

Water prices and water values: Applying economics to Texas water management

Sheila Olmstead LBJ School of Public Affairs, UT Austin

Texas Water Summit May 19, 2014



Economists' three basic contributions to water management

- Water pricing
 - Users (municipal, industrial, agricultural) should cover the full opportunity cost of their water consumption.
- Water markets
 - Where the value of water differs among users, mutually beneficial trades make everyone better off.
- Benefit-cost analysis
 - Water supply (e.g., infrastructure) investments should have economic benefits > economic costs.



Water pricing

- In most markets for goods and services prices are signals of:
 - Resource scarcity, and
 - Value in use
- For many reasons (some good, some bad), most water is not traded in markets.
- Water managers *could* set prices to signal both scarcity and value in use, as real market prices would. But water pricing serves many goals, and these are secondary at best.
- Water prices seldom reflect scarcity and economic value in Texas or elsewhere.



When water is scarce, prices are rarely used to curb demand.



Commercial Toilet Retrofit Programs

Install a newhigh-efficiency toilet and stop flushing money down the drain.





Water demand does respond to price changes.

- Industrial water use
 - A 10% increase in the price of water reduces demand by 1-8% in the short run, depending on industry type.
- Residential water use
 - A 10% increase in the price of water reduces demand by 3-4% in the short run, and 6-7% in the long run.
- Agricultural water use
 - A 10% price increase reduces demand by 4-5% (with higher responses where prices are higher, and where water is more scarce).



Prices achieve conservation cost-effectively

- Households, firms and farms decide how to reduce consumption, and by how much.
- Households and firms with different costs and benefits of water use can react differently.
- Water use reductions occur among users with the lowest value for water use.





More importantly, prices determine the allocation of water across sectors.



Different prices (in Texas' case, municipal/industrial prices higher than agriculture), open up a big gap in the value of water used in different sectors.

We're not alone...







Those big differences in water values produce pressure for change.

- Even without a formal market, the gains from trade (or some less appealing re-allocation mechanism) are obvious to some parties.
- Pressure to re-allocate is particularly strong when supplies are most scarce (water shortage, drought).





Do water markets work?

FIGURE 3 Water Transfers by Sector, 1987–2005



Brewer J., Glennon R., Ker A., Libecap G. 2008. Water markets in the West: Prices, trading, and contractual forms. *Economic Inquiry*. 46:91-112.





Finally, benefit-cost analysis...

- State Water Implementation Fund for Texas (SWIFT) will leverage \$2 billion in taxpayer money to help finance projects in the state water plan.
- Large water infrastructure projects tend to have costs that exceed their benefits (they subsidize use in one location, or by one set of users, at the greater expense of others).
- SWIFT (and SWIRFT) should avoid this "pitfall" of western and southwestern water projects
 - Identify "best" projects using rigorous benefit-cost analysis
 - Count reduced instream flows, and/or reduced groundwater levels, on the cost side of the ledger.



Concluding thoughts on water prices, markets, and benefit-cost analysis

- Pricing water at its full opportunity cost "signals" its scarcity, and its value.
- Many other pieces to the puzzle (education, etc.), but these are complements to, not substitutes for, the right price.
- Even with big price (and value) gaps across sectors, markets can maximize the net benefits of a water resource.
- Think like the market would when choosing new infrastructure investments – analyze benefits and costs, and "count" the depreciation of natural capital.



