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“Corporate water systems should not be eligible for state revolving funding. Taxpayer subsidies should be prohibited from profit generating companies or companies paying profits for shareholders/investors. Private companies argue that they have to comply with the same regulations. However, they voluntarily chose to get into this ‘business’ and compliance is not the over-riding principle that should be considered in this discussion. We believe that the distinction in mission between public and private is the core principle that should be considered. Private systems are in the business to maximize profit. Public water utilities were and are created to provide for public welfare (the reason why public water continues to expand to underserved and non-profitable populations). This is a significant difference. And while we believe that maximizing profit is a noble virtue and as American as safe water, we do not think that taxpayers should help the cause of privately owned systems. In addition, the needs of less affluent public water systems and families with no piped water dwarf the current SRF allocations. The state of Florida has a novel compromise to this issue. Florida limits SRF funds to private water systems less than 1,500 people – ensuring funds are limited to the class of private water systems that did not get into the business as a corporate enterprise. Also, this group of private systems could be included in the state’s needs assessment, which determines allocations under the bill.”
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“Corporate water systems should not be eligible for state revolving funding. Taxpayer subsidies should be prohibited from profit generating companies or companies paying profits for shareholders/investors. Private companies argue that they have to comply with the same regulations. However, they voluntarily chose to get into this ‘business’ and compliance is not the over-riding principle that should be considered in this discussion. We believe that the distinction in mission between public and private is the core principle that should be considered. Private systems are in the business to maximize profit. Public water utilities were and are created to provide for public welfare (the reason why public water continues to expand to underserved and non-profitable populations). This is a significant difference. And while we believe that maximizing profit is a noble virtue and as American as safe water, we do not think that taxpayers should help the cause of privately owned systems. In addition, the needs of less affluent public water systems and families with no piped water dwarf the current SRF allocations. The state of Florida has a novel compromise to this issue. Florida limits SRF funds to private water systems less than 1,500 people – ensuring funds are limited to the class of private water systems that did not get into the business as a corporate enterprise.”