

IPART – Why Hunter Water shouldn't get 10% increase.

Hi Sir or Madam,

My first concern that I would like an answer to is, what is Hunter Water proposing to use the money they will obtain, from a 10% increase in bill levels if it is granted? I have heard nothing and don't believe that I have received such advice from Hunter Water!!

I am not in favour of Hunter Water being allowed to increase their charges by 10% for several reasons –

1. I have constructed a table, which shows how my Hunter water bills have changed from 29/11/2004 to my last bill and I can see no consistency in their billing system, except that costs increase every year. Water usage costs are the only ones, which appear to be consistent. I am particularly concerned with the 43.26% and the 11.65% cost increases in relation to the sewer levy. I feel that these need to be explained!?? I am concerned about any large increase because this is compounded by smaller (more acceptable sized) increases and the consumer pays 'extra slightly fees' forever more – somewhat unfair in my opinion!
2. I am a retiree and I have no way of increasing my income stream in addition I have had no changes/upgrades/whatever to my sewerage system, on my property in the 39 years I have lived here. There has/have been 1 or 2 inspections of the sewer consisting of lifting the metal lid, looking in and replacing the lid – but not a word was spoken to me during this visit/visits!
3. I believe that the rapid increase in sewer costs is due to the connection of extra homes to the existing infrastructure and/or the extra treatment required to ensure that the sewage released into the ocean is not likely to cause any problems and/or increasing the salaries of the workers or to a greater extent the bosses.
I also believe that the environmental levy must have been used to ensure that this is already happening, otherwise – what is its purpose? An explanation may be required! So, while I am happy to pay for the proper treatment of the sewage, I don't believe that I should be in anyway accountable for the extra homes being added to the system. I have been paying **higher levies** for 39 years and have **received nothing** for my higher contributions.
4. Since I have no way to supplement my income, I find the ever increasing levy amount an unfair impost to me and other people of a similar age with similar income constraints. Surely we have paid our way and should not be held responsible for new homes being added to the system. People being added have higher wages than I did when I commenced work (\$35/week) and while I don't think the sewer levy should be abolished for people of my age I think it should be held constant and people being added now should pay increasing levy rates until they retire then their levy should remain constant! The new costs to the system should be borne by the people being added – a simple 'user pays system, who can argue??
5. The other reason why the levy rises occur would be wage increases and increased costs of chemicals/replacement of worn infrastructure. Again I would say that my income stream is stationary and increases in wages should be borne by those still working (as their wages are still increasing but worn infrastructure is still my problem.

To do as I wish means that Hunter Water would need to do a little more accounting and perhaps even supply a billing system that is consistent through the year – each levy is the same throughout that year and the costs per kL remain constant.

I would like you to answer my opening question. Have you? How am I going to find out??

Thank you for your time and I hope the consumers are looked after for a change!

Alan Lobley



Date	Days	Water \$	Sewer \$	Increase Decrease	% PA Inc/Dec	Environ \$	H2O Usage kL	\$
29/11/04	122	8.45	79.78			16.31	9	10.98
29/3/05	120	8.45	79.78	0		16.31	8	9.76
27/7/05	124	8.47	79.78	0	9.30/79.78	16.33	7	8.54
29/11/05	120	10.74	89.18	9.30	= 11.65	16.72	5	6.10
30/3/06	120	10.74	89.18	0		16.72	13	16.96
31/7/06	125	11.68	94.63	5.45	4.14/89.18	17.19	11	14.35
24/11/06	121	11.51	93.32	-1.31	= 4.64	16.95	9	12.24
29/3/07	120	11.71	94.87	1.55		17.24	9	12.24
27/7/07	122	12.97	102.80	7.93	6.79/94.87	18.11	6	8.18
26/11/07	123	12.64	100.11	-2.69	= 7.15	17.63	7	10.01
27/3/08	123	12.75	100.94	0.83		17.77	6	8.58
25/7/08	122	13.97	108.23	7.29	2.76/100.94	18.48	6	8.60
27/11/08	122	13.63	105.59	-5.36	= 2.73	18.03	7	10.44
26/3/09	120	13.86	107.35	1.76		18.33	7	10.44
27/7/09	121	13.97	108.23	0.88	46.44/107.35	18.48	6	9.03
26/11/09	124	13.13	152.03	43.80	= 43.26	10.93	7	10.94
25/3/10	119	13.35	154.57	2.54		11.11	6	9.42
26/7/10	122	13.87	164.91	10.34	8.86/154.57	11.41	6	9.44
24/11/10	122	13.53	160.89	-4.02	= 5.73	11.13	18	30.78
29/3/11	120	6.28	163.57	2.68		11.32	6	10.26
26/7/11	122	6.33	175.18	11.61	11.44/163.57	11.72	5	8.56
25/11/11	123	6.23	172.33	-2.85	= 6.99	11.52	7	13.30
26/3/12	121	6.28	173.75	1.42		11.62	6	11.40
25/7/12	123	6.38	187.11	13.36	10.21/173.75	12.09	7	13.32
27/11/12	122	6.22	182.54	-4.57	= 5.87	11.80	7	14.56
27/3/13	123	6.32	185.59	3.05		11.99	6	12.48
25/7/13	119	5.74	191.78	6.19	4.56/185.50	12.40	6	12.49
26/11/13	126	5.60	187.10	-4.68	= 2.45	12.10	7	14.91
31/3/14	120	5.68	190.23	3.13		12.29	8	17.04
24/7/14	119	5.90	197.34	7.11	5.43/190.34	12.76	7	14.91
26/11/14	125	5.76	192.53	-4.81	= 2.85	12.45	8	17.52
25/3/15	120	5.65	195.74	3.21		12.65	7	15.33
24/7/15	120	5.97	199.48	3.74	3.71/195.74	12.90	7	15.33
23/11/15	124	5.87	196.24	-3.24	= 1.89	12.69	7	15.54
25/3/16	120	5.91	197.86	1.62		12.78	7	15.54
28/7/16	122	8.66	203.65	5.79	3.44/197.86	13.10	9	19.99

24/11/16	124	8.45	198.68	-4.97	= 1.73	12.78	8	18.00
28/3/17	119	8.59	202.00	3.32		12.99	6	13.50
26/7/2017	124	17.23	208.55	6.55	4.79/202	13.38	6	13.50
28/11/17	122	16.81	203.47	-5.08	= 2.37	13.05	6	13.80
26/3/18	119	17.09	206.86	3.39		13.26	6	13.80
/7/18	Not yet in	my file.			5.57/206.86			
27/11/18	122	24.66	209.04	2.18	= 2.69	13.30	8	18.72
25/3/19	117	25.07	212.53	3.49		13.52	6	14.04
23/7/19	114	33.74	218.20	5.67	9.16/212.53	13.78	6	14.04
	Yet to	send.			= 4.30			