

California Water Plan Plenary – Finance Panel Questions

Update 2013 Finance Panel Topic: Principles for Prioritizing State Investment and Apportioning Costs

Objective: Begin developing the principles and approach for prioritizing the State’s future IWM investments and apportioning of costs

Panelists	Patterned Questions
<p>Dennis O’Connor, Principal Consultant, Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water</p> <p>Cindy Paulson, Executive Director, California Urban Water Agencies</p> <p>Sue Sims, Executive Director, California Water Commission</p> <p>Alf Brandt, Principal Consultant, CA State Assembly</p> <p>Glenda Humiston, State Director of Rural Development, U.S. Department of Agriculture</p> <p>Susan Tatayon, Associate Director, CA Water Program, The Nature Conservancy</p> <p>William Edgar, President, Central Valley Flood Protection Board</p> <p>David Bolland, Senior Regulatory Advocate, Association of California Water Agencies</p> <p>Jennifer Clary, Water Policy Analyst, Clean Water Action</p>	<p>Question 1 – The Update 2013 finance planning framework describes several constraints regarding future IWM investment such as: (a) Sustained economic downturn; (b) Near full allocation of existing bond funds; (c) Reduced willingness of the public to pay for government activities; (d) Decades of deferred investment.</p> <p>Under such constraints, prioritization becomes necessary; sometimes requiring tough decisions that benefit one interest and forgo another. The essence of any prioritization activity requires a full understanding of what stakeholders value most and then some tough relative value judgments. What types of resource-dependent values do you advocate and how can they be expressed in terms of principles for prioritizing investment?</p> <p>Examples of resource-dependent values include: Biodiversity, Public Health, Diverse portfolio of economic activity, Sustainability of GW supplies and aquifers, Relaxation and refreshment of mind and body (<i>samples from Finance Caucus work product</i>).</p> <p>Question 2 – There are several potential methods and rationales for apportioning State Government investment throughout the California such as resource management needs/priorities, population, disadvantaged communities and so on. At the same time, there is so much diversity of regional priorities and needs that one size fits all State policy simply cannot effectively meet State or regional resource management objectives. What principles should be used to apportion State government investment throughout California and how can these principles guide investment with enough flexibility to address the high regional variability?</p> <p>Question 3 – Historical water and flood management activities have resulted in unforeseen and unintended impacts that are becoming increasingly apparent today (i.e. legacy impacts). In addition, the state’s (note small “s”) resource-dependent values and priorities have changed to increase the emphasis on sustainable outcomes; thereby increasing the need for upfront investment (with the objective of long term environmental and economic sustainability). What principles should guide apportioning of costs between reducing legacy impacts and producing future public and private benefits? This question can also be phrased as “What is the appropriate role of public funding?”</p>