February 5, 2014

BDCP Comments
Ryan Wulff, National Marine Fisheries Service
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Wulff:

This letter raises a number of questions related to the funding and financing issues embodied within the Public Review Draft Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP). In addition to these questions, which are submitted as part of the BDCP open house in San Diego on February 6, 2014, the Water Authority intends to submit a more comprehensive comment letter on the Public Review Draft BDCP and associated Draft EIR/EIS documents prior to the April 14, 2014 comment deadline and close of public review.

As the largest member agency of the largest State Water Contractor, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), the Water Authority and its ratepayers are being counted upon to pay the second-largest share of BDCP costs in the state (among MWD member agencies, and second only to the Kern County Water Agency). Accordingly, we have requested – on multiple occasions – the opportunity to directly engage in the BDCP cost allocation discussions and negotiations process. Those requests have gone unanswered. We renew that request with this letter. The stakes are so high for the San Diego region that the Water Authority should clearly be afforded the opportunity to directly participate in the cost allocation negotiations and be provided the information we need to assess whether the preferred alternative advocated by the BDCP program will provide water supply benefits commensurate with the billions of dollars our ratepayers are being counted upon to pay. We also must ensure that our ratepayers are not at risk of paying costs for BDCP water supplies of other MWD member agencies or other state or federal water contractors, and that costs are allocated to the participants based on proportion of benefits received. To date, we have received no assurances to allay these concerns.

Over the past several years, I have sent several letters to officials with the California Natural Resources Agency raising a number of questions regarding the proposed project. To date, the Water Authority has received no responses to those questions. I incorporate those letters, attached, and the questions they raised, with this letter. We renew our request for answers raised in those letters with this letter.

We strongly believe that each participant in the BDCP must have clearly delineated capital and operations and maintenance cost responsibility identified, and be provided sufficiently detailed information to evaluate the cost-benefit (or feasibility) of participating in the project. The Water Authority has previously heard Dr. David Sunding report to the MWD Board of Directors that
cost-benefit analyses have been produced by BDCP for all urban and agricultural water contractors, and that include cost-benefit analyses for each MWD member agency, including the Water Authority. The Water Authority has made multiple requests for this information. These requests have been ignored. We renew that request with this letter.

As we have consistently stated in a variety of public venues, the Water Authority believes that any BDCP financing plan must include enforceable agreements to pay for the project, not only from state water contractors directly, but also from the member agencies or units that provide revenues to their respective state water contractor. The stakes are far too high to simply rely on the hope that the contractors’ variable water sales revenues will be adequate over the long-term to pay the project’s costs.

Equally important, the Water Authority is also concerned that future progress of the BDCP and efforts to resolve seemingly intractable conflicts in the Delta will falter, especially if the cost allocation for those expected to be participants in the BDCP is not expected to be resolved before the BDCP environmental review process concludes. Without the cost allocation explicitly agreed upon, how does BDCP expect water agencies to evaluate the cost-benefit of the various alternatives or reasonably limit the risk that their ratepayers will be expected to assume?

The attachment to this letter outlines a series of issues and questions that the Water Authority believes should be thoroughly resolved in the context of the BDCP public review process. We are requesting formal, written responses to each of these items. We are concerned that the Public Review Draft BDCP does not comprehensively or adequately conduct due diligence on all of the facts and circumstances highlighted in the attachment. We remain concerned that a potential cascading collapse of funding could occur if information that should be included in a proper due diligence analysis is not provided, in a timely manner, to those who are expected to fund the program.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these initial comments on the Public Review Draft BDCP. We remain committed to working with all parties to evaluate, address, and resolve these critical financing issues. We look forward to your written responses to our questions.

Sincerely,

Maureen A. Stapleton,
General Manager

Attachment 1: BDCP Financing and Economic Issues and Questions
Attachment 2: October 7, 2013 letter to California Natural Resources Secretary John Laird
Attachment 3: July 30, 2013 letter to California Natural Resources Agency Deputy Secretary Gerald Meral
Attachment 4: August 28, 2012 letter to California Natural Resources Agency Deputy Secretary Gerald Meral
BDCP Financing and Economic Issues and Questions

Take-Or-Pay Contracts/Enforceable Commitments
As the Water Authority has pointed out during discussions and written correspondence over the past two years, MWD — which, as the largest state water contracting agency, is the foundation for financing the BDCP project — relies on a financial rate structure that is not sustainable to pay its long-term financial obligations. While more than 80 percent of MWD’s costs are fixed, less than 20 percent of MWD’s revenues are paid from fixed charges. MWD’s heavy reliance — more than 80 percent — on variable water sales to meet its financial obligations causes its water rates to be highly volatile. Since 2007, water rates at MWD have increased by more than 86 percent while sales have declined by 31 percent.

Although MWD sales have increased this year due to dry conditions, they are nowhere near the historically high water sales level. Region-wide, MWD’s per-capita water use in 2012 reduced by about 15.5 percent from its 2005 10-year average baseline. MWD’s member agencies are not required to purchase any water from MWD. The variability of water sales — and thus uncertain future water sales revenues — coupled with Southern California water agencies’ current and future planned actions to implement the State’s policy to improve water use efficiency and invest in local water resource development, raises significant question regarding MWD’s capability to provide the financial backing needed to fund long-term BDCP obligations. This should be a major concern for the State of California, whose full faith and credit will be expected to back up the financing of the project. And yet, Chapter 8 makes no mention of this material, foundational risk to BDCP financing.

The Water Authority believes that, at a minimum, state water contractors that are wholesale water agencies must demonstrate that their customers have take-or-pay contracts or other enforceable long-term financial commitments to pay the fixed costs of the BDCP program corresponding to the term of the contractor’s BDCP obligation. The Water Authority continues to be prepared to make such a commitment to MWP, as long as the Water Authority gets the water supplies in return for its payments. We also believe that the willingness to make such a firm financial commitment to a Delta solution will determine the true demand for Delta water supply, and therefore help inform the best sizing for the conveyance facility. It would not be in the state’s best interest to construct a facility only to have it stranded because no one is willing or able to pay for it, or hoped-for water sales necessary to pay for it do not materialize.

“Step-Up” Provisions
Existing State Water Project contracts contain provisions under which non-defaulting contractors can be assessed to cover payments not made by defaulting contractors, up to 25 percent of the defaulting contractors’ obligations. Additionally, the East Branch Extension of MWD’s State Water Project contract has a provision obligating MWD to cover default by any and all other participants. These State Water Project contract stipulations are known as “step-up” provisions. We are informed that bond underwriters for the BDCP project are expected to require a “step-up” provision by which each BDCP participant in BDCP-related bonds pledges to assume the obligations of defaulting participants. In fact, the Public Review Draft BDCP Chapter 8, at Section 8.3.3 (page 8-71) suggests amending the existing contracts as a potential funding source:
“Existing water contracts would need to be amended to include the new costs of the BDCP assigned to the state water contractors and the repayment schedule.”

Since “step-up” provisions are already embodied within, and apply to, MWD’s existing State Water Project contract, it would appear that such provisions would apply to the “new costs of the BDCP assigned to the state water contractors.” Given those “step-up” provision obligations, we remain concerned that the Public Review Draft BDCP does not fully analyze the possible financial effects of the “step up” provisions on MWD and the other participants in the BDCP.

**Property Taxes**

The Public Review Draft BDCP suggests that property taxes may be used as back-up security for BDCP payment obligations of individual state water contractors. However, there are very clear and significant limitations in MWD’s existing taxing authority under the provisions of the MWD Act:

- The Act limits MWD’s ability to levy taxes to pay its State Water Project obligations. MWD is limited to levying taxes for “the composite amount required to pay (1) the principal and interest on general obligation bonded indebtedness of the district and (2) that portion of the district’s payment obligation under [the SWP contract] which is reasonably allocable, as determined by the district, to the repayment by the state of principal and interest on ISWP bonds as of [January 1, 1985] and used to finance construction of facilities for the benefit of the district.”

- Although the Act contains override ability in the event of a fiscal crisis, as determined by the MWD board, the override is limited to only one year at a time. In such an event, the State of California and bondholders would be relying upon an annual vote of MWD’s Board of Directors in which it “. . . finds that a tax in excess of these restrictions is essential to the fiscal integrity of the district....”

- It is unclear whether, or to what extent the MWD board would override this taxing limitation to back its BDCP obligation. The Public Review Draft BDCP should address and answer these questions.

Given these limitations and uncertainties, it is difficult to consider MWD’s or other contractors’ existing taxing authority as a meaningful back-up security for BDCP payment obligations. It is also highly questionable whether the financing of BDCP can be – or should be – backed by taxing authority that was authorized by voters decades ago, when the program was much different than is being discussed today. A careful legal analysis of MWD taxing authority should be included in the BDCP due diligence process if taxes are going to be relied upon as additional back-up security for BDCP project debt. The Public Review Draft BDCP is silent on this issue.

**Funding Sources**

Both state and federal regulations are clear in terms of their requirement for funding assurance before issuance of permit under the habitat conservation plan. The federal Endangered Species Act requires that a habitat conservation plan applicant ensure that adequate funding for the plan will be provided. The case law under ESA provides that:
• The plan must “ensure” funding over the lifetime of the permit
• The HCP cannot rely on federal funding to “ensure” funding of the plan in light of the “Anti-Deficiency Act and the availability of appropriated funds”
• The HCP must provide “remedies for failure to meet funding obligations by signatory measures”
• The HCP “cannot rely on speculative funding actions of others” for funding
• The HCP effectively must be backed by a guarantee by applicant to ensure funding for all plan element

Yet, the BDCP appears to rely on federal funding that has yet to be appropriated and voter passage of future state water bonds to finance the habitat restoration costs. In fact, footnote “a” in Table 8-37 of the Public Review Draft states:

“In most cases, funding amounts are estimates only based on funding history... Funding estimates from state and federal agencies do not represent commitments and are subject to grant awards, annual appropriations from Congress, and passage of water bonds by voters of California...”

The BDCP must address whether the regulatory agencies will accept BDCP’s reliance on public funding sources yet to be approved as sufficient funding assurance before issuance of permits.

While the Public Review Draft BDCP goes to great lengths to explain the various funding sources and the responsibilities of the parties to fund components of BDCP implementation, Section 8.4.2 discusses the actions that will be taken or required in the event of a shortfall in state or federal funding. Specifically, the Public Review Draft BDCP states that: “The Authorized Entities will not be required to provide land, water, or monetary resources beyond their commitments in this Plan in the event of a shortfall in state or federal funding.” This statement appears to directly conflict with “step-up” provisions in existing State Water Project contracts, and which will likely be included in amended contracts.

This statement found in Section 8.4.2 also appears inconsistent with the BDCP public messaging regarding what will occur in the event of a shortfall in state or federal funding. The graphic below – taken directly from a BDCP presentation – demonstrates the reliance on water contractors to also provide some or, potentially all funding for BDCP program components beyond implementation of Conservation Measure 1.
Cost Allocation

Even though the bulk of the BDCP will be paid by the federal and state water contractors, we are disappointed to learn that the actual funding share between the federal and state contractors will not be determined until it is "near the time that permits are issued for BDCP." If this timeline, as described in the Public Review Draft, holds true, each contractor’s share of BDCP’s cost obligation will not be known until many months after the closing of the public comment period.

How would water agency policy makers be in a position to assess whether BDCP is cost effective for their own unique jurisdictions? Relying on an overarching declarative statement that "the costs of CM1 and associated mitigation and construction are affordable by ratepayers of the urban and agricultural agencies..." is simply insufficient, and is certainly no guarantee that funding will materialize.

Even assuming that the BDCP, as a whole, would provide a statewide net positive benefit, how the costs are allocated and benefits apportioned could impact individual water agencies differently. Without a clear description of how costs are allocated, it is simply impossible to assess the cost-benefit of BDCP to individual water agencies and their ratepayers. Without this important piece being concluded or disclosed, what is the assurance that individual contractors will all find the BDCP cost effective when it is finally disclosed? And if not all contractors sign up to pay for the BDCP, how would that impact the costs that the remaining contractors must bear?

Postponing the cost allocation discussion to after the public commenting period is concluded is not acceptable. The BDCP must address this issue and keep the public commenting period open until this issue is resolved to afford the public an opportunity to comment on this critically important element.