

Request for a Feasibility Study for Municipal Ownership of Rockland County’s Water

Rockland’s drinking water supply faces increasing pressures in the next few decades, including rapid development in both Rockland and Orange Counties, increased possibility of extended droughts due to climate change, and threats to water quality. Rockland’s water supply is finite because of the limits of the watershed and its geology. Best water supply practices are increasingly critical to ensure adequate water supply and water quality, as well as affordable rates.

At the same time, customers of the Rockland County service area of Suez Water NY, the utility for 90% of Rockland water users, pay among the highest water rates in the state, and are facing steeply-rising water rates. If our water supply is not managed well, Rockland ratepayers could once again face—on top of already extremely high-water rates—extraordinary expenses for the most expensive new water supply sources of all, desalination or wastewater reuse.

Now, a proposal is before the Public Service Commission for the acquisition of French-based Suez Water by the largest international water company, Veolia. Many of the member organizations and individuals of the Rockland Water Coalition are concerned that this acquisition may be counter to the interests of Rockland ratepayers—or to effective management of our water resources.

Rockland County needs better long-term solutions to providing adequate, safe, and affordable water—and we need them now.

Members and supporters of the Rockland Water Coalition propose that our elected public officials ask New York State (NYS) to conduct a report on the feasibility of municipalizing Suez Water New York Inc.’s Rockland County assets as a water authority; a public utility. Such a study was recently completed for Nassau County by the NYS Department of Public Service. (DPS)¹ (the “Nassau Study”). This paper discusses the reasons to consider local government control of Rockland County water resources.

Rockland County’s water rates are among the highest, if not the highest, in NYS.² According to the NYS DPS, 96% of New Yorkers have municipal water service.³ In NYS, public water

¹ “Report on the Feasibility of Municipalizing New York American Water Company, Inc’s Nassau County Service Territories,” New York Department of Public Service, March 29, 2021, Page 34: <http://documents.dps.ny.gov/public/Common/ViewDoc.aspx?DocRefId=%7B2D65D5B0-E999-4C6D-AF7D-2C18DA7B56A3%7D>

² “Drinking Water Systems in New York, The Challenges of Aging Infrastructure” NY State Controller Thomas P. DiNapoli, February 2017, Page 16: <https://www.osc.state.ny.us/files/local-government/publications/pdf/drinkingwatersystems.pdf>

³ The Nassau Study, page 34.

authorities are common. A 2017 NYS Controller Report⁴ documents that 939 local governments have water departments or districts, and there also are 27 public water authorities.

The Rockland Water Coalition comprises 34 local, regional, and national groups, working together toward a sustainable water policy for Rockland County. In 2008, the Coalition came together to defeat the desalination proposal of Suez Water New York (SWNY)—which it did successfully. The Coalition also advocated for a County Water Task Force, a water conservation policy, watershed protection, and source water protection. Most recently, it has brought public attention to the PFAS contamination of our water supply and the need for stricter standards for PFAS chemicals at the state level.

BACKGROUND

SWNY, formerly known as United Water NY, an investor-owned private utility (“private utility”), supplies water to approximately 90% of Rockland County’s population.⁵ SWNY is a wholly owned subsidiary of Suez Water Resources LLC, which in turn is owned by Suez Utility Holdings Inc., which is 20% owned by PGGM (a Dutch Pension Fund) and 80% owned by Suez Water Inc. (Delaware), which in turn is owned by Suez North America Inc., which is owned by the Suez Group S.A.S., which is owned by Suez S.A. of Paris France, a global water resources company.⁶ There are 5 layers of profit-making corporations between SWNY and Suez S.A. of Paris France.

In May 2021, the Suez Group of Paris France entered into an agreement to be sold to Veolia, another French global water resources company.⁷ The Suez Group and Veolia filed an expedited joint petition with the DPS asking it to determine whether the acquisition is in the public interest, and to approve the purchase. They requested a determination by November 2021.⁸ We ask Rockland County and its legislators to become parties to this proceeding, PSC Case 21-W-0338, to determine if this acquisition is in our public interest.

We understand that Rockland County has a limited water supply. That makes it critically important that our drinking water supply is managed with best practices. We believe that Rockland’s water resources, including supply, treatment, and distribution, should not be owned

⁴ “Drinking Water Systems in New York, The Challenges of Aging Infrastructure” NY State Controller Thomas P. DiNapoli, February 2017, Page 1

⁵ “Rockland Tomorrow” Rockland County Comprehensive Plan March 2011, Page 261:http://rocklandgov.com/files/4513/5067/1656/Rockland_Tomorrow.pdf

⁶ PSC Verified Joint Petition of Veolia Environnement S.A., Veolia North America, Inc., Suez S.A., and Suez Water New York Inc. for Approval Pursuant to Section 89-h of the Public Service Law of the Acquisition of Suez S.A. by Veolia Environnement S.A. Case 21-W-0338 June 11, 2021 (the “PSC 2021 Joint Petition”) Attachment D - Suez Organization Chart

⁷ Suez Press release 5/14/21 <https://www.suez.com/en/news/press-releases/veolia-and-suez-have-signed-a-tender-offer-agreement-between-themselves--and-a-memorandum-of-understanding-with-meridiam-gip-caisse-des-depots-cnp--for-the-acquisition-of-the-new-suez>

⁸ PSC Verified Joint Petition of Veolia Environnement S.A., Veolia North America, Inc., Suez S.A., and Suez Water New York Inc. for Approval Pursuant to Section 89-h of the Public Service Law of the Acquisition of Suez S.A. by Veolia Environnement S.A. Case 21-W-0338 June 11, 2021, Page 25.

and controlled by a private international company that by its very structure operates our water system to prioritize shareholders and investment returns.

Rockland County's water supply is independent of and precluded from participating in the expansive water supply system that serves the greater New York City metropolitan area and other municipalities in New York State. As documented in the Rockland County Comprehensive Plan, "Rockland County is distinctive in that its water supply comes almost entirely from within its borders."⁹ Because of this unique source restriction, Rockland County has a responsibility to closely manage and protect its own water resources.

The intended acquisition of SWNY by Veolia makes the question of Rockland taking municipal control of its water a timely one. What is the best public interest? The Suez/Veolia transaction may increase the acquisition cost, which increases the urgency of answering the question.

It is unknown what that cost of municipal acquisition would be. A CPA member of the RWC roughly estimates this cost at over \$500 million.¹⁰ A feasibility study could provide a better cost estimate. The source of financing a municipal purchase of this private utility could come from municipal bonds or loans from the State at below-private-market rates.¹¹ With recent improvements in the Rockland County ratings and general bond market conditions, this may be a good time to consider a purchase, and have the County guarantee bonds issued by a water authority.

Ideally, both the DPS and PSC should consider local municipalization of Rockland's water resources before approving an acquisition by Veolia, to determine whether local control or control by an international company is in the best interests of Rockland County. According to New York State Law PBS §89-h (5), "No consent shall be given by the commission to the acquisition of any stock in accordance with this section unless it shall have been shown that such acquisition is in the public interest." A case can be made that the Veolia purchase would not be in the public interest, but that local control would be in the public interest.

One option for local control is an independent water authority. Such an entity could acquire the assets of SWNY in Rockland County and supply and deliver water to its customers. There are many examples of this in NYS. The Suffolk County Water Authority has been operational since 1951. Central New York Water Authority serves five counties and has been operational for decades.

Recently, on June 11, 2021, the NYS Legislature passed legislation establishing the South Nassau Water Authority and the North Shore Water Authority on Long Island, both empowered to purchase the private company, New York American Water; the bill awaits the Governor's signature.¹² (*ADDENDUM: Governor Hochul signed the bill into law on November 3, 2021.*)

⁹ "Rockland Tomorrow" Rockland County Comprehensive Plan March 2011, Page 109.

¹⁰ Robert Tompkins CPA, MPA (RWC member) based on PSC Case 19-W-0168, "Joint Proposal 1/17/20; Appendix 2 – Revenue Requirement Calculation," page 26; as of 1/31/22 projected Long-Term Debt (\$235 million) plus Common Equity (\$217 million) is equal to \$452 million plus 10%.

¹¹ ie. Environmental Facilities Corporation or the Dormitory Authority, see the Nassau Study, Page 54.

¹² LI Herald.com "Water Authority bill passes Legislature" by Andrew Garcia and Tom Carrozza,

REASONS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF LOCAL WATER

Customers may save money, while service and water quality could be improved.

For many years, Rockland’s SWNY ratepayers have paid one of the highest water rates in NYS. The 2017 NYS Comptroller’s Report on State drinking water systems documented that the SWNY 2016 “Typical Monthly Water Cost” was the highest rate of the “largest water systems operators” in New York (see Figure 8 below). That was before additional chargebacks to ratepayers for the terminated desalination plan.¹³

Figure 8					
Largest Water System Operators in New York State, 2016					
System	Service Area	Population Served	Water Source	Typical Monthly Water Cost*	Notes
New York City Water System	New York City	8,271,000	Surface (Catskills/ Delaware and Croton Watersheds)	\$61.12	
Suffolk County Water Authority	Suffolk County	1,100,000	Ground	\$29.22	
Monroe County Water Authority	Suburban Monroe County and Parts of Surrounding Counties	496,753	Surface (Lake Ontario, Hemlock Lake)	\$40.38	
Erie County Water Authority	Suburban Erie County	480,939	Surface (Lake Erie, Niagara River)	\$38.04	Operates 15 Systems
Suez Water (United Water)	Parts of Rockland and Westchester Counties.	471,028	Ground and Surface (Lake DeForest)	\$111.85	Private Water Company - 3 Systems
New York American Water	Parts of Nassau County	422,540	Ground	\$92.71	Private Water Company - 4 Systems
Onondaga County Water Authority	Suburban Onondaga County and Parts of Surrounding Counties	300,000	Surface (Lake Ontario, Otisco and Skaneateles Lakes)	\$42.89	
Buffalo Water Authority	City of Buffalo	276,000	Surface (Lake Erie)	\$48.19	
Rochester City	City of Rochester	214,000	Surface (Hemlock and Canadice Lakes)	\$50.00	
Yonkers City	City of Yonkers	196,086	Surface (Purchased from NYC System)	\$79.16	
Syracuse City	City of Syracuse	192,000	Surface (Skaneateles Lake)	\$46.68	
Mohawk Valley Water Authority	Parts of Herkimer and Oneida Counties	130,000	Surface (Hinckley Reservoir)	\$61.08	
Water Authority of Western Nassau	Part of Nassau County	120,000	Ground	\$48.67	
Town of Hempstead Water Department	Part of Nassau County	110,000	Ground	\$20.18	
Albany City	City of Albany	101,082	Surface (Alcove Reservoir)	\$42.83	

Source: Safe Drinking Water Information System, United States Environmental Protection Agency, <https://www3.epa.gov/enviro/facts/sdwis/search.html>.
 * Cost for residential customer using 12,000 gallons per month. Calculated by OSC based on information from each water system for the latest available year. Municipal water systems may also be funded with ad valorem or benefit assessments.

As shown in Figure 8, Rockland County’s SWNY customers’ typical monthly water cost in 2016 was 21% higher than that of the next highest water system, charged by New York American Water, which serves parts of Nassau County, the private water utility that the DPS recommended be municipalized in March 2021.

June 24, 2021 <https://www.liherald.com/merrick/stories/water-authority-bill-passes-legislature,133122>

¹³ “Drinking Water Systems in New York, The Challenges of Aging Infrastructure” NY State Controller Thomas P. DiNapoli, February 2017, Page 16.

Rockland Water Study Committee

Since 2016, Rockland County’s SWNY’s water rates have substantially increased multiple times. The PSC approved large rate increases in January 2017, and again in July 2020. The annual average rate increase for Suez NY customers is about 9.1% for each of the rate-years 2/1/20 to 1/31/24.¹⁴

Cost advantages of public ownership.

Customers could benefit from eventual lower water rates.

A review of PSC Case 19-W-0168 “Joint Proposal” documentation used in setting four years of SWNY’s water rates suggests potential substantial savings with a municipally owned and operated water system. The following table summarizes the projected revenue, taxes, and net income of SWNY for four rate years; these are the revenue and expense forecasts agreed upon by SWNY and DPS and seen in the Joint Proposal.¹⁵ It suggests \$261 million in potential savings.

Suez Water NY						
Projected Revenue, Taxes, Net Income						
Four Rate Years ending 1/31						
	Rate Year 1	Rate Year 2	Rate Year 3	Rate Year 4	Total Rate Years	Percentage
	Ending 1/31/21	Ending 1/31/22	Ending 1/31/23	Ending 1/31/24	2/1/20 - 1/31/24	of Revenue
Total Operating Revenue	\$105,773,370	\$112,020,205	\$118,198,370	\$124,353,695	\$460,345,640	100.00%
<u>Taxes</u>						
Federal Income	4,612,325	4,992,801	5,410,018	5,904,808	20,919,952	
State Income	2,014,925	2,180,209	2,361,453	2,576,396	9,132,983	
Real Estate	25,329,682	26,282,868	27,279,067	28,320,469	107,212,086	
Gross Receipts	380,249	399,949	419,315	438,508	1,638,021	
<u>Total Taxes</u>	\$32,337,181	\$33,855,827	\$35,469,853	\$37,240,181	138,903,042	30.17%
Net Income (After Taxes)	\$27,006,396	\$29,263,658	\$31,666,277	\$34,491,625	\$122,427,956	26.59%
Total Taxes plus Net Income	\$59,343,577	\$63,119,485	\$67,136,130	\$71,731,806	\$261,330,998	56.77%

Adjustments based on actual results will ensure that SWNY receives the PSC-approved profits.

The table shows the projected current year (Rate Year 2) total operating revenues paid by customers is expected to be about \$112 million. Deleting the costs of company taxes and profit that a public water authority would not have to pay could potentially save customers about \$63 million, as detailed below.

¹⁴ PSC 7/16/20 Press Release; 20061/19-W-0168; 19-W-0269
[https://www3.dps.ny.gov/pscweb/WebFileRoom.nsf/Web/1D2BCFF498F93F2F852585A7005E6B66/\\$File/pr20061.pdf?OpenElement](https://www3.dps.ny.gov/pscweb/WebFileRoom.nsf/Web/1D2BCFF498F93F2F852585A7005E6B66/$File/pr20061.pdf?OpenElement)

¹⁵ Table based on data from PSC Case 19-W-0168 Joint Proposal (1/17/20), Appendix 2 (Revenue Requirements Calculation, pages 1-4, 9-12; table prepared by Robert Tompkins, CPA, MPA (RWC member)

SWNY water rates include reimbursements for federal income taxes of \$4,992,801 (4.45% of total revenues), state income taxes of \$2,180,209 (1.95%), real estate taxes of \$26,282,868 (23.46%), and gross receipts taxes of \$399,949 (.38%). The total is \$33,855,827 in taxes or 30.24% of revenue that could be saved, since municipalities do not pay such taxes.

The PSC-approved profit for SWNY is 6.47% after taxes. This is calculated on a rate base of \$452,297,648, which includes debt and company common equity. The forecasted profit for rate-year-2 is \$29,263,658 (26.12% of total revenues). Unlike private utilities, a municipally operated water system does not have to pay investors.

The potential total savings for this year (Rate Year 2) could be about \$63,119,485 (56.35% of total revenues).

Water rates also are expected to be reduced because municipal system operators would pay lower interest rates on financing and are eligible for federal and state grants, whereas private utilities are not. There could potentially be substantial savings by cutting inflated non-SWNY management fees and inaccurate shared cost allocations among the many Suez companies. In addition, the substantial professional and legal fees incurred through the SWNY PSC rate case expenses would be eliminated.

Future potential savings could partly pay off the debt incurred by purchasing SWNY's Rockland County resources. Water rates might be about the same as those of a private utility until the debt is paid. Water rates then could be reduced, providing long-term economic benefits to Rockland County's economy.

Water is a basic life necessity. It is unfair that Rockland County residents and businesses who receive their water from a private utility must pay that company's taxes while those paying water rates in the Rockland County Villages of Nyack¹⁶ and Suffern¹⁷ do not. Upon information and belief, the latter pay substantially less for their water than their SWNY rate-paying neighbors.

Suez's property taxes are paid by ratepayers in their water charges.

The DPS stated that "collecting property taxes through water rates is regressive, inefficient and not transparent to customers."¹⁸ Property taxes comprise about \$26 million of SWNY's revenue. Recognizing that property taxes are an important revenue source for public school districts, towns, villages, and the County, a municipal water system could make tax-equivalency payments (TEP) of a similar amount. These could be reduced over a multiyear period to ease the sudden shift of property tax revenue.

Real estate taxes are a large portion of the ratepayer costs, which do not merely disappear. The RWC members signed below believe that the savings opportunities resulting from elimination of

¹⁶ Nyack does not publish or provide information about water rates.

¹⁷ Per Village of Suffern NY 2021-2022 Adopted Budget page 22, median household water bill every six months in 2020 is \$301, or \$50.09 per month. Per Village Clerk provided data, average 2020 water bill per month is \$62.50.

¹⁸ Nassau Study, Page 33.

shareholder profits, elimination of state and federal taxes, reduction of operational costs due to local focus, and advantageous financing, funding and grant opportunities alone are so significant that a feasibility study is warranted and the shifting of real estate tax costs should not be an impediment to potential municipalization.

Prioritize Rockland County needs over international profits and corporate priorities.

Rockland County has local priorities that may conflict with the corporate priorities of a French multinational corporation. SWNY must produce shareholder profits, which is not in the best interests of its ratepayers.

SWNY has a monopoly on the water it supplies; PSC oversight is mostly limited to reviewing water rate requests and judging the need to expand water supply. SWNY has made decisions based on its international business goals rather than on the needs of the community. When SWNY proposed a desalination plan to use Hudson River water, it chose the most expensive supply source alternative. Desalination, which fits its global desalination business strategy, would have increased profits for its international shareholders despite the availability of other less expensive and less environmentally harmful options, which also would be less of a risk to public health.

After seven years of intense opposition by the Rockland Water Coalition, ratepayers, the County, towns, key public officials, and State interest groups, in December 2015 the PSC ordered that the desalination plan be abandoned. Although SWNY’s desalination proposal failed, its Rockland County water rates were increased by the PSC to enable SWNY to recover \$54 million of the money it spent developing its plan, plus an after-tax interest rate of 7% through 2033, amounting to an additional \$33 million on top of the \$54 million that is to be paid by its customers.¹⁹ Ratepayers have been burdened with paying SWNY that \$87 million, which includes SWNY’s legal and consultant fees. However, many of Rockland’s municipalities, private citizens, and advocacy groups that opposed the desalination plant incurred substantial out-of-pocket costs that were never reimbursed.

NON-FINANCIAL REASONS FOR LOCAL CONTROL OVER WATER

Public confidence in Suez NY has been eroded.

The PSC Order to abandon the desalination proposal and SWNY’s slow pace for maintenance of the water system’s infrastructure, which resulted in large amounts of lost and wasted water, have eroded public confidence in the company.²⁰ SWNY withdrew from participation in the Rockland

¹⁹ PSC Order Establishing Rate Plan, Case 16-W-0130 January 24, 2017, Pages 15 and 35.
<https://documents.dps.ny.gov/public/Common/ViewDoc.aspx?DocRefId={ECCAD35D-B853-47EA-B97E-5F6BB1020CFC}>

²⁰ PSC Order Establishing Rate Case, 16-W-0130 January 24, 2017, Pages 50-56 (24% water loss compared to PSC standard of 18%) Suez Water New York 2020 Year-End Non-Revenue Water Report & Non-Revenue Water Reduction Plan –2/26/20 Appendix A – (Non-Revenue Water 2,056,330 MG/Yr vs. Water Supplied 9,948,527 MG/Yr represents 20.7% water loss)
<https://documents.dps.ny.gov/public/MatterManagement/CaseMaster.aspx?MatterSeq=59180&MNO=19-W-0168>

Rockland Water Study Committee

County Task Force on Water Resources Management, which was designed to develop a collaborative plan for “a safe, long-term water supply,” including conservation.^{21 22} Its withdrawal directly disregarded an instruction from the PSC that it develop a joint conservation plan.²³ SWNY has conflicting interests regarding conservation measures. While conservation and efficiency are an effective way to reduce water use, water conservation is not in the interests of the shareholders of a private international utility.

Local control should result in spending decisions better aligned with local values and environmental protection: improved public safety, less waste, and more responsiveness to customer complaints.

SWNY also has failed to provide the water pressure required for fire hydrants. This has contributed to devastating fires and fatalities, including at a nursing home in Spring Valley in March 2021²⁴ and at a lumber yard in Tallman in June 2005.²⁵ SWNY and the DPS failed to address excessive non-revenue lost water until that issue was raised during rate cases by members of the public, who hired independent experts.

Nor has SWNY adequately addressed chronic occurrences of brown water and foul water odors found throughout the County for extended periods of time.²⁶

SWNY’s recent repeated attempts to store fuel tanks in close proximity to the Lake DeForest reservoir are an example of its failure of stewardship of the quality of our water resources. Similarly, the company has failed to take a proactive approach toward lawn chemicals, resulting in recurring seasonal growth of algae and a need for additional chemicals for treatment.

In the past, SWNY misappropriated quantities of Rockland’s limited water supply by exceeding legal pass-through mandates to New Jersey through poor equipment maintenance such as a

²¹ See 8/27/2015 Rockland County Times, “United Water New York Pulls out of Task Force; Claims Consultant’s Findings are Inaccurate” by Janie Rosman
<https://www.rocklandtimes.com/2015/08/27/united-water-new-york-pulls-out-of-task-force-claims-consultants-findings-are-inaccurate/>

²² Rockland County Task Force on Water Resources Management mission;
<http://rocklandgov.com/departments/planning/task-force-on-water-resources-management/>

²³ 8/12/15 Rockland County Legislature Press Release; “Rockland Water Resources Management Task Force Chairwoman: United Water New York Needs To Act Collaboratively” “Cornell says company can’t opt out because it doesn’t like report’s findings”
http://rocklandgov.com/files/7914/3956/1045/TF_H_Cornell_pr_08-12-15.pdf

²⁴ LoHud “Water pressure probe launched by state into Spring Valley fatal fire” by Steve Lieberman and Peter D. Kramer April 7, 2021
<https://www.lohud.com/story/news/local/rockland/spring-valley/2021/04/07/state-psc-launches-investigation-into-low-water-pressure-fatal-fire/7129092002/>

²⁵ 6/29/2005 The Journal News “Lumberyard fire probed” by Steve Lieberman page 1B

²⁶ News 12 Westchester 11/13/19 “NYS Dept. of Health visits Rockland amidst Suez Water complaints” <https://westchester.news12.com/nys-dept-of-health-visits-rockland-following-suez-water-complaints-41316609>

broken gauge at Lake DeForest.²⁷ Suez New Jersey benefited from this negligence, and SWNY was fined a relatively small fine by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) for its action.²⁸ Since the Suez Group of Paris France owns both of these private utilities, its investors profited at the expense of Rockland County.

Improved conservation.

Rockland County needs an effective water conservation policy. A private utility has minimal financial incentives to promote one, cannot apply for state or federal grants to draft or implement one, and does not have the authority to enforce meaningful conservation actions. A local public utility designed to meet residents' needs would be able to prioritize, develop, and implement conservation measures more effectively.

Improved transparency.

SWNY limits the data available to the public and to government officials as proprietary information. A municipalized system would be subject to the Freedom of Information Law (FOIL); SWNY is not. To make better decisions about water use and the environment it affects, Rockland County needs transparency as well as comprehensive, timely, data. This includes mapping its water supply and maintaining and releasing information about demand, current and projected use, quality, conservation efforts, treatment of contaminants, and the impact of land development.

Improved watershed protection.

A locally controlled water authority could work to protect watersheds and water sources more effectively than a private utility, and could establish rules and regulations for its water systems and resources, as well as for groundwater protection.

Improve water quality through local control.

A local public water utility can react more quickly than a multinational private utility to compromised water quality; it can quickly establish higher standards for testing, since there are fewer layers of bureaucracy to hamper decision making. Also, since it has no subsidiaries, it has no need to take the time to create a unified response throughout them. For example, a public utility might have responded more quickly to the health threats from PFAS in Rockland.

²⁷ Assemblywoman Ellen Jaffee 8/15/12 letter to Garry Brown, Chair PSC regarding case 06-W-0131, page 5; 2. Unauthorized releases to New Jersey.
https://wri.cals.cornell.edu/sites/wri.cals.cornell.edu/files/shared/documents/Jaffee-NYSPSC-letter_August2012.pdf

²⁸ Assemblywoman Ellen Jaffee 8/15/12 letter to Garry Brown, Chair PSC regarding case 06-W-0131, page 5; 2. Paragraph 1 Unauthorized releases to New Jersey.
https://wri.cals.cornell.edu/sites/wri.cals.cornell.edu/files/shared/documents/Jaffee-NYSPSC-letter_August2012.pdf

CONCLUSION

The proposed acquisition by Veolia of Suez Group of Paris France, which owns SWNY, makes it more crucial to reassess how Rockland’s water resources are managed. We believe that the recent feasibility study of two Long Island water districts is a model for what should be done for Rockland ratepayers, who currently pay among the highest water rates in the state.

We call upon our elected public officials to request that the NYS DPS conduct a feasibility study to determine whether municipalization of the resources owned by SWNY in Rockland County is in the best interests of the County.

September 27, 2021

For questions, comments, information, discussion, contact RocklandWaterStudy@gmail.com