

Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Saturday, 16 November 2024

Your submission for this review:

I have reviewed the summary of Sydney Water's Price Proposal and the IPART Issues Paper and am opposed to - in fact outraged by - the very high price increases that Sydney Water is proposing for the next 5 year period. I thought the 9.5% last year was bad, but it was just an opener. From which part of my household budget is this .42% coming? There are so many red flags in this proposal. Most of the increase is in the fixed cost component, but even if it was more evenly spread households to already manage their water consumption would have no way of offsetting the increases. The paper does not adequately support the claimed justification. Operating expenses are of course increasing but there why are they above CPI? I know I'm old fashioned but CPI measures inflation which should reflect operating costs. If the increases are higher, why? For example, employment costs should only rise by inflation - any other employment increases should be offset by productivity gains which should be shared between the business and the consumer. And employment costs in the public sector (and related bodies) have been higher than private: what is the justification? What constraints are there on Sydney Water minimising operating expenses? Perhaps the new agreement was generous. Were the employees being underpaid previously? The reasons used to justify cost increases look to me to be BAU: improving services is BAU! Has Sydney Water not been doing that?. The only conclusion can be that there have been significant areas that have been neglected - why, and where are the responsibilities for this? Surely there must be offsetting savings by eliminating unnecessary expenditures, and new projects replacing completing projects.... it seems there's a lot of catching up to do. There are areas that appear to be in Sydney Water's control to reduce e.g. - compliance costs - they are to be managed. Push back, don't pass on! Make more noise. It's all well and good to complain but let's all do something about it. I am not in the mood to pay for any more compliance cost increases. While Sydney Water can report this as a justification, I don't accept it. And if any politician does deliver on their never ending claim they are going to reduce compliance costs, I look forward to an issues paper from Sydney Water on reducing fees as a consequence. - the cost for the NSW Govt charging land tax on land not previously taxed. Peter robbing Paul. Why not more public awareness? I am sure it suits the NSW government to pass on tax increases indirectly in a quiet manner where they hope no-one will make a fuss. Why not make a fuss? Capex is required to maintain/upgrade existing infrastructure. I have no qualms with that, provided I am confident in the efficiency of the organisation undertaking this. I am not. Rather I have, in the last 12 months, experienced quite the opposite - a monopoly that rides roughshod over consumers regarding responsibility for repairs and maintenance on/under public land adjacent to their properties..... spending hours arguing with customers who are experiencing extreme difficulties rather than doing what's right. The second stated reason for the required capex is to fund growth. It is totally unacceptable to assign these costs to existing users. Firstly a fundamental issue is that few of the population benefit from the population growth we have been experiencing, and the ongoing evidence (such as Sydney Water's current proposal) is that we continue to be disadvantaged by it. As we know GDP per capita has been falling and this is the negative growth experienced by households that is expected to fund the infrastructure for more growth. Benefits of population growth go to (1) political and government infrastructure who can't plan and manage education and training to deliver an appropriately trained workforce (instead relying on overseas countries to send them their best - for their loss). (2) businesses who think that their goal is to grow revenue by servicing more people, not expanding or improving their services. And if it's business that benefits, then businesses pay (ultimately that goes back to the consumer) but businesses also have more ability to put pressure on Sydney Water. What is the justification for deviating from user pays? This is not demonstrated. The costs of delivering growth must be met by those who benefit from it. And more desalination funding? The last one was such a success! It's not as if the customer outcome targets are radical. The costs of delivering water to Sydney are challenging but this issues paper hasn't convinced me. I am supposed to suddenly find an extra 0.42% in my household budget!