

This presentation premiered at WaterSmart Innovations

watersmartinnovations.com



RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Effectiveness of Conservation Pricing in Reducing Water Demand – Evidence from Increasing Block Rate Structures



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

Basic Questions to be Addressed

- What impact does the price of water have on the amount of water used?
- What effects do various pricing structures have on the reaction of water users to changes in the price of water?
- Through this link the impact of pricing structures on water use can be evaluated using individual water use and price data.

Impact of the Price of Water on Use

- **The impact of the price of water on use can be evaluated using price elasticity of demand from estimated demand curves**
 - **The price elasticity of demand is a measure of the change in the quantity demanded resulting from a change in price.**
 - **The price elasticity of demand in previous studies have consistently been inelastic, meaning that the percentage change in quantity of water used is less than the percentage increase in price.**

What effects do various pricing structures have on the reaction of water users to the price of water?

- The effect of different water structures can be evaluated using the price elasticity results in a second phase analysis.
- The second phase analysis evaluates the effect of price structures on estimated elasticities. This is called meta-analysis.
- Water bill format characteristics can also be included in the meta-analysis to explain variation in elasticity.

Modeling Water Demand - Data

- **10 Years of data were obtained from 11 suppliers**
 - **Contra Costa Water District**
 - **Eastern Municipal Water District**
 - **Irvine Ranch Water District**
 - **Los Angeles Department of Water and Power**
 - **City of Henderson**
 - **Otay Water District**
 - **East Bay Municipal Utility District**
 - **Las Vegas Water District**
 - **Western Municipal Water District**
 - **Carlsbad Municipal Water District**
 - **San Juan Capistrano**

Modeling Water Demand - Data

- Over 600,000 total observations for single family residences
- Over 150 zip codes represented
- Monthly use per connection
- Customer water rates per unit of use by tier
- Other charges and fees applied to bill
- Days included in billing period
- Service location/Zip Code

Modeling Water Demand

- **Important water demand variables include:**
 - Price of water – Used to estimate elasticity
 - Household income
 - Household size
 - Lot size
 - Size of home and other characteristics of home
 - Climatic variables: precipitation, temperature, ET
 - Seasonality
 - Education level
 - Unemployment
 - Age

Modeling Water Demand

- **Specific variables used in the models**
 - **Water use – Use per household in gallons per day**
 - **Lagged Price of water – Average real price per gallon used from previous billing period**
 - **Real median household income**
 - **Household size**
 - **Average monthly precipitation and temperature**
 - **Annual unemployment rate**
 - **Educational attainment, % with B.S. or higher**

Modeling Water Demand

- **Specific variables used in the models (continued)**
 - Lot size or landscape acreage when available
 - Proxy for lot size, percentage of homes that are detached
 - Seasonality variable – Seasonal sinusoids were used in final models.

Some potential issues in estimating water demand curves and elasticities

- **Increasing block rates**
 - Consumer can influence price through their consumption decision. So, price and quantity can be determined simultaneously.
- **What is the relevant price that consumers react to?**
 - Economic theory says marginal price is the relevant price that influences consumer behavior.
 - However, in the case of municipal and industrial water supplies households may not be well informed about the marginal price and may react to average price or total water bill.

Additional considerations in estimating water demand curves and elasticities

- **Effect of the Recession on water use**
 - Concern that effects from the recession could attribute some change in water use over the 2000 to 2010 period to changes in the price of water
 - Attempt to account for recession by dividing data sets into pre-recession (2000 to 2007) and recession (2008 to 2010) time periods.
 - Importance of the appearance of the water bill on use – What information is reflected and how does it influence behavior?

Summary of modeling results

- Modeling results are presented in the following two slides to show the range of results in terms of elasticities and significance of variables without identifying individual agencies.
- Many different iterations were run with combinations of variables. It should be noted that the individual elasticity estimates were very stable and consistent.
- Income, lot size, also precipitation variables were also consistent.

Summary of modeling results

Elasticity estimate	Adjusted R ² - Measure of explained variance	Precipitation (coefficient sign)	Household size (sign)	Income (sign)
-0.265	.37	(-)	(+)	(+)
-0.433	.35	Not sig	(+)	(+)
-0.839	.39	(-)	(+)	(+)
-0.821	.39	(-)	Not sig	(+)
-0.670	.32	(-)	Not sig	(+)
-0.846	.33	(-)	(+)	(+)
-0.634	.29	(-)	Not sig	(+)
-0.753	.41	(-)	(+)	(+)
-0.229	.28	(-)	(+)	(+)
-0.554	.20	(-)	(+)	(+)
-0.855	.36	(-)	(+)	Not sig

Summary of modeling results

Lot size data available (sign)	Proxy used in place of lot size (sign)	Unemployment (sign)
Yes (+)	NA	(-)
Yes(+)	NA	NA
No	% detached (+)	(-)
Yes(+)	NA	NA
No	% detached (Not sig)	NA
No	% detached (Not sig)	NA
Yes(+)	NA	NA
Yes(+)	NA	(-)
Yes(+)	NA	(-)
Yes(+)	NA	NA
No	% detached (+)	NA

Summary of modeling results

- All of the price elasticities of demand are inelastic (absolute value of coefficient is less than one).
- There is considerable variation in price elasticity of demand.
- Results were very good in terms of expected signs and significance.
- A large portion of variation in quantity of water demanded is not explained by the model (As reflected by R^2). However, equations are statistically significant.

Additional Results

- **Separate models were run for each agency, pre-recession (2000 to 2007) and recession (2008 to 2010) time periods.**
- **Models were compared using a Chow test, can be used to test if coefficients in two different regressions are statistically different. This can be used to test for structural differences between two time periods**

Additional Results - Continued

- **Effect of recession on elasticities**
 - Very mixed results depending on agency.
 - Inconsistent effect of recession on elasticity.
 - In most cases (but not all) there was a significant difference between pre-recession and recession based data models.
 - **Possible reasons for inconsistent results**
 - Recession coincided with other events such as drought, changes in rate structure, other.
 - Water is a relatively small portion, so factors other than recession have a greater influence.

Additional Results - Continued

- **Importance of the appearance of the water bill on use – What information is reflected and how does it influence behavior?**
 - **Two small groups were provided example water bills to evaluate clarity of information on:**
 - Use
 - Price paid
 - Current use relative to historical use
 - Pricing structure
 - **The results were used to provide additional justification for use of average price, lagged water bill, meta-analysis variables.**

Additional Results - Continued

Some results of “focus group” and comments that were made:

- Only 1 person could answer the marginal cost question for all bills (A maximum of five minutes was allowed on each bill, most took much less)
- All but two could answer average cost.
- The tier information was “interesting,” but the total bill was consistently the main focus.
- Having sewer on the bill confused two on total cost.

Summary of modeling results: Meta-Analysis

- **Meta-analysis is a method for quantitatively combining the results of different analyses to find patterns or consistencies that can be generally applied to various situations.**
- **The estimated elasticities from the modeling results shown previously are combined with data representing variables that characterize the various water agencies to evaluate factors that may influence elasticity.**

Summary of modeling results: Meta-Analysis

- **Model estimation:**

Elasticity = f(variables that influence responsiveness to price changes)

- **Variables considered to include in the Meta-analysis:**

- Average cost of water per gallon
- Average water bill
- Median household income
- Number of price tiers and “width” of price tiers
- Service population
- Bill characteristics – From small group evaluation
- Region

Summary of modeling results: Meta-Analysis

$E_d = f(\text{avg bill, service pop, conservation bill, southern area, \#tiers, multi bill})$

- Average bill, significant $+.011645$
- Service population (1,000's) coefficient of $-.000101$ and significant
- Conservation bill type, significant $+.061175$
- # of tiers, highly correlated with average bill (not significant)
- Multiple charges on bill (e.g. sewer included), not significant
- Adjusted $R^2 = .55$

Summary of modeling results: Meta-Analysis

- Some water agencies had changes in pricing structure during period of analysis. These agencies were characterized for longest period of time during analysis.
- The total water bill appears to have the greatest impact on elasticity.
- Number of tiers affects elasticity through the impact on water bill.
- Southern areas have lower elasticity
- Greater service population has lower elasticity

Summary

- Estimated models for the 11 water suppliers evaluated in the analysis indicate the price elasticity of demand is inelastic, but there is considerable variation.
- Estimated elasticities ranged from -0.23 to -0.85.
- The relevant price was lagged average price (real prices were used).
- The primary effect of tiers appears to be the impact on total water bill.