Responding to Natural Catastrophes - A California Forest & Water Management Optimization Bond

Author: Dr Robin Daniels BEng(Hons), PhD

Position: Co-Founder & Chief Executive Officer, The Darwin Fund (operating under the auspices of 501(c)(3) Seventh Generation Advisers) & Managing Director, Redpill Group Ltd. Fellow of Wolfson College, University of Cambridge.

Email: rcdaniels@redpillgroup.com | Phone: +44 7833 508456

Address: The Darwin Fund, 7th Generation Advisors, 1223 Wilshire Blvd. #776 Santa Monica, CA 90403, United States.

1. Problem Statement: Catastrophe risk, insurance stress and fragmented finance

California's climate-driven catastrophes are rising in frequency, severity and cost, but mitigation finance remains fragmented across emergency appropriations, project-by-project grants, utility capital plans and the Wildfire Fund. Fragmentation raises the cost of capital, slows delivery in high-risk wildland-urban interface (WUI) communities, and weakens the link between mitigation and insurance pricing - so households face rising premiums and coverage withdrawal despite local investments.

SB 254 calls for models that (i) mitigate damage, (ii) expedite recovery and compensation, (iii) protect access and affordability of property insurance, and (iv) socialize catastrophe risk while keeping utilities financially stable and able to attract low-cost capital on behalf of ratepayers.

2. Proposed Solution: the California Optimization Bond (OB)

We propose a California Forest & Water Management Optimization Bond (the "Optimization Bond") that treats forests, headwaters and high-risk WUI as a single policy-aligned portfolio - including first-of-a-kind mitigation and bio-industrial projects currently stuck in a "valley of death" - rather than a set of disconnected projects.

Core elements:

- Portfolio optimization: intake, screen and bundle eligible projects (e.g., fuels treatment, WUI hardening, headwaters restoration, biomass/biochar, community preparedness) into portfolios that maximize avoided loss and climate/water outcomes per dollar, subject to equity and delivery constraints.
- Stacked, multi-payer capital: combine state-backed tranches, utility and water-sector contributions, insurance-linked participation, local government involvement and catalytic philanthropic/impact capital in one coordinated capital stack, with payments aligned to measured risk reduction.
- Shared digital-twin and MRV backbone: a common data and modelling environment (the Darwin Fund Universal Toolkit) linking hazard, exposure, engineering, hydrology and socio-economic inputs to a standardized Nature Framework and 100-point California scorecard, with MRV/disclosure designed to be AB-1305-ready for any carbon or environmental claims.
- Repeatable issuance templates: standardized structures and documentation reusable across counties, basins and archetypes to lower transaction costs and enable programmatic issuance.

This is not a new instrument; it is a coordinating architecture for existing tools (bonds, charges, outcomes contracts, reinsurance and grants) joined up to deliver SB 254 objectives.

3. Methodology: Universal Toolkit and Gates

The Universal Toolkit is a transparent evaluation and structuring framework that turns resilience projects into investable portfolios with clear gates, metrics, evidence packs and financing options.

Gates:

- Gate 0 - Scoping: problem definition, stakeholders and institutional context.
- Gate 1 - Technical eligibility: hazard, exposure, feasibility and governance screening.
- Gate 2 - Finance-readiness: evidence pack linking interventions to quantified risk reduction, co-benefits, indicative costs and beneficiary mapping.
- Gate 3 - Structuring: design of capital stacks, instruments and risk-sharing arrangements across state entities, utilities, water agencies, insurers, local government and impact capital.

For this SB 254 demonstration, we used public datasets as context and populated Toolkit workbooks with synthetic but internally consistent numbers to illustrate Gate 2 and Gate 3 outputs; all figures are explicitly illustrative and would be replaced by model-based values in a production run.

4. How the Optimization Bond addresses SB 254 priorities

4.1 Insurance accessibility and affordability

By quantifying expected annual loss (EAL) before and after portfolios, and linking those reductions to structured, performance-based payments, the OB can support evidence-based mitigation crediting that feeds catastrophe models and regulatory filings, helping stabilize availability and affordability in high-risk WUI areas by tying finance to measured community-level risk reduction (not ad hoc spend).

4.2 Alternative structures to socialize risk

The coordinated capital stack complements the Wildfire Fund by allocating costs to beneficiaries in a pre-agreed, transparent way:

- State and public entities provide anchor capital; Prop 4 can serve as near-term seed/bridge funding to start priority resilience projects now, with the OB designed to take over as durable, scalable long-term financing once studied, piloted and operational.
- Utilities and water agencies contribute where they benefit from avoided outages, liability and sediment/drought risk.
- Insurers and reinsurers participate only through return-seeking, resilience-linked structures (e.g., resilience-linked cover or avoided-loss certificates) - not as a levy - because insurer claim payments are primarily funded by policyholder premiums, so direct payments for resilience would largely be a pass-through cost to policyholders.
- Local government and communities contribute smaller shares, supported by philanthropic/impact capital in junior, guarantee or first-loss roles.

4.3 Mitigation measures and technology solutions

The Butte and Placer archetypes show how one program can combine fuels treatments, home hardening, headwaters/riparian restoration, biomass/biochar and community preparedness into integrated portfolios with clear metrics, benefit-cost logic and consistent MRV. The Toolkit enables scenario analysis and a consistent evidence framework for incorporating new technology outputs (e.g., remote sensing, early warning, advanced fuels management).

4.4 Financing mechanisms to expedite recovery and compensation

With standardized evidence packs, pre-arranged capital stacks and issuance templates, portfolios can move from Gate 2 to financing and implementation faster than bespoke deals. Where appropriate, a defined portion of cash flows can be earmarked for rapid recovery mechanisms (e.g., temporary housing or rebuilding support) in communities where residual risk remains.

4.5 Benefits for ratepayers and utility accountability

The OB targets a lower weighted average cost of capital for mitigation portfolios than ad hoc emergency spending, moderating rate impacts. Performance-linked utility payments tied to validated outcomes improve accountability while preserving utilities' ability to attract low-cost capital for ratepayers.

5. Demonstration findings (illustrative only)

Using the Toolkit with public data as context, we examined three strands: (i) Butte County (Paradise/Camp Fire recovery archetype), (ii) Placer County (headwaters plus water-agency archetype), and (iii) a statewide pipeline of similar archetypes including metro-adjacent WUI belts. Synthetic but plausible figures suggest that a program of the order of ~USD 5B over ~15 years could deliver ~USD 1B/year in avoided EAL by Year 15, with portfolio-level benefit-cost ratios of ~2.0-2.3x once co-benefits (water, carbon, biodiversity, jobs) are counted alongside avoided losses. These figures are placeholders to demonstrate Toolkit outputs and the logic of a multi-benefit, multi-payer capital stack; a production run would replace them with decision-grade model results and stakeholder-validated cost and allocation assumptions.

6. Recommended next steps under SB 254

- Commission a full Feasibility Study under the SB 254 Study umbrella, focused on wildfire, forest and water-management portfolios in high-priority clusters (including Butte, Placer and metro-adjacent WUI belts).
- Deploy the Universal Toolkit in a production environment with agreed data-sharing across agencies, utilities, water agencies and (where relevant) insurers.
- Co-design project pipelines with local partners, prioritizing communities most affected by insurance stress and wildfire risk.
- Run integrated hazard, exposure, hydrology, carbon and economic models to populate the California scorecard and calibrate avoided-loss metrics.

- Design and test OB issuance options and associated advance market commitments / avoided-loss certificates, explicitly mapping how these structures complement - and, over time, could partially substitute for - existing mechanisms while improving affordability and resilience.

This approach offers a concrete, testable model aligned to the SB 254 mandate: mitigating damage, expediting recovery, and responsibly allocating catastrophe burdens across stakeholders while protecting access to insurance and affordable, reliable energy.

Appendix A - Butte County: Paradise / Camp Fire archetype (illustrative)

A Butte portfolio bundles fuels treatment and shaded fuel breaks around Paradise, large-scale home hardening/defensible space, headwaters and riparian restoration, and biomass/biochar facilities using hazardous fuels. Illustrative figures: ~USD 350M capex; ~USD 70M/year avoided EAL by Year 10; ~2.1x benefit-cost ratio; with a stylized stack spanning OB tranches, utility/water contributions, resilience-linked insurance participation, local inputs and catalytic first-loss/guarantee capital.

Appendix B - Placer County: Headwaters + water-agency archetype (illustrative)

A Placer portfolio emphasizes headwaters restoration across key catchments, WUI treatments and hardening along the I-80 corridor/Tahoe communities, biomass/biochar investments, and preparedness. Illustrative figures: ~USD 280M capex; ~USD 50M/year avoided EAL by Year 10; ~2.0x benefit-cost ratio; with a larger share allocated to water-sector beneficiaries alongside OB tranches, utility payments and catalytic capital.

Appendix C - Metro-adjacent WUI belts archetype (illustrative)

Metro-adjacent WUI clusters combine targeted fuels treatment and defensible space, community-wide hardening standards, and strategic grid hardening and undergrounding aligned with wildfire-mitigation planning. Illustrative results suggest modest per-cluster capital expenditure can yield high benefit-cost ratios where high-value property and infrastructure losses are avoided; these archetypes are especially relevant to stabilizing insurance availability and reducing pressure on the FAIR Plan, the Wildfire Fund and ratepayers.