
Governing the Tap

Special District Governance and the New Local
Politics of Water

Megan Mullin

The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England

© 2009 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information about special quantity discounts, please email
special_sales@mitpress.mit.edu

This book was set in Sabon on 3B2 by Asco Typesetters, Hong Kong. Printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Mullin, Megan, 1973–

Governing the tap : special district governance and the new local politics of water / Megan Mullin.

p. cm. — (American and comparative environmental policy)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-262-01313-0 (hardcover : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-262-51297-8 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Water utilities—United States. 2. Water districts—United States. I. Title.

HD4461.M85 2009

363.6'10973—dc22

2008044250

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Index

Note: A page number followed by a *t* indicates a table, *g* a graph, and *m* a map.

- Accountability
 - institutional design's effect on, 31, 39, 48, 74–79, 183
 - metropolitan reform theory on, 31, 34, 38, 39
 - of private water companies, 18, 19
 - public choice theory on, 8, 34
 - of special district officials, 7–8, 31, 34, 36, 39, 43, 75–79, 184
- ACIR. *See* Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations
- Adams Township dispute, 137–138, 137*m*, 158–160, 172
- Adams Township Water Authority, 138, 158–160, 172
- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), 29–30, 112, 209, 216*n*7
- Agenda 21 (international plan), 190
- Agreements. *See* Contracts and agreements; Cooperative relationships
- Agriculture, 9, 12*g*, 13, 14–15
- Air pollution, 15*g*, 16
- Alabama, 11, 73, 113
- Alameda County, California, 133*m*, 141*t*, 144–146, 147–153, 172
- Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Zone 7), 141*t*, 147–153, 183
- Altshuler, Alan, 82–83, 84
- American River, 134
- American Water Works Association (AWWA), 51, 63–64, 195, 220*n*14, 225–226*n*10
- Annexation. *See also* Boundaries; Boundary flexibility
 - of Dougherty Valley by DSRSD, 147
 - formation of special districts and, 6, 107
 - motivations for, 224–225*n*1
 - relationship to cooperative agreements, 107–111, 115–116, 116*t*, 117*g*, 118–121, 120*t*, 122, 184, 225*n*5, 225*n*9
 - rules on, 111, 112–113, 113*t*
 - as supply/demand mismatch solution, 104, 105–106, 111
- Antigrowth activists
 - benefits of specialized governance to, 151
 - challenges for, 49–50
 - Dougherty Valley dispute, role in, 132, 133*m*, 142, 150
 - East Cocalico dispute, role in, 162
 - increased activity, 185–186
 - moratoria use on connections, 126
 - political conflicts over growth and land use, role in, 185–186
 - Rohnert Park and Sonoma County dispute, role in, 165, 168–169
 - support of impact fees, 84, 85–86

- Antigrowth activists (cont.)
 sustainability policies and, 191
 Tassajara Valley dispute, role in, 132, 133*m*, 153–154, 156–157
- Association of Bay Area Governments
 survey, 92
- Atlanta, Georgia, 18, 19
- At-large elections, 76, 78*g*
- Auburn Dam, 11
- Aurora, Colorado, 176
- Avery v. Midland County*, 218*n*20
- AWWA. *See* American Water Works Association
- Ball v. James*, 31, 217–218*n*20
- Berrenda Mesa Water District, 147, 149
- Berry, William, 58
- Besley, Timothy, 43
- Bexar Metropolitan Water District
 (BexarMet), 109–110, 111, 118, 123–124, 127, 182, 225*n*8
- Bias. *See also* Accountability;
 Responsiveness
 general-purpose venues and, 35, 38
 election rules and, 74–79, 77*g*, 78*g*, 80, 183
 impact fees use and, 82, 88–91, 94–95, 95*g*, 96*g*, 97–102
 increasing block rates use and, 19, 66–67, 69–74, 70*t*, 71*g*, 72*g*, 76, 80
 metropolitan reform theory on, 89
 public choice theory on, 38, 66, 90
 specialized governance and, 19, 38–39, 43–44, 49–51, 66, 89–91, 175
- Black & Veatch surveys, 203
- Bolinas Public Utility District, 125–126
- Bollens, John, 31, 89, 216*n*7
- Bottled water, 215*n*28
- Boundaries. *See also* Annexation
 of cities/counties, 28
 contiguity between special districts/
 city or county, 40*t*, 49, 179*t*, 184
 contiguity requirement, 113–114, 113*t*, 116*t*, 118, 119
 design of, 6, 103, 107, 187, 216*n*5
 motivations for change in, 224–225*n*1
 overlapping areas' advantage to
 developers, 152
 supply/demand mismatch solution
 through changes in, 104, 105–106
- Boundary flexibility. *See also*
 Annexation
 advantages of, 6
 BexarMet expansion, 109–110, 225*n*8
 conditional theory's predictions, 40*t*, 111–112, 179*t*
 developers' exploitation of, 152
 of EBMUD, 132, 143, 144
 of independent special districts, 28
 interest group strategies, effect on, 171, 184–185
 interlocal agreements, effect on, 48–49, 107–122, 116*t*, 117*g*, 117*t*, 120*t*, 183–184, 184, 209–211
 in multiple jurisdictions, problems
 created by, 169–170
 purposes of, 46, 224–225*n*1
 research on, 225*n*9
 rules on, 107–108, 110, 111, 112–113, 115, 117*g*, 120–121, 120*t*
 water/land-use disputes, effect on, 140, 184, 186
- Boundary review commissions, 107
- Bourdeaux, Carolyn, 216*n*7
- Buckhorn Canyon, 134, 144, 145
- Building Industries Association, 145
- Bureaucracies, 29, 39
- Burns, Nancy, 6, 89
- California
 authority over land-use policy in, 131–132
 designation of special districts, 27
 Dougherty Valley dispute, 132–136, 140, 141*t*, 142–153, 146*t*, 170–171, 172, 182, 183
 droughts in, 93, 134, 135–136, 142, 144–145, 182, 183

- geographic data on water districts, 223–224n12
- impact fee levels, 82, 83, 91–95, 95g, 96g, 97–100, 98t
- Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act (1982), 224n15
- Mitigation Fee Act (1987), 92, 224n16
- moratoria on water-service connections in, 125–126
- population increase in, 91, 181, 224n13, 224n19
- Proposition 13, 92
- Proposition 218, 92, 224n14
- Rohnert Park dispute, 133m, 134–136, 163, 164t, 165–169
- special district expenditures in, 5
- State Water Project, 148
- Tassajara Valley dispute, 132–136, 153, 154t, 155–158, 170–171, 172
- water adequacy law, 128, 158, 173
- water/land-use planning integration in, 129g
- water metering in, 58–59
- water pricing strategies in, 221n23
- water shortages in, 10
- water supply management, 11–12
- California Building Industry Association survey, 92
- California Environmental Quality Act, 131
- California Statewide Database (SWDB), 204
- Caps on water-service connections, 10, 81, 84–87, 125–127, 177
- Case studies
- Adams Township dispute, 137–138, 137m, 158–160, 172
 - California impact fees, 91–94
 - Dougherty Valley dispute, 132–134, 133m, 140, 141t, 142–153, 146t, 155, 156, 157, 158, 167–168, 170–171, 172, 182, 226n6, 227n10
 - East Cocalico Township dispute, 137m, 138–139, 161–162, 171, 172
 - Rohnert Park dispute, 133m, 134–136, 163, 164t, 165–169, 173
 - Tassajara Valley dispute, 132–134, 133m, 150, 151, 153, 154t, 155–158, 167–168, 170–171, 172, 173
- Census of the Governments* (U.S. Census Bureau), 3, 51, 52t, 53, 196, 203, 209
- Citizens for Balanced Growth, 150
- City government. *See* Local governments
- City incorporation, 7
- Climate
- cooperative relationships, effect on, 116t, 120
 - election rules and, 78g
 - global climate change, 10, 23, 80, 192–193
 - impact fees adoption and, 93, 98t, 99, 224n21
 - increasing block rates adoption and, 67, 69–72, 70t, 77–78, 77g, 78g, 79, 80
 - institutional design, effect on, 53
 - responsiveness, effect on, 180
 - mismatch problem solution, effect on, 115
 - as water supply/use predictor, 69
- Climate Diagnostics Center, 204
- Coate, Stephen, 43
- Collective action problems, 16, 30–33, 48, 50, 218n27
- Colorado River, 11, 192
- Columbia River, 192
- Commercial water consumption, 12g
- Conditional theory of specialized governance
- assumptions of, 8–9
 - on boundary contiguity's effects, 40t, 49, 171, 179t, 184
 - on boundary flexibility's effects, 40t, 48–49, 112–116, 113t, 116t, 117g, 118–122, 120t, 179t, 183–184
 - on election rules' effects, 40t, 44, 48, 75–79, 77g, 78g, 179t, 183
 - implications of, 184–189

- Conditional theory of specialized governance (cont.)
 on problem severity's effects, 9, 40t, 41–46, 44t, 48, 67, 69–74, 70g, 71g, 72g, 77–79, 77g, 78g, 80, 91, 93, 97–99, 179t, 180–182
 reconciliation of theories, 2, 23, 25–26, 38–39, 41
 support for, 178, 179t, 180–183
 test on adoption of increasing block rates, 40t, 67, 70–80, 70t, 71g, 72g, 77g, 78, 80
 test on use of impact fees, 82, 90–91, 94–95, 95g, 96g
- Connection fees, 149, 222n1
- Conservation rates. *See* Increasing block rates
- Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors, 140, 151, 152
- Contra Costa County disputes (California), 173. *See also* Dougherty Valley dispute; Tassajara Valley dispute
- Contracts and agreements. *See also* Cooperative relationships
 benefits of, 16, 46–47
 between BexarMet and SAWS, 109–110
 as land-use/water dispute solution, 139–140
 metropolitan reform theory on, 31
 motivations for, 225n2, 225n5, 225n6
 opportunities for, 114–115
 public choice theory on, 35
 relationship to boundary flexibility, 48–49, 107–122, 116t, 117g, 120t, 184
 as supply/demand mismatch solution, 104–105, 106–107, 111–112, 121
 for water supply management, 16–17, 19
- Cooperative relationships. *See also* Contracts and agreements
 annexation/boundary flexibility and, 48–49, 107–122, 116t, 117g, 120t, 122, 184, 225n5, 225n6, 225n9
 benefits of, 18, 19, 46–48, 49, 191
 between BexarMet and SAWS, 109–110
 complications in systems of specialized governance, 169–173, 186–188
 conditional theory on, 26, 40t, 46–49, 179t, 183–184
 to cope with effects of global climate change, 193
 costs of, 47–48
 in growth planning, 86, 89–90, 101–102, 147, 223n10
 metropolitan reform theory on, 32, 38
 opportunities for, 114–115
 in Pennsylvania, 136–137
 political insulation and, 218n28
 prior appropriation doctrine and, 13
 public choice theory on, 35
 as supply/demand mismatch solution, 104–105, 106–107, 111–112, 121
 for sustainability, 191
- Coordinated planning, 86. *See also* Contracts and agreements; Cooperative relationships
- Cotati, California, 165, 167
- County government. *See* Local governments
- Dahl, Robert, 217n12
- Dams
 consequences of, 17
 construction of, 10–11
 environmentalists' opposition to, 135, 165–168, 175
 removal of, 11, 12
- Danville, California, 157
- Declining block rates, 58, 59, 60, 60g, 62, 64, 221nn22–23
- Demand-side policies, 2–3, 14–16, 176–177. *See also* Caps on water-service connections; Impact fees; Increasing block rates; Moratoria on

- water-service connections; Pricing strategies
- Department of Water and Power (Los Angeles), 37, 62, 220n12
- Dependent districts, 26–27, 29, 168–169, 213n1
- Desalination plants, 175, 176
- Developers
 - benefit of water adequacy laws for, 128
 - benefits from biased system, 49–50
 - domination of general-purpose venues, 180, 183, 185, 186
 - domination of special districts, 36–37, 38, 50, 66, 89–90, 100, 180, 185, 186
 - Dougherty Valley dispute, 132–134, 133*m*, 140, 141*t*, 142–147, 146*t*, 152, 167–168
 - goals for water supplies, 130
 - identification/payment for new water sources, 127
 - impact fees and, 81, 83–84, 87, 88, 90, 92–93, 99, 100, 101
 - increasing block rates and, 65
 - opposition to (*see* Antigrowth activists)
 - Rohnert Park dispute, 163–169, 164*t*
 - special district formation, 6–7, 52, 89, 186
 - Tassajara Valley dispute, 132–134, 133*m*, 154*t*, 155–158, 167–168
- Development. *See* Growth and development
- Development fees. *See* Connection fees; Impact fees; Land-use exactions
- Dillon's Rule, 213n2
- Doig, Jameson, 218n28
- Domestic water consumption, 12*g*, 14
- Dougherty Valley dispute
 - EBMUD and, 140, 141*t*, 142–147, 146*t*, 149, 150, 151–152, 183
 - impact on Tassajara Valley project, 155, 156, 157
 - issue salience/problem severity in, 144, 145–146, 149, 151–152, 172, 182, 183
 - legislation requiring consideration of water availability, 226n6
 - location, 133*m*
 - specialized governance's effect on, 167–168, 170–171
 - Zone 7 and, 141*t*, 147–153, 183
- Drinking water policy. *See* Connection fees; Impact fees; New local politics of water; Pricing strategies; Sustainability policies
- Droughts
 - adoption of increasing block rates during, 62
 - in California, 93, 134, 135–136, 142, 144–145, 148, 182, 183
 - global climate change and, 192
 - impact fees use, effect on, 94, 224n22
 - moratoria on water-service connections during, 126
 - preparation for and water adequacy laws, 128
 - in San Antonio area, 123
 - in Southwest, 73
 - water demand variations due to, 225n3
 - water shortages during, 9, 10
- DSRSD. *See* Dublin San Ramon Services District
- Dublin, California, 147, 149
- Dublin San Ramon Services District (DSRSD), 140, 147, 149–150, 151, 152, 153
- East Bay disputes. *See* Dougherty Valley dispute; Tassajara Valley dispute
- East Bay Municipal Water District (EBMUD)
 - concerns about water supply adequacy, 134
 - Dougherty Valley dispute, 140, 141*t*, 142–147, 146*t*, 149, 150, 151–152, 183

- East Bay Municipal Water District
(cont.)
effort to consider water availability in
land-use decisions, 226n6
policy on expansion of boundaries,
132
Tassajara Valley dispute, 153, 155–
157
- East Cocalico Planning Commission,
161–162
- East Cocalico Township dispute,
137*m*, 138–139, 161–162, 171, 172
- East Cocalico Water Authority, 161–
162
- Economic efficiency
empirical literature on, 36, 37
impact fees and, 87
public choice theory on, 33–34, 35
through increasing block rates, 23,
61, 64, 78–79
- Edwards Aquifer Authority, 123, 175
- Eel River, 227–228n20
- EIRs. *See* Environmental impact
reports
- Elections
approving UGB, 227n16
for board of EBMUD, 143–144,
145–146, 146*t*, 153, 227n8
for board of SCWA, 169
for board of Zone 7, 148
conditional theory on, 40*t*, 42–44
metropolitan reform theory on, 38
public choice theory on, 34–35, 38
of special district officials, 31, 32, 75,
76, 77*g*, 179*t*
ward vs. at-large, 75, 76, 78, 78*g*,
222n31
- Electricity pricing plans, 59
- EMBUD. *See* East Bay Municipal
Water District
- Endangered species, 16, 123
- Environmental impact reports (EIRs)
California requirement for develop-
ment, 131–132
for Dougherty Valley project, 140,
142, 143, 149
for Tassajara Valley project, 153,
155–156, 157
- Environmentalists
Dougherty Valley dispute and, 133,
143–146, 148, 150, 152
impact fees, support for, 84, 100
increasing block rates, support for,
55
in Rohnert Park, 165
in Sonoma County, 134, 135–136
Tassajara Valley dispute and, 133,
156–157
voter support for development,
influence on, 228n21
water supplies goals, 17, 130, 177
water use restrictions and, 16
- Environmental Protection Agency. *See*
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency
- Environmental regulation, 11, 59, 60,
80, 175
- Environmental review process, 131–
132, 142, 165, 188
- EPA. *See* U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency
- Erie, Steven, 217n17
- Ernst & Young surveys, 219n6
- Evapotranspiration rates, 192
- Federal government
assistance for large-scale
infrastructure projects, 3, 10–11
cutbacks on funding for local public
services, 83
regulation of endangered species, 16
special district formation, effects on,
6
sustainability policies and, 191–192
water quality/efficiency standards,
14–15, 16, 18
- Fire protection, 5, 44, 56, 57, 218n24
- Flat-fee rate system, 58, 60*g*
- Florida, 10, 11, 12, 73, 86, 175,
224n20
- Fort Collins, Colorado, 62–63
- Foster, Kathryn, 7, 36, 107, 185

- Fragmentation of authority. *See also* Special districts
 accountability/visibility of governing units and, 31
 as collective action problem, 218n27
 cooperative relationships in, 86, 106, 169–173, 178
 debate over, 30, 100
 impact fees use, effect on, 82
 land-use issues and, 88–89, 124–125, 131–136, 133*m*, 140, 141*t*, 142–153, 146*t*, 154*t*, 155–162, 226n6, 227n10
 local water review processes, effect on, 128
 metropolitan reform theory on, 31, 38
 negative externalities due to, 32, 178
 public choice theory on, 33–35
 sustainability initiatives and, 191
 water/land-use planning integration and, 128–130, 129*g*
- Fresno, California, 58
- Functional specialization. *See* Special districts; Water districts
- GAO. *See* U.S. Government Accountability Office
- General-purpose venues. *See also* Federal government; Local governments; State governments
 ability to address complex problems, 45
 access to officials, 35, 66, 79
 adoption of increasing block rates, 62–63, 66, 69–74, 70*t*, 71*g*, 72*g*, 78–79, 78*g*, 80
 annexation by, 105–106
 coordination with special districts, 88, 89, 101–102
 developer domination of, 49–50, 180, 183, 185, 186
 impact fees use, 82, 90, 94–95, 95*g*, 96*g*, 97–100, 98*t*, 100–101
 responsiveness of, 39, 42–45, 44*g*, 45, 183
 ward vs. at-large elections, effect of, 76–77, 78, 78*g*
 water/land-use planning integration and, 124, 128–130, 129*g*, 159, 163–169, 164*t*
- Georgia, 11, 18, 19, 73
- Gerber, Elisabeth, 228n21
- Gleick, Peter H., 17
- Global climate change, 10, 23, 80, 192–193
- Global Water Partnership, 17
- Gómez-Ibáñez, José, 82–83, 84
- Government Accountability Office. *See* U.S. Government Accountability Office
- Great Lakes, 11, 192
- Greenhouse-gas emissions, 192
- Groundwater aquifers
 aquifer storage and recovery projects, 176
 depletion of, 72–73, 80, 175
 development of cooperative institutions for management of, 16–17
 overdrafting of, 10, 14, 36, 104–105, 215n28
 regulation of extraction from, 13–14
 as source of public water, 12*g*
- Growth and development
 Adams Township dispute, 137–138, 137*m*, 158–160
 in California, 91, 131–132, 133*m*, 139–140
 cost distribution of, 87–88
 Dougherty Valley dispute, 132–134, 133*m*, 140, 141*t*, 142–153, 146*t*, 226n6, 227n10
 East Cocalico Township dispute, 137*m*, 138–139, 161–162
 environmentalists' opposition to, 133, 135–136, 143–146, 148, 150, 152, 156–157, 167–168, 177, 228n21
 impact fees and, 57, 81, 82, 84–87, 93, 94–95, 95*g*, 97–99, 181
 measurement of, 92–93

- Growth and development (cont.)
 metropolitan reform theory on, 36–37
 moratoria/restrictions on water-service connections and, 81, 125–126, 127, 177
 opposition to, 82, 83–84, 90, 185–186
 in Pennsylvania, 136–137, 137*m*, 139–140
 relationship to water policy, 18, 23, 44–45, 105, 123–124, 177, 182 (*see also* Impact fees)
 Rohnert Park dispute, 133*m*, 134–136, 163, 164*t*, 165–169
 special districts' effect on, 36–37, 180, 185, 217*n*12
 special districts' role in planning/management of, 1, 88–89
 supply/demand mismatch from, 103, 105
 sustainability policies and, 190, 191
 Tassajara Valley dispute, 132–134, 133*m*, 153, 154*t*, 155–158
 water systems, effect on, 82, 85
- Growth machine, 49–50, 90, 180, 183, 185, 186. *See also* Developers
- Growth policy. *See* Connection fees; Environmental impact reports (EIRs); Impact fees; Land-use exactions; Land-use management; Moratoria on water-service connections; Urban-growth boundaries (UGBs); Water adequacy laws
- Hanak, Ellen, 93
 Heikkila, Tanya, 218*n*21
 Hooghe, Liesbet, 107
 Houston, Texas, 10, 36, 37, 72–73
- Impact fees
 benefits of, 100
 in California, 91–92
 climate's effect on, 99
 definition of, 222*n*1
 disadvantages of, 87
 empirical literature on, 86–87, 223*n*7
 as form of growth policy, 81, 84–87, 100–101, 181, 223*n*4
 income's effect on, 99
 influence of governing structure on use of, 91–95, 95*g*, 96*g*, 97–102, 98*t*
 intergovernmental coordination and, 86, 88–89, 101–102
 legislation regulating use of, 224*n*16
 motivations for, 23, 82–84, 85, 86, 219*n*3
 opposition to, 84, 87, 88, 90, 99, 100
 relationship to growth and development, 93, 94–95, 95*g*, 96*g*, 97–99
 reliance on, 87–88
- Increasing block rates
 adoption of, 60, 64, 177, 221*nn*22–23
 climate's effect on adoption of, 69–71, 70*t*, 77*g*, 78–79, 78*g*
 determining rates by income, 65, 220*n*11
 election rules' effect on adoption of, 74–79, 77*g*, 78*g*, 80, 222*n*31
 as inducement to conservation, 23, 55, 57, 61, 64, 80, 220*n*8, 221*n*15
 opposition to, 57–58, 59, 62–63, 64, 65–66, 180, 220*n*12, 220*n*13
 public benefits of, 23, 55, 58, 61–62, 64–65, 78–79, 219–220*n*7
 revenue variability, 61
 specialized governance's effect on adoption of, 66–74, 70*t*, 71*g*, 72*g*, 195–198, 199*t*, 200–201
- Indianapolis, Indiana, 18
 Institutions, 39, 41
 Intergovernmental coordination. *See* Cooperative relationships
 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 192
 Interlocal cooperation. *See* Contracts and agreements; Cooperative relationships

- Inverted rates. *See* Increasing block rates
- Ipswich River, 10
- Irrigation, 9, 12g, 14, 15, 56, 176
- Isett, Kimberly, 218n21
- Issue bundling, 43–44, 76
- Issue salience
- in Dougherty Valley dispute, 144, 145–146, 149, 151–152, 172, 182, 183
 - general-purpose governments' response to, 183
 - increasing block rates adoption, effect on, 67, 73–74
 - land-use disputes and, 134, 138, 172
 - in Pennsylvania disputes, 172, 182
 - problem severity and, 42, 69, 181–183
 - public good provisions, effect on, 71–74
 - public opinion measures of, 218nn22–23
 - responsiveness, effect on, 42–45, 180, 183
 - special districts' response to, 183
 - water/land-use disputes, effect on, 140
- Jones, Victor, 32, 89
- Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, 137m, 138–139, 161–162
- Land-use disputes. *See* Growth and development
- Land-use exactions, 81, 83, 84–87, 92, 223n9. *See also* Impact fees
- Land-use management. *See also* Growth and development; Impact fees; Land-use exactions; specific dispute over development
- impact fees and, 81–82, 84–87, 100–101, 180–181
 - influence on growth and development, 23
 - integration with water planning, 125–130, 176, 180, 226n6
 - opportunities for public involvement in, 131, 182, 183, 184
 - policy spillovers and, 32
 - relationship to water supply, 16, 19, 44–45, 127, 175
 - restrictions on building or new connections, 10, 81, 85, 125–126, 177
 - voter impact on, 228n21
- Lifeline plans, 62, 220n14
- Lin, Ben, 216n7
- Livermore, California, 148, 150–151
- Local governments. *See also* Cooperative relationships; General-purpose venues; Growth and development; Land-use management
- annexation rules, 113, 113t
 - authority of, 213n2
 - authority over land-use management, 88, 90
 - constraints on, 41–42
 - functions/boundaries of, 28, 29
 - numbers of, 4
 - utility service area expansion, 105–106
- Logrolling, 25, 43
- Los Angeles, California, 37, 62, 220n12
- Marks, Gary, 107
- Mead, Lake, 10
- Metering, 57, 58–59, 173, 176
- Metropolitan reform theory, 30–33, 35–37, 38–39, 48, 89, 183
- Metropolitan Water District (California), 37, 217n17
- Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 18
- Moratoria on water-service connections, 10, 81, 85, 125–126, 177
- National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), 196, 204
- National Research Council Water Science and Technology Board, 215n23

- NCDC. *See* National Climatic Data Center
- New local politics of water, 2–3, 9, 18–19, 51, 67, 85, 127, 175, 177, 178, 189–193
- New regionalism, 33
- New York, 4, 5, 193
- North Carolina, 10, 11
- OECD. *See* Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
- Ogallala Aquifer, 192
- Orange County Water District (California), 175
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 219n4
- Orme, Tennessee, 10
- Ostrom, Elinor, 107
- Pacific Institute, 17
- Palmer Hydrological Drought Index (PHDI), 205
- Peiser, Richard, 216n7
- Penngrove, California, 165–166, 167, 168
- Pennsylvania
- Adams Township dispute, 137–138, 137*m*, 158–160, 182
 - East Cocalico Township dispute, 137*m*, 138–139, 161–162
 - Municipalities Planning Code, 136
 - special district expenditures in, 5
 - special district governance in, 27, 172
 - state oversight of planning activities, 136–137
 - water issue salience in, 172, 182
 - water supplies distribution in, 173
- Peterson, Paul, 50
- PHDI. *See* Palmer Hydrological Drought Index
- Phillips, Justin, 228n21
- Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 137
- Pleasanton, California, 148, 227n10
- Polycentrists, 30, 33–35
- Population growth/redistribution. *See also* Growth and development in California, 91, 132, 135
- cooperative relationships, effect on, 116*t*
 - demand/capacity mismatch and, 10, 103, 115, 175
 - depopulation, 103–104
 - impact fees, effect on, 94–95, 95*g*, 96*g*, 97
 - in Pennsylvania, 136, 137
 - impact fee use, promotion of, 86–87
 - rate structure and, 228n3 (app. 1)
 - in San Antonio, 123
- Porter, Douglas, 216n7
- Potomac River, 11
- Power plants, 12*g*, 13
- Prairie Waters Project, 176
- Precipitation. *See* Climate
- Pricing strategies
- for agricultural water supplies, 219n2
 - as conservation approach, 57, 221n15
 - declining block rate, 58, 59, 60, 60*g*, 62, 64, 221nn22–23
 - flat-fee system, 58, 60*g*
 - impact fees, 23, 81–84
 - increasing block rate, 23, 58, 60–65, 60*g*, 80, 180, 220nn7–8, 220nn11–13
 - lifeline rates, 62, 220n14
 - as policy instrument, 55, 57–58, 219nn2–3
 - price increases, 219n4
 - redistribution of income through, 23, 55, 57, 61, 62, 65
 - uniform rate, 58, 59, 60, 60*g*
- Prior appropriation doctrine, 13
- Private goods, 56–58
- Private water companies, 18–19, 57, 86, 215n25
- Problem context, 25–26, 46–49, 79, 115, 140. *See also* Issue salience; Problem severity

- Problem severity
 in California, 91
 conditioning effect of, 41–46, 180–183
 in Dougherty Valley dispute, 144–146, 149, 151–152, 172, 182
 cooperative relationships, effect on development of, 48, 116*t*, 171
 global climate change and, 193
 impact fees, effect on, 92, 96*g*, 97–99, 100, 102
 increasing block rates adoption, effect on, 67, 70*t*, 71–74, 71*g*, 72*g*, 77, 80
 interlocal agreements participation, effect on, 119–120
 issue salience and, 181–183
 mismatch problem solution, effect on, 115, 116*t*
 responsiveness, effect on, 9, 40*t*, 42, 44*g*, 45–46, 172, 179*t*, 180, 182–183
 water/land-use disputes, effect on, 140
- Progressive rate structures. *See* Increasing block rates
- Public authorities. *See* Special districts
- Public choice theory, 7–8, 23, 33–35, 36, 38–39, 48, 66–67, 90, 183, 217*n*18
- Public goods, 2, 19, 23, 26, 32, 33, 34, 35, 46, 56–58, 68, 71, 73–74, 79, 80, 87, 180, 183, 185, 191
- Public hearings, 108, 131, 165–166, 226*n*17
- Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act (1978), 59
- Public water supply, 12–14, 12*g*, 14*g*, 15–16, 15*g*, 17, 20, 214*n*13, 214*n*17
- Raftelis surveys, 219*n*6
- Rationing, 61, 176, 221*n*15
- Responsiveness
 conditional theory on, 20, 23, 40*t*, 41–46, 178, 179*t*, 180, 181, 183
 definition of, 49, 217*n*11
 election rules' effect on, 39, 40*t*, 44, 74–79, 77*g*, 78*g*, 80, 179*t*, 183
 empirical literature on, 36, 37
 intergovernmental coordination and, 101–102
 metropolitan reform theory on, 31–32, 34, 38, 39
 new local politics of water and, 3, 18, 19, 49, 51, 178
 of private water companies, 18, 19
 problem severity/issue salience's effect on, 40*t*, 42–43, 45–46, 69–74, 70*t*, 71*g*, 72*g*, 101, 179*t*, 180–182, 222*n*30
 public choice theory on, 2, 8, 34, 38, 39, 66
 specialized governance's effect on, 39, 41–45, 44*g*, 66–67, 69–74, 70*t*, 71*g*, 72*g*, 80, 88–91, 94–95, 95*g*, 96*g*, 97–102, 98*t*, 178, 180, 181, 186
 value of, 188–189
- Restrictions on water use, 10, 16, 17, 93, 189
- Retail water deliveries, 73, 214*n*16
- Revenue bonds, 6–7, 9, 213*n*6
- Richmond v. Shasta Community Services District* (California), 224*n*14
- Riparian doctrine, 13
- Roanoke River, 11
- Rohnert Park dispute, 133*m*, 134–136, 163, 164*t*, 165–169, 173
- Russian River dam, 135, 165, 168
- Sacramento, California, 58–59
- Safe Drinking Water Information System (EPA), 204
- Salience of issues. *See* Issue salience
- Saltwater intrusion, 73
- Salyer Land Company v. Tulane Lake Water Storage District*, 31, 217–218*n*20
- San Antonio, Texas, 109–110, 123

- San Antonio Water System (SAWS), 109–110, 111, 123–124, 175, 226n1
- SAWS. *See* San Antonio Water System
- SCWA. *See* Sonoma County Water Agency
- Sierra Club, 135, 143, 150
- Smith, Robert, 216n7
- Sonoma County dispute, 133*m*, 134–136, 163, 164*t*, 165–169, 173
- Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA), 134, 135, 165, 168, 227–228n20
- South Platte River, 176
- Special districts. *See also* Water districts; specific water district by name
- accountability of, 31, 33, 34, 43, 75–76, 183–184, 185
- appointment of district officials, 31, 32, 38, 39, 48, 75–76, 80, 115, 183
- authority of, 5, 26–28
- boundaries of (*see* Boundaries; Boundary flexibility)
- cooperative relationships (*see* Contracts and agreements; Cooperative relationships)
- defining characteristics, 3, 23–30, 216nn2–3
- dependent vs. independent, 26–27, 29, 168–169, 213n1
- efficiency of, 34, 35, 36, 37, 217n12, 217n15, 217n17
- election of district officials, 31, 32, 34–35, 38, 39, 75, 76, 78, 78*g*, 80, 115, 119, 143–144, 145–146, 146*t*, 148, 153, 169, 227n8
- elimination of, 33, 110–111
- expenditures by, 4, 5–6, 20, 21*m*, 36, 37
- formation of, 6–7, 9, 51–52, 89, 107, 186
- functions of, 1, 2, 3, 4–5, 36–37
- issue expertise, 1, 25, 29, 41, 45, 75, 80
- limitations of, 186
- locations of, 5, 22*m*
- proliferation of, 1, 2, 4, 4*g*, 6
- responsiveness, 31–32, 34, 38, 41–45, 44*g*, 160, 178, 179*t* (*see also* Responsiveness)
- visibility of, 7, 8, 25, 29–30, 31–32, 36, 43–44, 183, 186, 216n7, 218n21, 218n28
- Spillovers, 32, 35, 47, 103, 106, 167, 169–170, 171
- State governments
- assistance for large-scale infrastructure projects, 3, 10–11
- cutbacks on funding for local public services, 83
- regulation of land-use policies, 19, 85
- special district formation and design, effect on, 5, 6, 29, 53, 107–108, 110, 111, 112, 113*t*, 187
- sustainability policies and, 191–192
- water adequacy laws, 127–129
- Stein, Robert, 112, 225n5
- Stockton, California, 18
- Supply-side solutions, 2–3, 10–11, 16, 82, 175–176. *See also* Dams; Desalination plants; Water sources
- Supreme Court, 31, 83, 217–218n20
- Surface water, 12*g*, 13, 80, 98*t*, 100
- Sustainability policies, 18, 189–193
- SWDB. *See* California Statewide Database
- Tampa, Florida, 10, 73, 175
- Tassajara Valley dispute
- Dougherty Valley dispute and, 150, 151
- issue salience/problem severity in, 172
- location, 133*m*
- specialized governance's effect on, 170–171
- Tassajara Valley Property Owners' Association (TVPOA), 153, 154*t*, 155
- Temperatures. *See* Climate
- Teodoro, Manuel, 222n30

- Texas
 BexarMet expansion, 109–110, 111, 123–124, 182
 desalination plants, use of, 175
 Edwards Aquifer Authority establishment, 123
 overtapping of groundwater aquifers, 10, 36, 72–73
 progrowth outlook in, 36–37
 special district expenditures in, 5
 water districts, reliance on, 53
 Thermoelectric power production, 12g, 13, 15
 Tiebout, Charles, 33, 35–37
 Toilet to tap projects, 176
 Tufte, Edward, 217n12
 TVPOA. *See* Tassajara Valley Property Owners' Association
- UGBs. *See* Urban-growth boundaries
 Uniform rates, 58, 59, 60, 60g, 65
 Urban-growth boundaries (UGBs), 135, 138, 140, 163, 227n16
 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 10–11
 U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, 10–11
 U.S. Census Bureau, 3, 27, 51, 52t, 53, 195, 196, 203, 209, 216n2
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 18, 85, 204, 219n5
 U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), 83
- Virginia, 11
 Voting Rights Act, 6
- Wagner, Richard, 217n15
 Ward elections, 75, 76, 78, 78g, 222n31
 Washington (state), 213n6, 214n15
 Washington, D.C., 11
- Water
 affordability of in U.S., 17, 18, 219nn5–7
 as a good, 56–58
 as a natural monopoly, 20
 residential consumption, 220n11
 social/cultural meaning of, 188–189
 true marginal cost of, 219–220n7
 uses of, 12–13, 12g
 Water adequacy laws, 127–129, 158, 173
 Water availability
 development and, 172–173, 182
 factors affecting, 181–182
 global climate change and, 192–193
 Water demand
 in cities, 214n17
 droughts and, 9
 factors increasing, 10, 56–57, 103, 175
 income and, 62, 220n11
 price structure response, 61
 reduction strategies (*see* Demand-side policies; Impact fees; Sustainability policies)
 seasonal variations, 225n3
 supply mismatch with, 103–105
 trends, 14g
 Water distribution systems. *See also* New local politics of water; Special districts; Water demand; Water districts
 challenges to, 79–80, 175, 189–193
 cost structures of, 56
 debt, 114, 116t, 119
 development of, 56–57, 79, 173
 financing of expansion, 82
 history of, 2–3, 10–12, 17, 56–59, 175–176
 integration with land-use planning, 125–130, 176, 180, 226n6
 responsibilities of, 56
 shift from private to public governance of, 80
 Water districts. *See also* specific water district by name
 boundary flexibility (*see* Boundary flexibility)
 definition of, 215n26
 establishment of, 9, 51–52
 expenditures by, 20, 21m

- Water districts (cont.)
 numbers and locations of, 20, 22*m*,
 52*t*, 53
 rules for boundary changes, 110,
 111, 112
 staff size, 46
- Water pollution, 9, 15*g*, 16, 103, 104–
 105, 190
- Water-pricing strategies. *See* Pricing
 strategies
- Water rate structures. *See* Pricing
 strategies
- Water-resource managers, 49–51, 55,
 63–64, 81, 138–139, 177
- Water rights, 11, 13–14
- Water-sewer districts, 29
- Watershed management, 16–17,
 177
- Water sources. *See also* Dams;
 Groundwater aquifers; Surface
 water
 aquifer storage and recovery projects,
 176
 competition for access to, 2–3, 17
 degradation of, 103, 104–105
 desalination, 175, 176
 global climate change and, 192–193
 large storage projects, 2–3, 10–12,
 17, 175–176 (*see also* Dams)
 limitations of, 9–10, 13–14, 175
 for public water systems, 12*g*, 13,
 173
 water rights and, 11, 13–14
- Water transport issues, 10, 11–12,
 124, 127, 149–150, 152, 153, 190–
 191
- Water treatment, 214*n*17
- Water-use restrictions, 10, 16, 17, 93,
 189
- Weber, Max, 29
- Weber, Warren, 217*n*15
- West View Water Authority, 138, 158,
 159–160
- Wheeling, 127
- Wilson, James Q., 221*n*17
- Wilson, Woodrow, 29
- Wlezien, Christopher, 218*n*22
- World Water Forum (2009), 215*n*22
- Zone 7 Water Agency, 141*t*, 147–153,
 183