

POTATO GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF WA (INC)

6th of December 2010

Dear All Vegetable and Potato growers,

Recently I attended a teleconference with the Farmers federation, Fruit West, Manjimup and Pemberton landowners, to achieve a coordinated plan for horticulture regarding the second draft report, **"Inquiry into water resource management and planning charges"**.

The report was requested by treasury for consideration by state cabinet. This extraordinary report appears to be based on a philosophy of cost recovery and user pay principals. Unlike the previous legislation that failed which was after grower's money of \$5.8 million. This report is suggesting \$29.2 million as per the attached letter.

Therefore our group is requesting all of our growers in horticulture to place your name and address at the top of the attached letter, sign it and post it so it will arrive in Perth before the deadline of 20th of December.

Our group will be submitting individual detailed submission to the ERA, attending a series of meetings with political leaders and the public service.

Please don't under estimate this report, we all need to work together to achieve legislation that is acceptable to the growers of Western Australia.

Regards,

Jim Turley

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.


The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely

Elia Rigali
D. Rigali

ABN: 14 133 301 069		ACN: 133 301 069
Gourmet fresh farms pty ltd		
E. & D. & D. Rigali Ph: (08) 9206 0000 Fax: (08) 9206 2191 Elia Mob: 0417 929 769 Damien Mob: 0407 447 524		

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007-2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



V+M Cavallaro

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999


We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



7-12-2010

[REDACTED]

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007-2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



CR. WESTCOTT

9-12-2010.

[REDACTED]

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007-2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely

BA Taylor.

9-12-2010

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007-2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



DIRECTOR

I. R BAKOTA

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999


We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007-2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



I & R BAKOTA

David Paterson

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely

David Paterson

6-12-10

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
 Economic Regulation Authority
 Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
 Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
 Economic Regulation Authority
 Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
 Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007-2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely

G. Ivankovich 9/12/10

Ph (08) 9731 2134
 ABN: 95 525 658 429

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
 Economic Regulation Authority
 Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
 Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database, and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



P.M. Uicgh.

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.


The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely

S. MITRI



Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999


We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely

J. MITRI


Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
 Economic Regulation Authority
 Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
 Fax: (08) 92131999


We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



WADE, Glenn BERTT
DECAMINO

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999


We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely



Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.


The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely

JG. UC Eardley-Wilmot





POTATO GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF WA (INC)

6th of December 2010

Dear All Vegetable and Potato growers,

Recently I attended a teleconference with the Farmers federation, Fruit West, Manjimup and Pemberton landowners, to achieve a coordinated plan for horticulture regarding the second draft report, **"Inquiry into water resource management and planning charges"**.

The report was requested by treasury for consideration by state cabinet. This extraordinary report appears to be based on a philosophy of cost recovery and user pay principals. Unlike the previous legislation that failed which was after grower's money of \$5.8 million. This report is suggesting \$29.2 million as per the attached letter.

Therefore our group is requesting all of our growers in horticulture to place your name and address at the top of the attached letter, sign it and post it so it will arrive in Perth before the deadline of 20th of December.

Our group will be submitting individual detailed submission to the ERA, attending a series of meetings with political leaders and the public service.

Please don't under estimate this report, we all need to work together to achieve legislation that is acceptable to the growers of Western Australia.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Turley", written over a horizontal line.

Jim Turley

G Verheyen

Inquiry into Water Resource Management Charges
Economic Regulation Authority
Email: publicsubmissions@era.wa.gov.au
Fax: (08) 92131999

We are a self-supply water user in agriculture; our private investment in water infrastructure contributes to the economy and employment in Western Australia. The ERA Draft Report of the Inquiry into Water Resource Management and Planning Charges (December 2009) has identified \$29.2 million of the annual budget of the Department of Water for cost recovery from water users. This amount for cost recovery is five times the \$5.8 million cost recovery sought by the Department of Water in 2007–2008, which was twice disallowed by State Parliament because the associated fee structure was irrational and unfair.

The previous flawed attempt at cost recovery was particularly unfair to self-supply water users in agriculture. Now the ERA Draft Report is similarly flawed but the cost implications to us are five times as great. The Draft Report proposes many self-supply water users pay annual water resource management and planning charges of \$1,670 for each licence, and renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process. Applying for a new licence for a dam or bore will cost between \$2,101 and \$3,350. The ERA gives examples of a small winery using 11 megalitres of water being subject to an annual charge of \$1,669, yet a large winery using 360 megalitres and an irrigator using 55,000 megalitres are charged the same \$1,669 in water resource management and planning charges. This is irrational and unfair.

We submit the following in relation to services relevant to self-supply water users:

1. Water is vital to all communities and most economic activity in WA. The State Government should fund water resource management and planning from the consolidated fund derived from State and Commonwealth taxes we pay. Specific charges imposed on water licence holders for 'water resource management' (including planning) are opposed. Any attempt to apply water resource management and planning charges is likely to be fundamentally flawed because of diversity between water resource regions, uses and users in WA. The simplistic revenue raising 'formula' for water resource management charges the ERA proposes cannot be applied rationally and equitably across all water resources and use regions. The ERA says the State Government should cover the water resource management charges of water for the environment, but fails to recognise the value self-supply water users in agriculture add to the economy, especially in regional WA. Again, irrational and unfair.
2. Where an allocation of or entitlement to water is sought, an 'Application Assessment Fee' could be required which reflects the complexity of Department of Water assessment for the particular dam or bore and water resource; with the applicant to receive a quote for assessment related to hours of service and fee per hour, and be able to appeal to a senior officer of the Department if the quote is unacceptable. The Draft Report says the Department of Water is not able to provide specific quotations for services, so the ERA is proposing a crude \$2,101 to \$3,350. Again, irrational and unfair. The Department must improve its operations to provide quotations that are normal practice for commercial services in the private sector.
3. Upon allocation of water, a 'Water Licence Fee' could be required which reflects cost recovery of administration of a licensing database. The licence holder could opt to pay either annually or 10 years in advance (analogous to a drivers licence). The Drivers licence fee is an established benchmark for administration of a licensing database and is either \$36.60 annually or \$116 for five years in advance. A 'Water Licence Fee' at a higher cost than a Drivers licence fee is opposed.
4. A 'Licence Renewal Fee' at end of licence duration (usually 10 years) could be required; this would represent the 'Water Licence Fee' (analogous to the renewal of a Drivers licence). If a relevant Water Allocation Plan identified a particular water resource was over-allocated because of diminished resource, a reassessment could be required and be subject to the same transparent fee process as an initial application. The ERA proposed Licence Renewal fees of \$1,056 for what is usually a 'rubber stamping' process are unacceptable.
5. An 'Arbitration Fee'; in the rare event a dispute arises between water users, the water users could seek conciliation and arbitration services of the Department of Water and the Department apply a reasonable charge to recover officer's time for conciliation and arbitration.

Yours sincerely


G. Verheyen