

## **Supplementary Submission to IPART re Water Charges to Irrigators on the Lower Bogan.**

After attending the community consultation meeting in Tamworth hosted by IPART on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010, I wish to raise several points re a fair and equitable charge on irrigators.

At present we are charged for water whether it is available or not. This is blatantly unfair for reasons pointed out in my original submission.

I would ask that IPART recommend to N.O.W. that the charges for the Lower Bogan be based on the required level of flow for legal irrigation at the stream gauging station known as Monkey Bridge.

The charge only to be applied for the period of time that the flow equals or exceeds the minimum legal flow for irrigation. ( the flow rates at Monkey Bridge are available from the BOM site on the internet and are remotely recorded on an hourly basis)

For example: flow rate above 125Mecs/day for 30 days in the year. That water is available for irrigation and meets the criteria for "Water Availability Charge". Therefore charge 8.2%  $(30/365 \times 100)$  of the full charge for the 12 month period.

This criteria could apply to every unregulated river in NSW and would be a fair way of recuperating some costs.

It was quite evident from the submissions presented today, that full cost recovery would place an intolerable financial burden, not only on irrigators, but also on industry and local government.

Full cost recovery for NOW is not achievable from the irrigation industry as NOW currently stands. Its operations would need to be severely curtailed before the users of water could fully fund its cost basis and it is doubtful whether NOW could meet its service obligations.

As was mentioned today, some of its services could be tendered out to private enterprise, with NOW also submitting a tender for the supply of services. This would bring increased transparency to its operations.

Another point mentioned today was the frequent changes of name for the organisation and the split in function between NOW and State Water. Mr Harriss did mention that considerable effort is being made to avoid duplication of service. Surely this could be avoided altogether if there was one body handling all the water business that the state is responsible for.

I wish to thank IPART for the opportunity to attend the community consultation meeting and to be able to have some input into the process.

John Hall