

# Lecture # 19 -- Case #2: Water Pricing

## Case #2: Water Pricing in Akvo

- Goal: To find a water pricing scheme for a small city in a middle-income country.
  - Water is currently subsidized, costing the community money.
  - You have been asked to consider several alternatives for raising the price to reduce the cost to the community.
  - Note that water delivery as features of a natural monopoly
    - There are high fixed costs, so that the average cost of providing water is always falling.
- Current policy
  - All households pay \$0.3/m<sup>3</sup>.
  - From the chart, we see that total demand will be 307,500
  - Use demand curve for each type of household to find consumption for each.
    - Low income:
      - $Q_L = 6.25 - 3.75P$
      - $Q_L = 6.25 - 3.75(0.3) = 5.125$
    - High income:
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5P$
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5(0.3) = 51.25$
  - Note that we can verify total demand as follows.
    - To get total water consumption, note that there are 10,000 low-income households and 5,000 high-income households:
    - Total consumed by low-income households:
      - $10,000 \times 5.125 = 51,250$
    - Total consumed by high-income households:
      - $5,000 \times 51.25 = 256,250$
    - Total consumed:
      - $= 51,250 + 256,250$
      - $= 307,500$
  - Revenue, costs, and profits
    - Total revenue
      - $0.3 \times 307,500 = \$92,250$
    - Total costs
      - $= 0.6 \times 307,500 + 35,000 = \$219,500$
    - Profits = Total revenue – total costs
      - $= \$-127,250$

- Option 1: Marginal cost pricing
  - All households pay  $\$0.6/\text{m}^3$ .
  - From the chart, we see that total demand will be 240,000
  - Use demand curve for each type of household to find consumption for each.
    - Low income:
      - $Q_L = 6.25 - 3.75P$
      - $Q_L = 6.25 - 3.75(0.6) = 4$
    - High income:
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5P$
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5(0.6) = 40$
  - Note that we can verify total demand as follows.
    - To get total water consumption, note that there are 10,000 low-income households and 5,000 high-income households:
    - Total consumed by low-income households:
      - $10,000 \times 4 = 40,000$
    - Total consumed by high-income households:
      - $5,000 \times 40 = 200,000$
    - Total consumed:
      - $= 40,000 + 200,000$
      - $= 240,000$
  - Revenue, costs, and profits
    - Total revenue
      - $0.6 \times 240,000 = \$144,000$
    - Total costs
      - $= 0.6 \times 307,500 + 35,000 = \$179,000$
    - Profits = Total revenue – total costs
      - $= \$-35,000$
    - Note that, since marginal costs are constant, the loss exactly equals the fixed costs.
      - Intuitively, the price charged covers all the variable costs of water provision, but does not cover the fixed cost.

- Option 2: Privatization
  - The privately held firm will maximize profits.
  - Profits are maximized where  $MR = MC$ .
    - Since water provision is a natural monopoly, note that  $MR < P$ .
  - From the table, we cannot find a price where MR exactly equals MC. Thus, we look for the last price where  $MR > MC$ .
    - This is a price of  $\$1.1/m^3$ .
  - From the chart, we see that total demand will be 127,500.
  - Use demand curve for each type of household to find consumption for each.
    - Low income:
      - $Q_L = 6.25 - 3.75P$
      - $Q_L = 6.25 - 3.75(1.1) = 2.125$
    - High income:
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5P$
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5(1.1) = 21.25$
  - Note that we can verify total demand as follows.
    - To get total water consumption, note that there are 10,000 low-income households and 5,000 high-income households:
    - Total consumed by low-income households:
      - $10,000 \times 2.125 = 21,250$
    - Total consumed by high-income households:
      - $5,000 \times 21.25 = 106,250$
    - Total consumed:
      - $= 21,250 + 106,250$
      - $= 127,500$
  - Revenue, costs, and profits
    - Total revenue
      - $1.1 \times 127,500 = \$140,250$
    - Total costs
      - $= 0.6 \times 127,500 + 35,000 = \$111,500$
    - Profits = Total revenue – total costs
      - $= \$28,750$

- Option 3: Break-even pricing
  - To find a price where the water utility breaks even we use average cost pricing.
    - For average cost pricing, we find where price equals average cost.
  - Since there is no price exactly equaling average cost in the chart, we look for the lowest possible price that exceeds average cost.
    - That is, we want any profits to be as small as possible
    - This occurs at a price of  $\$0.8/\text{m}^3$ .
  - From the chart, we see that total demand will be 195,000
  - Use demand curve for each type of household to find consumption for each.
    - Low income:
      - $Q_L = 6.25 - 3.75P$
      - $Q_L = 6.25 - 3.75(0.8) = 3.25$
    - High income:
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5P$
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5(0.8) = 32.5$
  - Note that we can verify total demand as follows.
    - To get total water consumption, note that there are 10,000 low-income households and 5,000 high-income households:
    - Total consumed by low-income households:
      - $10,000 \times 3.25 = 32,500$
    - Total consumed by high-income households:
      - $5,000 \times 32.5 = 162,500$
    - Total consumed:
      - $= 32,500 + 162,500$
      - $= 195,000$
  - Revenue, costs, and profits
    - Total revenue
      - $0.8 \times 195,000 = \$156,000$
    - Total costs
      - $= 0.6 \times 195,000 + 35,000 = \$152,000$
    - Profits = Total revenue – total costs
      - $= \$4,000$

- Option 4: Minimum allotment
  - This policy has multiple goals:
    - Each family must receive at least the 4m<sup>3</sup> of water per month necessary for survival.
    - The water utility must cover all costs on its own, so that the government need not subsidize the utility.
  - Note that none of the other options meet this goal.
    - The only strategies in which low-income families receive at least 4m<sup>3</sup> of water are the current subsidy or marginal cost pricing. Both result in the water utility losing money.
  - Thus, we will need to use some form of price discrimination to meet both goals.
    - We know that demand for low-income families equals the minimum allotment at the marginal cost of \$0.6/m<sup>3</sup>. Thus, low-income families cannot be charged more than this price.
    - However, we also know that if we charge high-income families this same price, the utility will lose money.
      - Thus, high-income families must pay more.
      - Policy options include:
        - Price discrimination using tiered pricing
          - Charging the marginal cost of 0.6/m<sup>3</sup> for the first 4m<sup>3</sup>, and a higher price for anything above that quantity.
          - The higher price should be high enough to allow the utility to at least break even.
        - Price discrimination based on income
          - Charge low-income users the marginal cost, and charge a higher price to high-income families.
        - Two-part tariff
          - Charge users the marginal cost for water, but also include a fixed connection fee that covers the fixed costs.
          - Low-income families could be exempted from this connection fee.

- These options are more complicated to calculate, since they involve different prices for different groups. The most straightforward is the two-part tariff.
  - Since the per-unit charge equals marginal costs, we already know the consumption for each group.
    - Low income:  $4\text{m}^3$
    - High income:  $40\text{m}^3$
    - Profit from marginal cost pricing =  $-\$35,000$
  - Since the marginal cost pricing exactly covers the variable costs of water supply, the connection fee just needs to cover the fixed costs.
    - If we only charge the connection fee to high-income families,  $\$35,000$  must be raised from 5,000 households.
    - Thus, the charge per household is  $\$35,000/5,000 = \$7$ .
  - Note that this assumes high-income consumption doesn't change as a result of the connection fee.
    - This is probably a reasonable assumption. It would change if there were an income effect – if demand fell because household income is lower after the connection fee.
    - However, since the connection fee is small, the income effect is likely negligible.
- Alternatively, we can examine one of the price discrimination options by first calculating the revenue raised from sales at  $0.6/\text{m}^3$  and then finding a price for the remaining demand that satisfies
  - Price discrimination based on income
    - We know that low income users will be charged  $\$0.6/\text{m}^3$  and will consume  $4\text{m}^3$ 
      - Ignoring fixed costs, the utility breaks even on these customers.
    - Thus, we need a price that generates at least  $\$35,000$  of profit from high income consumers in order to break even.
      - As I showed in class, this is easiest to do using a spreadsheet. We can simply try prices until finding one that generates at least  $\$35,000$  of profit based on the variable costs.
  - To do by hand, we know that the price for low-income consumers must be  $\$0.6/\text{m}^3$ . We'll need a high-enough price for high income consumers to cover our losses on this group.
    - That price must be higher than the break-even price of  $\$0.8/\text{m}^3$ . So, begin by trying a price of  $\$0.9/\text{m}^3$  for high income households:
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5P$
      - $Q_H = 62.5 - 37.5(0.9) = 28.75$
    - Now we can get total demand and find total costs that we can verify total demand as follows.



- While this is the same quantity as above, profits will be somewhat different:
  - Total revenue
    - $0.6 \times 40,000 + 0.6 \times 4 \times 5,000 + 0.9 \times 24.75 \times 5000 = \$147,375$
  - Total costs
    - $= 0.6 \times 183,750 + 35,000 = \$145,250$
  - Profits = Total revenue – total costs = \$2,125

- To summarize:

	<b>Current</b>	<b>MC pricing</b>	<b>Privatization</b>	<b>Break-even</b>	<b>Minimum allotment</b>
Price (per m <sup>3</sup> )	0.3	0.6	1.1	0.8	0.6 (low) 0.9(high)
Low-income usage	5.125	4	2.125	3.25	4
High-income usage	51.25	40	21.25	32.5	28.75
Total consumption	307,500	240,000	127,500	195,000	183,750
Total Revenue	92,250	144,000	140,250	156,000	153,375
Total Costs	219,500	179,000	111,500	152,000	145,250
Profit	-127,250	-35,000	28,750	4,000	8,125

NOTE: All consumption data reported in m<sup>3</sup>/month