

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Chapter 1 : Kansas Rural Water Association > ONLINE RESOURCES > News Article

Water Resource Investment and the Public Interest. An analysis of federal expenditures in ten Southern states. An analysis of federal expenditures in ten Southern states. Robert H. Haveman.

Readings will be transmitted hourly to monitor usage and alert the utility department if a leak is suspected. They have been in service for 15 to 20 years and have reached the end of their use, he said. The new meters have a year battery life. The contaminants include total coliform bacteria and nitrate. The campaign includes a flyer, public service announcement, web page and social media messaging. One of the selected projects in Kansas is for the City of Frontenac, which proposes a new well, water treatment facility upgrades, water distribution system improvements, elevated water storage tank improvements, and a new, gallon elevated water storage tank. It also increases water supply redundancy, water storage for firefighting and supply to customers, and the useful life of the entire water system. The proposed facility will be a greenfield water treatment plant to serve the City of Wichita and surrounding communities, industries, and wholesale customers. The new plant will provide million gallons per day MGD of firm capacity and will replace the existing, aging Main Water Treatment Plant. The purpose of the project is to replace aging infrastructure to provide reliable delivery of drinking water from a diversified water supply portfolio. These loans will allow large and small communities across the country to implement projects to address two national water priorities – providing for clean and safe drinking water including reducing exposure to lead and other contaminants and addressing aging water infrastructure. The 39 selected projects are from 62 letters of interest submitted by prospective borrowers for water infrastructure projects across the country that were submitted to EPA earlier this year. Before the new map is finalized, property owners and lessees are being allowed one last opportunity to provide engineering data through their community during the official day appeal process. The appeal period began Sept. The new map will provide communities with up-to-date flood risk information and tools that can be used to enhance local mitigation plans, and help local officials and residents make informed decisions about reducing flood risks and purchasing flood insurance. Only mapping within the City of Augusta levee analysis area and the City of El Dorado levee analysis area is being updated at this time. The local mapping project is part of a nationwide effort led by the Federal Emergency Management Agency to increase local knowledge of flood risks and to support actions to address and reduce those risks. Community officials encourage property owners and lessees to view the proposed Flood Insurance Rate Map to learn about local flood risks and potential future flood insurance requirements. Though some complain that the tradition is an invasion of privacy, most say it has helped the country resist the trend toward growing inequality that has crept across the rest of Europe. Transparency may or may not reduce inequality, but does tend to make people less satisfied, several concluded. A study of faculty members at the University of California, where pay was made accessible online in, found that lower-earning workers, after learning how their pay stacked up, were less happy in their job and more likely to look for a new one.

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Chapter 2 : Principles for New Federal Infrastructure Investment Policy

Buy Water resource investment and the public interest:: An analysis of Federal expenditures in ten Southern States, on www.nxgvision.com FREE SHIPPING on qualified orders.

More fundamentally, what environmental factors have changed so dramatically as to make privatization the preferred alternative? In other words, what is the environmental rationale for Bill ? In our view, the problems that led to the creation of OCWA have not been eliminated or significantly reduced, and they are unlikely to be eliminated or significantly reduced under the era of privatization that will inevitably result under Bill. Recently, for example, outbreaks of cryptosporidium have threatened the drinking water of Ontario residents. The Ministry of Environment and Energy [should] assess the needs of approximately 40 surface water treatment plants in Ontario which are potentially vulnerable to cryptosporidium. For plants which are most vulnerable, planning for the installation of filtration should proceed, unless it can be demonstrated to be unnecessary. The Ministry of Environment and Energy and the Ministry of Health should also consider installing cryptosporidium detection methods at the most vulnerable plants to provide early warning of a breakout. There are many examples of poor land use planning across Ontario where groundwater and surface water contamination has resulted from inappropriate development. Under the current land use planning regime, these problems are likely to continue unabated. Transferring OCWA assets to municipalities, and then permitting municipalities to privatize any and all water and sewage services, is a fundamentally flawed and ill-timed proposal that will not translate into enhanced environmental protection or improved water or energy conservation. Other Ontario municipalities are said to be considering various privatization options, and there appears to be growing private interest in acquiring OCWA itself. A number of these corporations already have large U. For example, the rapid influx of numerous new private players will undoubtedly lead to the fragmentation of the water services industry, which underscores the need for an independent public regulator, as described below. In addition, if multinational corporations are successful bidders on water and sewage services, then it appears likely that Ontario water and sewage rates will be determined abroad by foreign directors whose primary interest is maximizing profits and shareholder dividends. Similarly, having regard for the British privatization debacle, it also appears likely that Ontario water and sewer revenues will be siphoned abroad for other purposes, rather than be re-invested into infrastructure maintenance and improvements in Ontario. These are fundamentally important issues that cannot be ignored as Bill proceeds through the legislative process. One publication recently described the Ontario situation as follows: The move will give municipalities greater freedom to attract private-sector involvement in water supply and distribution systems. Formal transfer of ownership will occur when provincial loans used to build the plants are repaid. In addition, environment minister Norm Sterling said the province plans to halt loans and grants to finance construction of water plants, except in areas with unusually low assessment rates. The only apparent restriction on selling off water and sewage facilities is the requirement to repay any provincial capital grants received for the facility since. In essence, all this provision really does is establish the price tag for water and sewage facilities. This also means that only the largest companies will be able to acquire the facilities, which increases the likelihood of private sector monopolies controlling water and sewage services in many areas. Inexplicably, only the face value of the provincial grants will have to be paid back -- no interest is payable. A number of well-documented problems have been experienced in Britain under the privatization regime, including: Not surprisingly, the problems and excesses of the British privatization regime has provoked considerable public outrage and prompted calls for a return to public delivery of water and sewage services. Similarly, in Ontario, there is very little public support for the privatization of water services. The same poll revealed that an overwhelming majority of Ontarians want water services delivered on a non-profit basis, with surplus revenues being dedicated for improvements to water services. Once this export "tap" has been turned on, the Free Trade Agreement requires the continued supply of this "commodity" to south of the border, even if water

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

shortages occur within Canada. In summary, the Bill regime does not merely change the title or ownership of water and sewage facilities in Ontario. Privatization is not simply a change of ownership. It is a change in the role, responsibilities, priorities and authority of the state. The current Minister of Environment and Energy has indicated that if a sell-off were to occur, the province would still maintain and enforce "rigid" water quality standards. Accordingly, CELA and GLU have no confidence that violations of provincial standards by municipal or private operators will be met with effective and timely investigation and enforcement activities by MOEE staff. However, if privatization is not going to be expressly prohibited by Bill , then CELA and GLU strongly submit that Bill must provide for the creation of a new, independent regulator of water and sewage services in Ontario. This streamlined agency, composed of provincially appointed members representing broad sectoral interests including public interest groups , must be given adequate supervisory, approvals, and regulatory powers over a variety of matters, such as: It is noteworthy that in several other environmentally significant industries, the centrepiece of the legislative framework is an independent regulatory body. At the federal level, for example, the National Energy Board generally regulates intraprovincial and international energy exports and related activities. Even in Britain, when water services were privatized, a public sector agency -- the Office of Water Supplies -- was established to regulate water prices. If Bill proceeds without the creation of an independent regulator, then Ontarians will be virtually powerless against the private water and sewer monopolies that are likely to result under Bill Consumers of water and sewer services do not generally enjoy the option of switching to a competitor, or not using the "product" at all. Water, for example, is a basic daily requirement for the health and safety of all persons, and is therefore distinguishable from other commodities or natural resources. In the opinion of CELA and GLU, there is a clear and compelling need for an independent public regulator to safeguard against profiteering on water and sewage services, to require water conservation programs and demand management strategies, and, perhaps most importantly, to ensure that Ontarians enjoy clean and safe drinking water. The Ontario government should immediately withdraw Bill unless the legislation is substantially amended. The nature and scope of the necessary amendments to Bill are outlined below in our detailed review of Bill First, Bill contains no express prohibition against the privatization of water and sewage services in Ontario. CELA and GLU are strongly opposed to the privatization of such services, particularly in light of the questionable privatization track record in Britain and other jurisdictions. If the Ontario government is truly committed to the concept of "public ownership" of such services, then Bill must be amended to include an express prohibition against the privatization of water and sewage facilities, infrastructure and services in Ontario. If Bill proceeds, it must be amended to include an express prohibition against the privatization of water and sewage facilities, infrastructure or services in Ontario. Second, as described above, Bill makes absolutely no provision for an independent public regulator to safeguard the public interest as water and sewage services are transferred, amalgamated, and ultimately privatized. Therefore, if Bill proceeds in a form that does not prohibit privatization, then it must be amended to include provisions establishing an effective, efficient and independent public regulator. If Bill proceeds, it must be amended to include provisions establishing an effective, efficient and independent regulator of water and sewage undertakings in Ontario. Third, Bill fails to enact or entrench the essential elements of the long-overdue Safe Drinking Water Act. Such legislation has long been advocated by public interest groups[23] in Ontario, and would include the following components: In the opinion of CELA and GLU, the need for safe drinking water legislation does not depend on the outcome of the current privatization debate. Regardless of whether water services are under public or private control, Ontarians deserve tough drinking water laws and regulations as opposed to unenforceable "objectives" or "guidelines" to ensure safe and adequate supplies of clean drinking water. Nevertheless, the seemingly imminent arrival of privatized water and sewage services in Ontario makes it an even greater priority to pass safe drinking water legislation to enhance the accountability of private operators if and when problems arise. In short, the province must act now to ensure that drinking water is protected at the point of consumption. If Bill proceeds, it must be amended to include or entrench the essential elements of a Safe Drinking Water Act

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

in order to ensure that Ontarians enjoy safe and adequate supplies of clean drinking water. Fourth, Bill fails to require electoral assent to the proposed privatization of municipally owned facilities or infrastructure. This important accountability mechanism was repealed under the Bill 26 reforms discussed above. In the opinion of CELA and GLU, a proposal to dissolve a public utility in order to privatize municipal water and sewage facilities is a fundamentally important matter with profound implications for all ratepayers and consumers of such services within a municipality. If Bill proceeds, it must be amended to restore the previous statutory requirements under the Public Utilities Act and Municipal Franchises Act regarding electoral assent to proposals to dissolve or establish utilities providing water or sewage services, or to privatize municipal facilities, infrastructure or services respecting water and sewage. Fifth, Bill does not require "full cost accounting" or even traditional cost-benefit analysis when proposals are made to privatize municipal facilities, infrastructure or services. In the opinion of CELA and GLU, full cost accounting principles must be applied to such proposals to ensure that the full range of short-and long-term consequences of privatization are quantified and discussed in an open and public process before final decisions are taken. If Bill proceeds, it must be amended to ensure that proposals to privatize municipal facilities, infrastructure or services are subjected to "full cost accounting" to ensure that the full range of short- and long-term consequences of privatization are quantified and discussed in an open and public process before final decisions are made. The remainder of this section of the brief will focus on the provisions that are included in Bill as drafted. However, section 2 5 prohibits the transfer of certain OCWA liabilities to a municipality. In the view of CELA and GLU, this liability limitation provides further evidence of how the Ontario government hopes to make transfer orders more palatable to municipalities and to any private sector companies waiting in the wings. Second, section 3 of the MWSTA provides that an order which transfers an interest in land from OCWA to a municipality may be registered on title in the appropriate land registry office. Indeed, nothing in Bill appears to constrain the ability of municipalities to sell off any municipally owned water or sewer facility, property or asset. It is the understanding of CELA and GLU that this "free rein" proved to be a serious oversight in Britain, where private companies acquired public utility properties for less than full market value, and then sold the properties at considerable profit for development purposes. Given that in many urban centres in southern Ontario, water and sewage plants occupy large expanses of prime waterfront property, CELA and GLU submit that Bill and MWSTA must be amended to place substantive restrictions on municipal proposals to sell off such lands. For example, the legislation could prohibit municipalities selling such properties for less than the fair market value, as determined by independent real estate appraisals. If Bill proceeds, the Municipal Water and Sewage Transfer Act must be amended so as to place restrictions on proposals to sell, transfer or otherwise dispose of municipally owned lands used for water works or sewage works. Third, section 11 of the MWSTA contains an extremely broad Crown immunity clause that is intended to bar certain civil actions against the Crown and its ministers and public servants. In addition, new section 12 significantly, there is no obligation to repay any federal funds that were received by the municipality, nor is there any obligation to pay interest on the provincial funds that are payable to Ontario. The Minister is to be the sole arbiter of any disputes as to the amount of funds that are to be paid back to the province. In the view of CELA and GLU, the mere requirement to pay back interest-free funds to the province constitutes an inadequate safeguard against privatization. For the reasons stated above, CELA and GLU submit that Bill should contain an express prohibition against privatization, or alternatively, should contain a series of amendments that protect Ontario residents against the undesirable consequences of rampant and unregulated privatization. In unorganized territories, this responsibility is transferred from the MOEE to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, an agency that is not generally known for its sewage system expertise. In general, Part VIII sewage systems include septic tanks, small private sewage works, and other systems that do not discharge effluent directly into watercourses. The precise number of Part VIII systems across Ontario is not known, but it has been estimated that there may be over one million such systems located throughout the province. For example, the Commission on Planning and Development Reform in Ontario found that there "is increasing evidence of contamination of both ground

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

and surface water" from septic systems. The Commission also referred to regional MOEE studies that showed one-third of septic systems were designed below standards, and one-third were classifiable as a public health nuisance. The Commission recommends that: The MOEE continue to be responsible for inspections and the issuance of permits for private and communal systems, for setting standards for installation and operation, and for licencing septic haulers and septage haulers. The MOEE be responsible for regular inspection of private and communal septic systems every five years. Unfortunately, no such safeguard exists in section 3.4 of Bill , which simply imposes regulatory responsibility for sections 76 to 79 of the EPA upon all local municipalities, regardless of whether individual municipalities are willing, able or equipped to properly carry out these new duties. In the opinion of CELA and GLU, it is completely unacceptable for the MOEE to simply confine its role to promulgating provincial standards, while leaving the critically important matters of implementation and enforcement of standards up to the vagaries of local municipal budgets, staffing, and priorities. However, there is no reason or evidence to believe that enforcement activities are going to materially improve under the new regime contemplated by section 3 of Bill. While this arrangement has produced acceptable results in some jurisdictions, it has produced mixed results in others, underscoring the need for a continuing provincial role in inspections and approvals, as opposed to a wholesale devolution of such responsibility to every municipality in Ontario. Aside from the practical constraints facing municipalities now burdened with Part VIII responsibilities, it must be recalled that municipalities also enjoy statutory authority under the Planning Act to approve severances and subdivisions that may be serviced by Part VIII systems. In the past, many of these Planning Act approvals were issued without proper regard to whether the new lots were suitable for septic systems, but at least independent MOEE staff could, in theory, catch such problems when assessing applications for Part VIII certificates of approval. However, removing the review and approvals role of MOEE staff, and giving municipalities the concurrent power to issue Part VIII approvals, may only serve to compound this land use planning problem. Finally, it must be noted that with the transfer of Part VIII authority comes considerable legal liability if something goes wrong under the new municipal regime under section 3 of Bill. If Bill proceeds, section 3 must be deleted. Section 4 of Bill amends the Regional Municipalities Act in order to permit the regional municipalities of Haldimand-Norfolk and Sudbury to receive the transfer of authority under section 3 of Bill.

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Chapter 3 : Bill Text - AB Forestry and fire prevention: joint prescribed burning operations: watersheds.

Get this from a library! Water resource investment and the public interest; an analysis of Federal expenditures in ten Southern States,. [Robert H Haveman].

Make communities safer and more resilient What We Believe We strongly believe that well-planned infrastructure projects strengthen communities, boost the economy, and expand opportunity. They also promote a return on the public investment, in contrast with unplanned infrastructure that can waste public funds, damage communities and the environment, and otherwise lead to inefficient growth. Looking across the country and the globe we see that the cities and regions that are thriving are those investing in critical infrastructure such as roads, transit, sidewalks, parks and recreation, water, energy, freight, and communications that connect people and goods to economic and social opportunity. At the same time, we know that a poorly designed infrastructure program can inhibit the shared prosperity, economic growth, and community development that we all seek. In this area of policy, details matter as much as funding. It is essential that investment occur in a wide of array of projects. Funding and investment programs should support not only road development and transportation but also other critical needs, such as water, energy, and communications. Broad flexibility and eligibility will ensure a greater impact and meet local needs. Driven by Local Visions and Strong Regional Planning The vision and values of local residents are best represented and advanced by shifting decision making to local communities and empowering local and regional planning for guiding investments and engaging citizens. Regional planning is at the heart of the federal transportation planning process. Productive federal policy would build on these regional institutions and support good planning. Address Long-term Funding Sustainability New legislation holds the promise of ensuring that federal infrastructure funding is put on a sustainable and predictable path. In spite of important advances in recent transportation legislation, the structural challenges to the federal gas tax and trust fund remain. If a new program is a component of tax reform, it provides a unique opportunity to meet our long-term needs. A thoughtful approach to tax reform can support long-term investment in infrastructure and provide tools to regions and communities that bring prosperity and access to opportunity. Harness Private Sector Investment and Creativity to Advance and Protect the Public Interest There is a clear and important role for private investment in addressing our infrastructure challenges. Public-private partnerships and innovative project finance strategies can be useful and vital tools in infrastructure development; however, such strategies need to recognize that true partnerships include equitable sharing of both risks and benefits. A new infrastructure package should include and expand opportunities for private investment that benefits communities and regions economically, but it must genuinely advance the right projects and the public interest. Policy should ensure that projects without a steady or obvious revenue stream get support, full public transparency is provided, and new tools expand the pool for investment without shifting costs to local communities. There are significant opportunities for communities to spur development associated with and connected to new infrastructure projects. Federal policy should consider the importance of location, help communities fully leverage investments, and connect infrastructure to related issues like housing and economic development. Good policy requires building on existing investments and communities, including support for repair and modernization. Promote Access Transportation infrastructure decisions have often been driven by the desire to promote mobility – often defined as moving people as quickly as possible. While mobility is a consideration, today the needs of access and connection are paramount in ensuring that infrastructure investment provides the biggest benefit to communities and the economy. Moreover, mobility considerations should focus on mobility for people, not just vehicles. Incorporating measures and standards of access to opportunity and connectivity into new infrastructure investment policy is vital. Advance Opportunity for All Too often in our past, infrastructure programs have exacerbated inequality, harmed low-income and minority neighborhoods, imposed disproportionate environmental impacts on vulnerable communities, and failed to advance

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

broad-based prosperity. The legacy of some past infrastructure decisions continues to impose a social cost on many communities. A new program has the opportunity and the obligation to support social equity goals and advance economic and social opportunity for all. This requires robust public engagement and intentional strategies for incorporating equity. Embrace and Support Innovation Recent years have seen the rapid emergence of new transportation technologies and businesses, advanced use of data analytics, and "smart" infrastructure. There seems little doubt that we will see autonomous vehicles and other new technologies implemented soon. These new services, systems, and approaches will place new needs and demands on our infrastructure. Federal policy should foster innovation in design, planning, and implementation of "smart city" tools and fund these new infrastructure demands. Make Communities Safer and More Resilient Communities across the country are focusing on minimizing and avoiding damage from natural disasters. Resilience and mitigation have become essential elements of local planning for infrastructure development. A new federal investment program should support efforts to advance hazard resilience and design safer infrastructure that meets the needs of all users. Safer communities will protect the investment and produce better projects and benefits. However, resilience is more than preparing for disasters. Resilience includes adaptation to changing economic and social structures and physical conditions for which investments in supportive infrastructure can be beneficial and cost effective.

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Chapter 4 : CTWS : Summary for Connecticut Water Service, Inc. - Yahoo Finance

This book applies some criteria of welfare economics to an analysis of public investments in water resource development using the information available for a large number of Corps of Engineers' projects in the 10 Southern states in respect to efficiency in use of resources and regional income redistribution.

Using Business Resources While Ensuring Public Interest Outcomes and Preventing Policy Capture Critical to this debate is the question of how to use business resources toward mutually beneficial outcomes while ensuring that companies act in a manner that aligns with the public interest and that avoids undue influence. Though we see emerging incentives for companies to act in a responsible manner, there are also important and powerful conflicting interests and competing incentives that may lead to perverse and unbalanced outcomes Morrison et al. However, these concerns should not overshadow the need to solve critical water challenges that affect us all. Rather, looking forward, corporate engagement with water issues should be founded upon an appreciation of the potential risks and perverse outcomes to communities, the environment, and others, and the reality that greater due diligence, dialogue, and transparency are essential to success. Following is a list of some of the most salient tensions and barriers to beneficial private sector involvement in water policy and management. Explicitly recognizing these barriers can help us navigate them as we go forward. Similarly, while many companies may seek to implement projects that have public interest outcomes e. Companies are unlikely to be the leading advocates for prioritizing domestic water uses i. For example, the State Water Policy in Rajasthan where Kaladera is located stipulates that water allocations should be prioritized to drinking water, irrigation, power generation, and industry, in that order Department of Water Resources While water uses to meet basic human needs are a clear societal priority and in fact typically represent only a small proportion of water use in a basin , companies may not be inclined to proactively advocate for water management regimes that deprioritize their own water use. Thus, champions of such causes will typically need to come from other segments of society, including explicit government commitment. The potential exists for greenwashing: However, history also shows that some of these drivers, especially those regarding license to operate and brand value, can hinge on the perception of action, rather than genuine action itself. This leaves open the potential for greenwashing initiatives that foster a perception of good practice without any tangible benefits to the public interest. As the issue of water is tackled by a growing number of companies, we are likely to see a growing number of claims of stewardship and industry-led initiatives that serve a corporate social responsibility CSR agenda far more than they do a strategic one. The onus will be on many of the practitioners and NGOs that support corporate water stewardship, as well as on academics and peer businesses, to differentiate between spurious claims and substantive efforts. While many critics will use these examples as straw men to criticize all corporate action on water, the case for validating claims and auditing performance should create stronger accountability and monitoring toward genuine shared outcomes. It should be noted that the maturity and experience level of companies varies a great deal and that even within the same company, responses at basin level differ depending on the local situation. For instance, companies considering long-term business viability will be much more likely to invest in water-use efficiency measures and sustainable water supply than companies seeking to maximize profit in the near term. Likewise, many investors who have a short-term perspective and continue to orient around quarterly earnings statements may find it difficult to fathom the justification for a long-term engagement in water governance in a particular region, when that engagement will only garner positive results over a five-to ten-year time horizon. Even within a company, CSR and Sustainability departments may seek approvals for programs and corollary expenditure based on long-term considerations and planning only to be confronted by unsupportive senior executives and legal departments who are requiring shorter-term returns on investments. Some business models and operational contexts may not offer strong drivers for action A significant number of companies have strong incentives to ensure sustainable access to water in a single location over the long term. These businesses, such as

DOWNLOAD PDF WATER RESOURCE INVESTMENT AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

geographically bound mining or oil and gas companies, typically must operate in particular locations to be economically viable. Furthermore, SMEs may not have the economic means to simply move away from water-stressed settings. Others, however, have greater flexibility in the location of their facilities and supply chain and may not intend to remain in one watershed for long. Such enterprises might be inclined to shift operations and supply chains away from water-challenged areas. As a result, they are less dependent on those regions, and their move perhaps even improves how they are perceived by some key stakeholders.