wallace	East Bay Municipal Utility District
Robert D. Whitley, PE	Contra Costa Council/Whitley Burchett & Associates
Jeff Wingfield	Port of Stockton
Leo Winternitz	The Nature Conservancy, California Water Program