Underground Infrastructure and Fresh Water: A Problem That Cannot Be Reduced to Money

Laboratory of Climate Change and Settlement Adaptation [1]

DOI: https://doi.org/10.66659/qzhgxs92

Published: November 26, 2026

How to cite: Laboratory of Climate Change and Settlement Adaptation. Underground Infrastructure and Fresh Water: A Problem That Cannot Be Reduced to Money. 2026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.66659/qzhgxs92

Abstract

This paper frames municipal underground infrastructure and fresh water as a problem that cannot be reduced to funding. Deferring maintenance may lower current expenditure while allowing water losses, failures, flooding, service disruption, and future repair costs to accumulate. After years of delay, even a well-funded intervention may be more difficult and disruptive than timely maintenance. Water is part of natural systems: public finance and administrative decisions shape access to it, but cannot guarantee that its quantity, quality, or seasonal availability will remain unchanged. Climate change adds new stresses to infrastructure that may already be weak, without explaining the origins of long-standing problems. The paper examines how residents, public authorities, and the expert community can each become distanced from sustained consideration of the problem, while their roles and responsibilities remain different. It distinguishes independent inquiry into a complex, changing object from the implementation of a predefined project. The paper does not offer a municipal action plan. It formulates questions for discussion: how can settlements recognise cumulative costs, understand the limits of their infrastructure, and prepare for future water-related stresses before chronic discomfort develops into serious risk?

Keywords: underground infrastructure; fresh water; municipal management; deferred maintenance; climate change; water systems; expert community; Scientific Recognition Architecture; urban resilience.

Key Points

1. Money is necessary, but funding alone cannot restore a system whose condition, connections, and accumulated damage have not been understood.
2. Maintenance deferral may reduce current expenditure while shifting costs and responsibility to future municipal administrations and residents.

[1] Corresponding author contact@pollution-diseases.org

3. Long delays can change the problem itself: later intervention may be more difficult, costly, and disruptive.
4. Fresh water is part of a natural system, not a service guaranteed to remain available in the same quantity, quality, or seasonal pattern.
5. Climate change can add new stresses to existing infrastructure; it does not explain the origin of every long-standing infrastructure problem.
6. Residents, public authorities, and experts are distinct but connected actors. The paper examines how each may become distanced from sustained assessment of the problem.
7. Independent research into a complex object is different from carrying out a predefined, budgeted project.

Purpose of the Text

This text is not a ready-made action programme for a municipality and does not offer final answers. Its purpose is to state the problem clearly and put it forward for discussion among specialists, municipal leaders, and other colleagues.

The starting question is simple: to what extent is the familiar practice of postponing work on underground networks justified today, when climate change may create new pressures on water supply, water quality, and drainage? What happens when a problem is explained for years only by a lack of money or the absence of an instruction from above?

1. The Starting Assumption That Money Solves Everything

Municipal projects do require funding. Repairing water supply, sewerage, and stormwater drainage networks can be expensive, technically complex, and disruptive for residents. It is therefore easy to assume that the problem is mainly financial: once the money is available, the networks can be repaired; once a decision is made, the situation can be put right.

This assumption overlooks time, the condition of the system, and accumulated damage. After decades of inaction, a system may no longer be restored quickly or without disruption, even if the money is finally found. It is necessary to understand what has happened to the network, which sections and processes are connected, what losses have accumulated, which functions have already been impaired, and what further intervention may involve.

Money is necessary, but it does not by itself provide a full understanding of the object or guarantee a timely and adequate solution. We cannot automatically assume that any problem can be fixed at any moment simply by allocating the required sum and issuing an order.

2. Deferral May Help the Current Budget and Harm the City

A decision not to repair a network today may appear rational within a single financial year or the term of a particular municipal leader. Current expenditure falls, and the problem can be passed to the next administration. This logic is understandable from the perspective of someone making a short-term budget decision.

But a city lasts longer than one budget or one term of office. Over time, water losses, failures, flood damage, service interruptions, and the cost of future repairs may all increase. Some costs do not appear in a single budget line: they are spread across the municipality, residents, businesses, and other urban systems.

We therefore need to distinguish short-term savings from the full cost of a decision for the city. Deferral may become a false economy: less is spent now, but more is lost later. This does not mean that every postponed repair will necessarily become more expensive. It means that we cannot call it a saving without assessing its consequences over time.

3. Long Inaction Changes the Problem Itself

The analogy of going to the dentist helps explain the cumulative effect. A person may avoid treatment for many years and eventually visit a dentist. But during that time the problem may become more complex, treatment more painful, and the consequences wider. Qualified intervention may still be necessary, but it does not restore the situation to what it was before.

Something similar may happen with underground infrastructure. Long delays can increase the volume of work and make it harder to understand how separate failures and losses are connected. Meanwhile, the city, the load on its networks, and external conditions all change. After many years of inaction, we cannot assume that it will be enough simply to find the money and fix everything.

It is especially important that long-term neglect is not always recognised as an action that creates future risk. People notice an individual failure or flood but may not connect it with the accumulated history of postponement. Organisations may consider each event separately and fail to see how earlier decisions have changed the condition of the system as a whole.

4. Fresh Water Is Part of Nature, Not a Guaranteed Service

In everyday life, water is often treated as something that simply comes out of the tap. People do not usually need to think about where it comes from, its quality, how much is available, how it is treated, or how much is lost during distribution. This perception makes the source and the water environment almost invisible.

But water exists within natural systems and follows processes of its own. Funding and public decisions matter for access to water, but they cannot oblige nature to provide the same quantity, quality, or seasonal pattern as before. Climate change and other external factors may alter conditions to which a settlement has grown accustomed.

A water supply system therefore includes more than a source and treatment facilities. It also includes the condition of underground networks, water losses, quality, reliability of distribution, maintenance arrangements, and the city's ability to act when external conditions change. Asking residents to save water does not replace management of the system as a whole.

5. New Climate Pressures Meet Old Infrastructure

Climate change does not explain the origin of every water supply or urban infrastructure problem. Many such problems arose long before current climate changes. However, new conditions can interact with existing weaknesses and increase their consequences.

Drought, heat, intense rainfall, and other climate pressures may affect water availability and quality, water demand, stormwater runoff, and the work of municipal services. The specific consequences for each city require investigation. But the possibility of new combinations of factors means that past experience cannot guarantee that the system will cope with future conditions.

Reliable underground infrastructure can partly support a city's resilience during such changes. But infrastructure does not become resilient simply because it is underground. We need to establish its actual condition, operating limits, the connections between networks, and the possible consequences of failure. A central question is how resilient the underground infrastructure of a settlement really is.

6. Residents, the State, and the Expert Community

The problem takes shape through the interaction of three distinct but connected actors: residents, the state, and the expert community. Their responsibilities and capacities differ. The point is not that all three are equally responsible for the condition of the networks. Rather, in everyday life each may become distanced from a full consideration of the problem.

Residents use water and experience interruptions, leaks, and flooding. But they may see the solution as entirely external: someone else should come and fix it. Complaints often become visible after an incident, but they do not always develop into sustained attention to the causes and to the condition of the system as a whole. This does not make residents responsible for building or repairing municipal networks.

State and municipal authorities may ask people to save water while failing to make local infrastructure a lasting priority. Authorities change, as do their tasks and political slogans, yet everyday systems that sustain urban life may continue without consistent development. A new administration inherits not only the network but also the accumulated consequences of earlier decisions and delays.

The expert community is part of society and at the same time works within state or professional institutions. The presence of a university and qualified specialists in a city does not automatically mean that its real local problems will be studied. Research topics depend on which questions are accepted as legitimate, important, and worthy of funding. If independent research does not become part of the scientific agenda, a problem may remain poorly studied even where the necessary specialists are physically present.

7. Studying a Problem Is Not the Same as Implementing a Project

It is important to distinguish independent study of a real object from spending funds within a predefined project. A project may have fixed deadlines, indicators, and

a limited question. This can be useful, but it does not always reveal how a complex and changing object works, what data are missing, or which assumptions need to be revised.

Scientific Recognition Architecture proposes beginning with the object itself: clarifying what needs to be understood, connecting specialised knowledge, distinguishing observations from assumptions, making uncertainty explicit, and revising explanations as new data emerge. This work may precede a full funding programme; it helps establish what research is actually needed [1].

This framing raises a question: is the expert community ready to study local problems independently before they become a government commission? Or does it mainly work on topics already recognised by the system and the client? This is not a judgement about individual scientists, who cannot be assessed without specific evidence. It is a question about the professional and institutional readiness of science to recognise complex and inconvenient objects.

8. How Distance from the Real Problem Develops

In everyday life, this distance appears in simple actions and explanations. A resident opens the tap and assumes water should be there; after a failure, the resident looks for someone responsible. A municipality sees urgent expenditure and postpones maintenance. An expert may work on what is included in a project or accepted within a discipline, without raising a problem that has not yet been recognised as a scientific topic.

None of these actions alone explains the whole situation. Together, however, they can sustain a cycle in which the problem has no clear owner: residents wait for the state, the state points to budgets and priorities, and the expert community does not necessarily produce an independent account of the object. Meanwhile, natural processes and infrastructure ageing do not stop.

The discussion should therefore focus not on blaming one actor, but on recognising the shared mechanism: how a problem disappears from the sustained agenda, how responsibility is passed to others, and why the consequences of earlier delays do not lead to earlier action.

9. Questions for Colleagues

1. In what circumstances may a municipality reasonably postpone work on underground infrastructure, and when does postponement begin to create greater risk and a higher full cost for the city?

2. How should water losses, failures, flooding, service interruptions, and harm to residents be counted when they are spread across different budgets and organisations?

3. How can accumulated damage be identified when information about the condition of the networks is incomplete, fragmented, or outdated?

4. How can short-term savings be distinguished from false economy when a decision is assessed not for one financial year but for its consequences for the city over time?

5. How ready is the expert community to study real local problems independently before a government commission is issued?

6. How should research be organised when the object is complex and changing and no mature explanation is yet available?

7. What needs to be known about the limits of underground infrastructure when ageing, water scarcity, and new climate pressures occur together?

8. What signs would show that a settlement is approaching a level of environmental deterioration at which familiar response methods are no longer sufficient?

Conclusion

This text questions two familiar assumptions: that everything is ultimately decided by money, and that any accumulated problem can be fixed at any moment. Money is necessary, but it does not remove the effects of time, the condition of the object, natural limits, missing data, or the complexity of late restoration. Underground infrastructure is not simply waiting for funding: while its maintenance is postponed, the problem itself changes.

Settlements may live for a long time with conditions that are persistently uncomfortable. When external conditions worsen, accumulated weaknesses may turn into real risks. But the exact nature of those risks cannot be established through general discussion alone; the object has to be studied.

This text invites colleagues to discuss not a ready-made answer but the framing of the task itself: how to recognise problems before a crisis, how to study them independently, and how to assess decisions at the scale of the whole city and over a long period. Simferopol will be one concrete case for a later discussion; colleagues may offer their own examples, refine the framework, and show where it needs to change.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement

No new data were created or analyzed in this study.

References

1. Nikolaenko, D. 2026. *Learning to Understand the Object: Scientific Recognition Architecture*. Pollution & Diseases Book Series, vol. 5. Prague: Pollution and Diseases Publisher. English edition, eISBN 978-80-909865-7-2. Russian edition, eISBN 978-80-909865-6-5.