UDK 338:505

THE PUBLIC INVESTMENTS IN INFRASTRUCTURE W. Kozłowski

UWM- University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn Olsztyn, Poland (Poland, Olsztyn 10-718, ul. Oczapowskiego 2, email: wkozlowski@xl.wp.pl; tel. 604469001)

Key words: infrastructure investments, indicators, assessment.

Summary. Local development is a dynamic process which mainly relies on qualitative and quantitative changes, accordingly to the needs of the local communities. The main problem, in terms of projects of infrastructure is their socio-economic evaluation. The article presents a model for assessing investments in infrastructure, on the basis of four groups of indicators. Results of the research give opportunity to a more detailed analysis and evaluation of investments in infrastructure, furthermore they make a strong foundation for the exploration of cause-and-effect relations between the investments in infrastructure and the quality of life in the region.

Introduction

Public investments in infrastructure is a major element in local socjoeconomic development Helps to create new companies and quality ife in local field. In Poland, local infrastructure has developed dynamically in recent years with the use of European funds. Sound investments are credited with a significant positive influence on the quality of life in local communities, as well as an increase in consumer demand (Kryk 2012, p.150). Most infrastructural investments are local, which is mostly due to statutory competences of the municipal authorities. Value-wise, global investments prevail.

Primary municipal investments are those in the road infrastructure, water and sewage networks, housing infrastructure, waste management, as well as heating and renewable energy supply. Structural investment requires significant funding and compliance with rigorous legal requirements, mainly concerning public financing, environmental protection, and land management6.

Demand effects go in pace with the increase in consumption in the given territory, due to the growing interest in the infrastructure, thus with the growing number of households, enterprises which results in the increase in sales of goods and services. Supply effects are related mainly to the im-

⁶ The most important laws and regulations include: the Local Self-Government Act of 8 March 1990 (Dz.U. of 1990 No. 16, item 95), the Public Finance Act of 27 August 2009 (Dz.U. of 2009 No. 157, item 1240), the Spatial Planning and Development Act of 27 March 2003 (Dz.U. of 2003 No. 80, item 717).

provement of effectiveness of production, growth of local efficiency and productivity(Kozłowski 2012, p.15)

Infrastructural and commercial investments differ mainly in their goals, and consequently in the methods used for viability evaluation. Infrastructural investments are typically very capital-intensive and pose a high technological risk. The viability of local infrastructural investments, expressed mainly in their economic and social aspects, is difficult to evaluate (Kasiewicz, Rogowski 2009, p.109). Evaluation is done both ex ante and ex post. Ex ante evaluation of infrastructural investments focuses mainly on the planning stage, concerning project preparation and selection of options that best fulfil the local development strategy, as well as meeting investment goals. Ex post evaluation is based on effect verification vis-à-vis the investment plan. The final evaluation consists in a comparison of the effects and the plan.

The purpose and methods of the article.

The subject of this paper is the evaluation of infrastructure investments. According to the research hypothesis, there is a stochastic relationship between structural investment expenses and their socio-economic effects, as expressed by selected socio-economic ratios. The basic research methods used in the study are:

-Ratio analysis based on 6 socio-economic ratios, describing their effects related directly or indirectly to the infrastructure investment expenditure,

– Pearson correlation coefficient, which measures correlations between the socio-economic ratios.

| No. | Basic ratio | Formula | unit |
|------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| E1 | Amount of investment expenditure | Invested amount | PLN |
| | | | |
| E2 | Amount of investment expenditure | Invested amount / | PLN |
| | per capita | population | |
| S 3 | Dynamics of the population in the | Population | % |
| | years in question | | |
| S4 | Dynamics of the working age popula- | Working age population/ | % |
| | tion ratio | Population | |
| S5 | Dynamics of the unemployment rate | Number of the unemployed / | % |
| | | Population | |
| S6 | Dynamics of the migration balance | Number of migrants | % |
| | - | _ | |

| Table 1– | Socio-e | conomic | ratios | of | infrastructural | investments |
|----------|---------|---------|--------|----|-----------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | |

Source: own research

The subject of the research

The subject of the research are infrastructure investments completed in municipalities and communes of the poviat of Olsztyn. The poviat's area is

2840.3 km², which constitutes 11.7% of the Warmińsko-Mazurskie province. It is the largest poviat in the province, and third largest in the country. The poviat is divided into 12 municipalities, including:

- 5 urban-rural municipalities: Barczewo, Biskupiec, Dobre Miasto, Jeziorany, Olsztynek,

- 7 communes: Dywity, Gietrzwałd, Jonkowo, Kolno, Purda, Stawiguda, Świątki. The time scope of the study: years 2010–2016.



Figure 2 – The poviat of Olsztyn and its municipalities and communes

Source: www.mapa-polski.net.pl

Analysis of infrastructural investment expenses by communes of the poviat of Olsztyn

The analysis of infrastructural investment expenses includes their amount and structure. Cluster analysis has also been performed within sets of observations that were deemed to be related. Table 2 shows infrastructural investment expenses from 2010 to 2016.

| Municipality/ Commune | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Total | Mean |
|--------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Barczewo | 9468 | 15320 | 6507 | 5887 | 6826 | 4560 | 4462 | 53030 | 13258 |
| Biskupiec | 24833 | 15201 | 4635 | 3145 | 11387 | 5155 | 7012 | 71368 | 17842 |
| Dobre Miasto | 6490 | 5316 | 3271 | 4262 | 12800 | 1771 | 2238 | 36148 | 9037 |
| Dywity | 9068 | 7327 | 5994 | 6084 | 7931 | 7354 | 4279 | 48037 | 12009 |
| Gietrzwałd | 2614 | 2221 | 7763 | 8407 | 7211 | 3360 | 2850 | 34426 | 8607 |
| Jeziorany | 3963 | 3048 | 6507 | 3856 | 4334 | 2286 | 1692 | 25686 | 6422 |
| Jonkowo | 13229 | 3577 | 6759 | 2567 | 5065 | 2949 | 2668 | 36814 | 9204 |
| Kolno | 3658 | 2165 | 276 | 271 | 1277 | 4742 | 1801 | 14190 | 3548 |
| Olsztynek | 10983 | 11929 | 6651 | 6238 | 9427 | 6150 | 5274 | 56652 | 14163 |
| Purda | 5650 | 3545 | 3002 | 2803 | 4123 | 2284 | 2055 | 23462 | 5866 |
| Stawiguda | 9808 | 10601 | 8036 | 7056 | 9477 | 9219 | 5807 | 60004 | 15001 |
| Świątki | 1214 | 2151 | 1736 | 2425 | 1721 | 574 | 915 | 10736 | 2684 |
| Total | 100976 | 82402 | 61136 | 53001 | 81579 | 50405 | 41054 | 470553 | 117638 |

Table 2 – Amounts of infrastructural investment expenses (PLN thousand) (E1)

Source: own research

In years 2010–2016, the greatest nominal amounts were expended for infrastructure investments in the municipalities and communes of Biskupiec (PLN 71.4 million), Stawiguda (PLN 60.0 million), and Barczewo (PLN 53,0 million). The least expenses were made in the communes of Świątki (PLN 10,7 million) and Kolno (PLN 14.2 million). The greatest total infrastructural investments were completed by the municipalities and communes in 2010, amounting to about PLN 100.9 million (Table 2). Another analytical ratio was the amount of investment expenditure per capita (Table 3).

| Municipality/ Commune | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Mean |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Barczewo | 561 | 898 | 379 | 340 | 393 | 261 | 254 | 441 |
| Biskupiec | 1317 | 784 | 239 | 163 | 593 | 269 | 367 | 533 |
| Dobre Miasto | 411 | 328 | 202 | 263 | 791 | 110 | 139 | 321 |
| Dywity | 898 | 705 | 563 | 564 | 720 | 663 | 380 | 642 |
| Gietrzwałd | 456 | 371 | 1280 | 1358 | 1136 | 518 | 437 | 794 |
| Jeziorany | 496 | 377 | 809 | 481 | 542 | 287 | 213 | 458 |
| Jonkowo | 2083 | 538 | 994 | 373 | 722 | 416 | 375 | 786 |
| Kolno | 1096 | 632 | 81 | 80 | 383 | 1440 | 546 | 608 |
| Olsztynek | 801 | 855 | 477 | 447 | 674 | 439 | 380 | 582 |
| Purda | 732 | 437 | 364 | 336 | 487 | 269 | 240 | 409 |
| Stawiguda | 1604 | 1667 | 1186 | 993 | 1281 | 1204 | 728 | 1238 |
| Świątki | 291 | 509 | 412 | 576 | 409 | 137 | 219 | 365 |

Table 3 – Amount of investment expenditure per capita (PLN) (E2)

Source: own research

The analysis of investment expenditure per capita reveals that the highest ratios were recorded in the communes of Stawiguda (PLN 1238 per capita) and Gietrzwałd (PLN 794 per capita). The lowest ratios were those of Świątki (PLN 365 per capita), Purda (PLN 409 per capita) and Dobre Miasto (PLN 321 per capita).

This research has also investigated the relationships between infrastructure investment expenditures in the municipalities and communes in question and the ratios characterising their socio-economic effects. The correlations confirmed the existence of causal relationships which, in turn, may become a driving force behind growth, creating a synergistic feedback loop. The correlations between ratios under investigation show dependencies existing between them, which can aid in planning infrastructure investments with specific socio-economic goals in mind (Table 5).

| | E1 | E2 | S1 | S2 | S 3 | S5 |
|------------|----|-------|-------|--------|------------|--------|
| E1 | 1 | 0.368 | 0.228 | -0.084 | -0.060 | -0.146 |
| E2 | | 1 | 0.782 | -0.064 | 0.691 | -0.382 |
| S 1 | | | 1 | 0.039 | 0.671 | 0.101 |
| S 2 | | | | 1 | -0.310 | -0.025 |
| S 3 | | | | | 1 | -0.107 |
| S5 | | | | | | 1 |

Table 5Pearson linear correlation coefficient at p < 0.05

Source: own research.

The analysis suggests a number of significant correlations between the ratios under investigation:

- There is a positive correlation between investment amount per capita (E2) and: population growth (S1) at p=0.782, and employment increase (S3) at p=0.691.

- There is a positive correlation between the population growth (S1) and employment increase (S3) at p=0.671.

Conclusions

Following the analysis, it may be concluded that the research hypothesis has been partly confirmed and that stochastic relationships do exist between the levels of expenditure and the selected socio-economic ratios.

The municipalities and communes under investigation were characterised by different infrastructure investment amounts. In the years 2010–2016. The greatest absolute amounts were spent by the municipalities and communes of Biskupiec, Stawiguda, Olsztynek and Barczewo. The smallest amounts were expended by the communes of Świątki and Kolno. The highest socio-economic ratios were achieved by the commune of Stawiguda. The lowest levels were recorded in the communes of Kolno and Świątki. There was a positive correlation between the level of investment per capita and the municipality or commune's own income, its number of economic operators, its population and the level of employment. This testifies to the existence of a causal relationship between the ratios under investigation.

Evaluating investments through the lens of socio-economic ratios allows for a broader look both at municipal investment expenditures and their effects. The diagnosed dependencies enable decision-makers to plan expenses more effectively and to expect more realistic outcomes. Ratio analysis may become one of the tools which will ensure an optimal and realistic evaluation of the expenses by local authorities. It is therefore advisable for municipalities and communes to analyse economic ratios pertinent to their development strategies and translate them into investment procedures.

REFERENCES

1. KRYK B. (2012): Jakość życia w kontekście zrównoważonego rozwoju. Szczecin, Handel Wewnętrzny, Uniwersytet Szczeciński.

2. KAJSIEWICZ S., ROGOWSKI W. (2009): Inwestycje hybrydowe- nowe ujęcie oceny efektywności. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo SGH .

3. KOZŁOWSKI W. (2012): Zarządzanie gminnymi inwestycjami infrastrukturalnymi. Warszawa, DIFFIN.