

Mr Charles Millsteed Chief Executive Officer Queensland Competition Authority GPO Box 2257 BRISBANE QLD 4001

3rd November 2019

Via email: http://www.qca.org.au/Submissions/Water

Dear Mr Millsteed,

Re: Central and Lower Lockyer Irrigators Submission on Draft Report – Rural Irrigation Price Review 2020-24 Part C: Seqwater - August 2019

This submission is on behalf of the Lockyer Valley Irrigators in the Central Lockyer water supply schemes and the Lower Lockyer water supply scheme.

Our submissions in March of this year and October 2018 asked the Authority to investigate the implications of the continuing poor annual performance of the water supply assets in determining prices for irrigation supply in both schemes over the next four years.

The QCA, while acknowledging the low water reliability issues for the schemes has rejected adjusting the tariff structure because the of the terms of reference for the investigations applied by the State Government.

It is noted that the Authority has recommended that 'prices for the Central Lockyer Valley WSS be updated to take into account the Water Plan (Moreton) (Supply Scheme Arrangements) Amendment Plan 2019 as soon as practicable after it is finalised'. We support this recommendation as the draft plan has addressed issues about the performance of scheme assets in recharging groundwater supply within the scheme. It will be important for the QCA to address the implications of the draft plan for pricing outcomes once the draft plan is approved for implementation.

No measures have been considered by the QCA or the State Government to address the continuing impact high fixed prices will have on irrigation farming in the Lower Lockyer. It is our view that the continued application of the pricing principles outlined in the State Government's referral will eventually drive commercial irrigation out of the Atkinson Dam Scheme.

This submission addresses the key issues that the QCA has failed to investigate in the draft report. The issues are dealt with in the order outlined in the draft report.

Prices are for the supply of water for irrigation purposes

The State Government requires the QCA to determine prices for the supply of water for irrigation services. These services are defined broadly in the Water Act 2000 as the 'supply of water or drainage services for irrigation of crops or pastures for commercial gain'. The QCA advises that this terminology is more specific than that used in the previous reviews 'and means that our recommended prices may potentially apply to a narrower range of irrigation customers compared to our previous review'. No attempt is made to identify which customers may be affected by this change in definition. For example, what are the implications for smaller farms that may not now be considered as using water for stock and domestic purposes. What other farming operations will be faced with paying significantly more for their water supply. The impact of these changes could be significant but customers have not been adequately informed and had the opportunity to submit on the impacts changes in prices will have.

Capital and operating cost assessments including renewals forecasts to 2027-28 and beyond

Customers in all schemes have not had sufficient opportunity to review the QCA analysis of capex and opex. The timing available since the release of the report is limited. Customers would need to engage consultants to review the costs analysis to be able to submit by 4th November. This engagement would need to also involve scrutiny of the financial model to adequately assess the QCA's investigations. The financial model has not been made available.

SEQWater also submitted to the QCA revised forecasts of renewals in November 2018 and January 2019. These changes have been accepted by the QCA but an opportunity should have been provided to review these updated estimates at an earlier stage of the investigations. The QCA failed to consult with customers during the conduct of investigations despite our formal requests. Investigations have been conducted behind closed doors without any opportunity to submit on revised capex and opex proposals.

Continuing the policy with renewals of replacing like with like is questioned particularly for schemes facing significant problems meeting cost reflective targets. Is it still relevant to continue with this approach given these cost recovery problems. Annual reviews of Network Service Plans don't really provide the opportunity to discuss this issue. The QCA recommendations for SEQWater to improve consultation in the future is of little benefit for this new price path. QCA should have investigated alternative capex programs to identify cost efficiency outcomes. Attention has been given to the future implementation of a regulated asset base (RAB) approach but this does not change the outcomes for this price path. We would need to be convinced that application of a RAB would make any change to our capex outcomes in future pricing investigations.

Conclusion: The QCA investigations do not adequately address the cost issues facing the Central and Lower Lockyer schemes.

Water access entitlements in the Central Lockyer scheme.

QCA has accepted 5,051 ML as the volume of water access entitlements for the Morton Vale pipeline to calculate the Part C distribution fixed price for pipeline customers. The QCA notes that this volume includes entitlements that were handed back in the period before the 2013 pricing determination. It is also noted that the Water Act was only amended in 2017-18 to provide processes to deal with the hand back of entitlements. The QCA uses SEQWater's submitted water allocation entitlements of 3,420ML to calculate the bulk fixed price for the scheme.

The QCA justifies this approach on the basis of consistency with the 2013 pricing determination and to avoid pipeline customers paying the cost of the handed in entitlements. It is understood that SEQWater covers the cost of these unused entitlements.

Recommendation: That the treatment of the handed in allocations in the Morton Vale distribution scheme be investigated by the State Government in consultation with scheme customers to allow the QCA to update prices as soon as possible.

Forecast volumes and entitlement usage

The QCA has proposed using a 20 year period to assess water use for the purpose of assessing volumetric tariffs. In Central Lockyer Lake Clarendon received 11% and Bill Gunn Dam 30% of entitlements over this period and Lower Lockyer 19%. The three schemes were built to supply water for irrigation but the storage works have not been able to deliver the volumes of water in accordance with designed performance standards. The table attached in the appendix to this report shows the performance of storages in the schemes relative to their design capacity. The Table below included in our March submission summarises the data from the appendix1.

Scheme	Commissioned	Years of Data	Capacity	Performance
	(1 st release)			(Average)
Atkinson Dam	1972	45 years	31,300 ML	19%
Lake Clarendon	1995	22 years	21,000 ML	11%
(includes Mortonvale				
Pipeline releases)				
Bill Gunn Dam	1989	28 years	7,520 ML	29%

The draft plan for the Central Lockyer scheme provides for two thirds of groundwater entitlements to be treated as low priority while further investigations are conducted into levels of recharge performance from scheme storages compared with recharge that occurs naturally.

As outlined in the introduction to this submission we support the QCA's recommendation that 'prices for the Central Lockyer Valley WSS be updated to take into account the Water Plan (Moreton) (Supply Scheme Arrangements) Amendment Plan 2019 as soon as practicable after it is finalised.'

Conclusion: The QCA does not make any provision in the draft report to address the poor performance of the Lower Lockyer water supply scheme. Most customers in the scheme have no alternative supply.

Tariff structure

The QCA recommends a tariff structure of a volumetric price that covers the variable costs of supply and a fixed price that recovers the balance of the revenue requirement.

The Authority acknowledges the concerns raised by customers in schemes with low reliability particularly in Lockyer Valley. However, the option of adjusting the tariff structure to address low reliability of supply was rejected as it was inconsistent with the Government's requirements in the referral that fixed charges be no lower than the existing 2019–20 fixed price. They also noted that 'rebalancing the tariff structure may mask the underlying problems in some schemes and delay the timely consideration and resolution of those problems'.

We question this conclusion given that the QCA adjusted the tariff structure in the Pie Creek distribution scheme to address the impact of very high fixed costs. It is understood that this determination was based upon an assessment of capacity to pay for the four commercial irrigation farms in the scheme.

We understand that the State Government's referral requires the QCA to take into account capacity to pay. However, we have not had the opportunity to prepare an adequate scheme wide case for the Lower Lockyer which addresses the issue of capacity to pay for a majority of entitlement holders. Such a case would need to address the long term impact on commercial irrigation farming of high fixed charges and continuing poor scheme water reliability. The assessment of bill impacts conducted by the QCA assumes there are no impacts with prices over the current price path. Also there is no investigation of the longer term impacts of continuing to apply the tariff structure proposed in the draft report. Customers are effectively paying six times the proposed fixed charge given that they are not receiving a reasonable supply reliability of 70 to 80%.

It is also important that investigations address the impact of high fixed charges on the application of not only the water pricing principles of the National Water Initiative but also for the implementation of water planning provisions and particularly the implementation of water trading. Water trading is promoted as an effective market mechanism to help schemes such as the Lower Lockyer to boost demand and thereby drive down prices.

What has been the benefit of water trading in the Lower Lockyer in improving water use over the term of the current price path? Are high fixed charges impeding the functioning of the water market? Is water being purchased in the scheme for irrigation or for other non-irrigation purposes? How is it possible for a water trading mechanism to be viable when scheme performance is 19% and has delivered nil water for over 3 years, the mechanism cannot be relevant to the operational reality and therefore cannot work.

It is unlikely that customers of the Lower Lockyer scheme will have the time and resources to undertake this brief for the QCA.

The financial impact is clearly identified by Lower Lockyer Irrigator Ray Mayne who done the maths based the last 20 years achieving an average of 10% announced allocation. The true cost of water from Atkinson Dam is \$653.30 per ML delivered. Under the proposed 2020-2024 price path the Part A charge will be \$29,917 per year regardless of any scheme water delivery. Ray Mayne's analysis of water pricing and impacts is contained in appendix 2.

Conclusions:

- The proposed 2020 2024 price path will cause some Lower Lockyer Irrigators to close down and leave agriculture.
- The State will end up with stranded water assets.
- The current Part A fixed cost recovery model is not applicable or viable for long term poor performing water schemes.
- **Recommendation:** It is recommended that the State Government engage with the scheme customers and SEQWater to investigate the long term impacts of high fixed charges on the Lower Lockyer irrigation scheme and measures that can be implemented to address these impacts including water trading and policy changes to allow improved adjustment arrangement for tariffs.

The State Government's referral requires the Authority to develop prices for current tariff groups for all water supply schemes.

Our March 2019 submission requested that 'Nodal Pricing should be given serious consideration to prevent cross subsidisation. The QCA's proposed prices are the same for both the Bill Gun Dam and Lake Clarendon sections of the bulk water supply scheme. However, the operation of each segment are completely different as the Bill Gun Dam is gravity fed for water both in and out whereas Lake Clarendon is dependent on electric pumps. The electricity charges to move water through Lake Clarendon are significant.

Recommendation: It is requested that the QCA investigate the evidence supporting the application of nodal pricing.

Dam safety costs

Seqwater had advised that dam safety projects in the irrigation scheme have either been commissioned prior to 1 July 2020 or are not forecast to be commissioned until beyond 2023–24. A project for Atkinson Dam is to be commissioned in 2036-37. QCA outlines their proposals for the treatment of dam safety costs in their Part A draft report. We are opposed to the QCA recommendation that 80% of the irrigation share of dam safety upgrade capital costs be allocated to irrigation water users state wide for schemes that are not designated as providing a flood mitigation benefit. We are of the view that this ratio cannot

be justified for the proposals for Atkinson Dam.

In a large scale flooding event, the benefits that will accrue from any works to reduce flood damage will be of significant benefit to the extensive areas of urban, industrial and infrastructure development downstream of the Lockyer Valley. This benefit will increase significantly with the further development of the South East Queensland region. It is also questioned whether the costs can be justified at any time in the future for a dam with such a low reliability of supply record. The prospect of having to cope with the addition of dam safety costs in a future price path raises further questions about the viability of this irrigation scheme if there is no change to government policies in regard to annual fixed price escalation and there are no improvements in supply reliability.

Conclusion: Lower Lockyer irrigation customers oppose the recommendations of the QCA in regard to the sharing of dam safety costs.

Inspector-General Emergency Management (IGEM) costs

The QCA draft report for SEQWater makes no reference to the application of the full costs of flood management including emergency action planning and monitoring and reporting seasonal flood events to schemes as required in the State Government's referral. It is understood that this is because SEQWater does not perform this function at this stage.

It is understood however that SEQWater will be required to perform these functions in the future.

We are opposed to the introduction of these costs in future price paths because if our dams and storages were not in place there would still be a requirement to manage the risk to populated areas during flood events. These assets also provide flood mitigation benefits. The requirement to manage the risk is not brought about by the capture of water, so the cost should not be passed on the people using the water.

The IGEM recommendations involve the implementation of a community safety program to be delivered by the Bureau of Meteorology and the local disaster management groups. The program must be funded by the community, not SEQWater customers.

Conclusion: There has been no consultation with SEQWater irrigation customers about the introduction of these costs in future price paths. We are opposed to the introduction of these costs.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- It is recommended that the State Government engage with irrigation customers and SEQWater to investigate the long term impacts of high fixed charges on all Lockyer Valley irrigation schemes so measures can be implemented to address these impacts including water trading and policy changes to allow improved adjustment arrangement for tariffs.
- Create a water pricing category specifically for irrigation schemes that have been identified as having long term poor performance (less the 50% delivery). Develop new government Part A pricing policy that specifically addresses poor scheme performance which is correlated against a moving scale for fixed cost recovery that matches the annual announced allocation. If the announced allocation is 20%, then the Part A fixed cost recovery should also be set at 20%.
- Investigate options to rebirth (in progress) the three poor performing schemes in the Lockyer Valley to make them financially sustainable and viable for the irrigation community and the State Government.

S. von der &

Gordon Van der Est Chief Executive Officer Lockyer Water Users Forum

25m/

Greg Banff Secretary/Treasurer Lockyer Water Users Forum

Appendix 1.

Capacity: 7,520 constructed 1987) 21,000 constructed 1932) 31,300 1972		Bill Gunn Dam		am	Lake Clarendon			Atkinson Dam		
1972 2,960 10% 1973 5,999 19% 1974 5,999 19% 1975 3,478 11% 1976 3,832 12% 1977 3,832 12% 1978 11,133 36% 1979 5,274 17% 1980 7,73 36% 1981 7,33 23% 1982 13,451 43% 1984 12,23 36% 1985 7,175 23% 1986 12,633 40% 1987 6,830 17% 1988 6,830 2% 1989 2,900 39% 4,744 1989 2,900 39% 1,122 1989 2,900 39% 1,122 1989 2,460 30% 1,122 1999 2,450 30% 1,257 1999 2,450 30% 1,275 1999	Capacity:	7,520	(constructed 1	987)	21,000	(constructed 1	992)	31,300		
1972 2.996 10% 1973 5.899 19% 1974 2.192 7% 1975 3.478 11% 1976 3.632 12% 1977 1.902 6% 1977 3.632 12% 1978 1.902 6% 1979 1.3451 3.632 1980 7.230 2.3% 1981 7.230 2.3% 1982 11.232 3.6% 1983 11.232 3.6% 1984 11.233 17% 1985 11.2,503 4.0% 1986 4.854 16% 1987 4.855 16% 1988 4.855 16% 1999 2.470 3.8% 4.855 1999 2.470 3.8% 11.122 1991 6.300 92% 11.122 1995 - 0% 1.757 1998 - 0%			(11111111111111111111111111111111111111	,						
1973 1974 1975 5.899 19% 1976 2,102 7% 2,102 7% 1977 3.632 12% 3.632 12% 1977 3.632 12% 3.632 12% 1978 5.274 17% 3.632 12% 1980 5.274 17% 5.274 17% 1981 5.274 17% 5.274 17% 1983 5.274 17% 5.23% 5.274 17% 1984 5.274 17% 5.23% 5.274 17% 1985 5.270 3.8% 1.222 39% 12.503 4.0% 1985 5.233 17% 12.503 4.0% 12.503 4.0% 1986 - 6.630 2.90% 11.122 39% 11.232 39% 1995 - 0% 1.777 8% 1 1.1455 3.4% 1995 - 0% 1.777	1972							2,996	10%	
1974	1973							5,899	19%	
1975 3,478 11% 1977 1,902 6% 1977 3,632 12% 1978 1,11,135 3,632 1979 1,11,135 3,632 1980 1,1232 3,632 1980 5,274 17% 1983 5,274 17% 1984 1,1232 36% 1985 1,1232 36% 1986 1,1232 36% 1988 1,1232 36% 1989 2,900 39% 12,503 1989 2,900 39% 12,503 1989 2,900 39% 12,503 1999 2,670 36% 12,503 1999 2,670 36% 12,503 1999 2,670 36% 11,22 1991 6,630 92% 11,122 1992 2,240 30% 11,122 1993 6,732 90% 11,123 1996 - 0% 11,123 1997 2,435 326%<	1974							2,192	7%	
1976 1,002 6% 1977 3,3632 12% 1978 11,135 36% 1980 11,135 36% 1980 13,451 43% 1981 7,230 23% 1982 13,451 43% 1983 11,22 36% 1984 5,274 17% 1986 11,220 36% 1988 5,183 17% 1986 5,183 17% 1986 4,655 2% 1988 2,900 39% 4,764 1989 2,670 36% 4,764 1992 2,240 30% 4,764 1993 6,732 90% 11,122 1996 - 0% 11,122 1993 6,732 90% 1,141 1996 - 0% 1,143 1996 - 0% 1,143 1996 - 0% 1,	1975							3,478	11%	
1977 3,632 12% 1979 11,135 36% 1979 13,451 43% 1980 13,451 43% 1982 11,135 36% 1983 7,230 22% 1984 11,122 36% 1985 11,123 36% 1986 11,232 36% 1987 5,717 23% 1988 11,232 36% 1986 11,232 36% 1987 5,718 17% 1988 2,900 39% 4,555 1999 2,670 36% 11,122 1999 2,670 36% 11,145 1999 2,670 36% 11,145 1999 2,670 36% 11,145 1999 2,670 36% 11,145 1999 2,240 30% 11,145 1999 2,240 38% 10,332 1996 450	1976							1,902	6%	
1978 11,135 36% 1990 13,451 43% 1980 13,451 43% 1982 13,451 43% 1982 13,451 43% 1982 13,451 43% 1982 11,232 36% 1984 4,454 15% 1985 11,75 23% 1986 12,203 40% 1988 2,900 39% 12,003 1988 2,900 39% 4,455 1990 2,670 36% 4,455 1991 6,330 92% 11,122 1992 2,240 30% 11,456 1992 2,400 30% 11,464 1993 6,732 90% 13,371 1994 6,450 86% 7,491 1995 - 0% 1,145 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 1998 - 0% 1,414	1977							3,632	12%	
1979	1978							11,135	36%	
1990	1979							6,006	19%	
1981	1980							13,451	43%	
1982 5,274 17% 1984 11,232 36% 1984 4,884 15% 1986 12,203 40% 1996 12,503 40% 1997 5,183 17% 1998 6,36 2% 1999 2,670 36% 4,885 1990 2,670 36% 4,885 1992 2,240 30% 11,122 1993 6,732 90% 11,122 1993 6,732 90% 11,444 1995 - 0% 11,444 1995 - 0% 1,757 1996 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1997 2,435 32% 6,626 32% 3 1996 - 0% 11/8 9% 4 12,623 1999 2,216 29% 2,964 14% 5 2,616 8% 2000 1,655 <th>1981</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>7,230</th> <th>23%</th> <th></th>	1981							7,230	23%	
1983 11,222 36% 1984 1 4,584 15% 1985 7,175 23% 1986 12,503 40% 1987 5,183 17% 1988 636 2% 1999 2,900 39% 4,854 1991 6,930 92% 4,764 1992 2,240 30% 11,122 1993 6,732 90% 11,122 1994 200 3% 10,332 1995 - 0% 1,757 1994 200 3% 10,332 1995 - 0% 1,757 1994 200 3% 10,332 1995 - 0% 1,757 1998 - 0% 1,757 1999 2,435 32% 6,626 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 2001 1,757 23% 1,284 4% 2001 1,757 23% 1,284 12,485	1982							5,274	17%	
1984 4,884 15% 1985 7,175 23% 1986 7,175 23% 1987 12,503 40% 1988 4,885 16% 1999 2,670 39% 4,855 1990 2,670 39% 4,855 1991 6,330 92% 11,122 1992 2,240 30% 11,122 1993 6,732 90% 11,145 1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1993 6,450 86% 7,491 30% 2,3871 12% 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 30% 2,466 8% 2000 1,655 22% 2,267 11% 6 8,440 27% 2000 1,655 22% 2,267 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44%	1983							11,232	36%	
1995 7,175 23% 1996 12,503 40% 1987 5,183 17% 1988 636 2% 1999 2,900 39% 4,855 16% 1990 2,670 36% 4,764 15% 1991 6,930 92% 11,122 36% 1992 2,240 30% 8,095 26% 1993 6,732 90% 11,495 37% 1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3871 12% 1998 - 0% 1,18 9% 4 12,623 40% 1999 2,216 29% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,743 8% 7 13,619 44% 2003 - 0% - 0% 144 16	1984							4,584	15%	
1996 12,503 40% 1997 5,183 17% 1988 636 2% 1999 2,670 36% 4,855 1999 2,670 36% 4,764 1991 6,930 92% 4,764 1992 2,240 30% 11,122 1993 6,732 90% 11,122 1994 200 3% 11,455 1995 - 0% 1,757 1995 - 0% 1,757 1995 - 0% 1,757 1995 - 0% 1,918 1998 - 0% 1,918 1998 - 0% 1,918 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 1999 2,216 29% 2,257 2002 - 0% - 2003 - 0% - 2004 - 0% - 2005 - 0% - 0% 2006 -	1985							7,175	23%	
1987 5,183 17% 1988 636 2% 1989 2,000 39% 4855 1990 2,670 36% 4855 1991 6,930 92% 11,122 1992 2,240 30% 80,095 1993 6,732 90% 11,142 37% 1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1995 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,823 40% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,823 40% 1999 2,216 29% 2,267 11% 6 8440 27% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8440 27% 2004 - 0% - 0% 1 2,102 7% 2004 - 0% </th <th>1986</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>12,503</th> <th>40%</th> <th></th>	1986							12,503	40%	
1988 636 2% 1998 2,000 33% 4,855 16% 1990 2,670 36% 4,764 15% 1991 6,930 92% 11,122 36% 1992 2,240 30% 11,123 36% 1993 6,732 90% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1995 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1998 - 0% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 1 1,619 44%	1987							5,183	17%	
1999 2,900 39% 4,855 16% 1990 2,670 36% 4,855 16% 1991 6,330 92% 11,122 36% 1992 2,240 30% 11,145 37% 1993 6,732 90% 11,445 37% 1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,444 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3,871 12% 1996 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1998 - 0% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2000 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2002 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2004 - 0% - 0% 11 2,10	1988							636	2%	
1990 2,670 36% 4,764 15% 1991 6,330 92% 11,122 36% 1992 2,240 30% 8,095 26% 1993 6,732 90% 11,495 37% 1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3,871 12% 1997 2,435 32% 6,626 32% 3 10,767 34% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2000 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2003 - 0% - 0% 1 2,102 7% 2004 - 0% - 0% 1 2,102 7% 2005 - 0%	1989	2,900	39%					4,855	16%	
1991 6,330 92% 11,1,122 36% 1992 2,240 30% 11,495 26% 1993 6,732 90% 11,495 37% 1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 2 3,871 12% 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3,871 12% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1999 2,216 29% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,767 23% 1,1783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2002 - 0% - 0% 12 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2005 - 0% - 0% 12 - 0% <td< th=""><th>1990</th><th>2,670</th><th>36%</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>4,764</th><th>15%</th><th></th></td<>	1990	2,670	36%					4,764	15%	
1992 2,240 30% 8,095 26% 1993 6,732 90% 11,495 37% 1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3,871 12% 1997 2,435 32% 6,626 32% 3 10,767 34% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2003 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2005 - 0% - 0% 15 16,075	1991	6,930	92%					11,122	36%	
1993 6,732 90% 11,495 37% 1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3,871 12% 1997 2,435 32% 6,626 32% 3 10,767 34% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1999 2,216 29% 2,964 14% 5 2,616 8% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2003 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% -	1992	2,240	30%					8,095	26%	
1994 200 3% 10,332 33% 1995 - 0% 17,57 8% 1 1,464 5% 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3,871 12% 1997 2,435 32% 6,626 32% 3 10,767 34% 1999 2,216 29% 2,964 14% 5 2,616 8% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2002 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,298 4% 2003 - 0% - 0% 9 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2006 - 0% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2008 894	1993	6,732	90%					11,495	37%	
1995 - 0% 1,757 8% 1 1,464 5% 1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3,871 12% 1997 2,435 32% 6,626 32% 3 10,767 34% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1999 2,216 29% 2,964 14% 5 2,616 8% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2002 - 0% 1 2,267 11% 8 1,298 4% 2003 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2006 - 0% - 0% 15 16,075 <th>1994</th> <th>200</th> <th>3%</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>10,332</th> <th>33%</th> <th></th>	1994	200	3%					10,332	33%	
1996 6,450 86% 7,491 36% 2 3,871 12% 1997 2,435 32% 6,626 32% 3 10,767 34% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1999 2,216 29% 2,964 14% 5 2,616 8% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2002 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,298 4% 2003 - 0% 1,757 0% 0 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2007 - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2004 16,34 <th>1995</th> <th>-</th> <th>0%</th> <th></th> <th>1,757</th> <th>8%</th> <th>1</th> <th>1,464</th> <th>5%</th> <th></th>	1995	-	0%		1,757	8%	1	1,464	5%	
1997 2,435 32% 6,626 32% 3 10,767 34% 1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1999 2,216 29% 2,964 14% 5 2,616 8% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2003 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,298 4% 2004 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2006 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2007 - 0% - 0% 14 818 3% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23%	1996	6,450	86%		7,491	36%	2	3,871	12%	
1998 - 0% 1,918 9% 4 12,623 40% 1999 2,216 29% 2,964 14% 5 2,616 8% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2002 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,298 4% 2003 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,298 4% 2004 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2007 - 0% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23%	1997	2,435	32%		6,626	32%	3	10,767	34%	
1999 2,216 29% 2,964 14% 5 2,616 8% 2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2002 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,298 4% 2003 - 0% - 0% 9 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 12 - 0% 2006 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 1,75 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888	1998	-	0%		1,918	9%	4	12,623	40%	
2000 1,655 22% 2,257 11% 6 8,440 27% 2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2003 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,288 4% 2003 - 0% - 0% 9 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 12 - 0% 2007 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2	1999	2,216	29%		2,964	14%	5	2,616	8%	
2001 1,757 23% 1,783 8% 7 13,619 44% 2002 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,298 4% 2003 - 0% - 0% 9 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 12 - 0% 2007 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17%	2000	1,655	22%		2,257	11%	6	8,440	27%	
2002 - 0% 144 1% 8 1,298 4% 2003 - 0% - 0% 9 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 12 - 0% 2006 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2007 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2016	2001	1,757	23%		1,783	8%	7	13,619	44%	
2003 - 0% - 0% 9 - 0% 2004 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% - 0% 12 - 0% 2007 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2012 1,275 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% <th>2002</th> <th>-</th> <th>0%</th> <th></th> <th>144</th> <th>1%</th> <th>8</th> <th>1,298</th> <th>4%</th> <th></th>	2002	-	0%		144	1%	8	1,298	4%	
2004 - 0% - 0% 10 - 0% 2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% 12 - 0% 12 - 0% 2007 - 0% 13 - 0% 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0%	2003	-	0%		-	0%	9	-	0%	
2005 - 0% - 0% 11 2,102 7% 2006 - 0% 12 - 0% 2007 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2012 1,275 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3%	2004	-	0%		-	0%	10	-	0%	
2006 - 0% 12 - 0% 2007 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2012 1,275 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 271,414 Ta	2005	-	0%		-	0%	11	2,102	1%	
2007 - 0% - 0% 13 - 0% 2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2012 1,275 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 201 2,21,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 462,000 1,408,500 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 30% 11% 19* 19* <th>2006</th> <th>-</th> <th>0%</th> <th></th> <th>-</th> <th>0%</th> <th>12</th> <th>-</th> <th>0%</th> <th></th>	2006	-	0%		-	0%	12	-	0%	
2008 894 12% 780 4% 14 818 3% 2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2012 1,275 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Averag	2007	-	0%		-	0%	13	-	0%	
2009 7,687 102% - 0% 15 16,075 51% 2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2012 1,275 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11%<	2008	894	12%		780	4%	14	818	3%	
2010 6,290 84% 1,634 8% 16 7,124 23% 2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2012 1,275 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 19%	2009	7,687	102%		-	0%	15	16,075	51%	
2011 217 3% 575 3% 17 3,192 10% 2012 1,275 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 16% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 19*	2010	6,290	84%		1,634	8%	16	7,124	23%	
2012 1,2/5 17% 2,647 13% 18 4,888 10% 2013 307 4% 2,442 12% 19 5,379 17% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 19*	2011	217	3%		5/5	3%	17	3,192	10%	
2013 307 470 2,442 1270 19 5,373 11% 2014 3,580 48% 10,472 50% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 195	2012	1,2/5	17%		2,04/	13%	18	4,888	10%	
2014 3,360 40% 10,472 30% 20 12,468 40% 2015 6,110 81% 6,907 33% 21 8,610 28% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 20 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 40% Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 19%	2013	307	4%		2,442	IZ%	19	5,379	17%	
2015 6,110 61% 6,907 33% 21 6,610 20% 2016 1,263 17% - 0% 22 886 3% Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 21 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 19%	2014	5,560	40%		10,472	00%	20	12,400	40%	
Z010 1,203 17% - 0% 22 666 3% Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 22 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 195	2015	1 262	01%		6,907		21	0,010	20%	
Summary Data Bill Gunn Dam: 28 Years Summary Data Lake Clarendon: 22 Years Summary Data Atkinson Dam: 45 Years Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 1955	2010	1,203	1770		-	0%	22	000	370	
Total Water Released:63,80850,397271,411Target Release:210,560462,0001,408,500Average released per year :2,2792,2916,031Average % of Design Capacity:30%11%19%		Summary Dat	a Bill Gunn Da	m. 29 Voars	Summary Dat	a Lako Claron	don: 22 Voars	Summary Data	Atkinson Day	m: 45 Voare
Total Water Released: 63,808 50,397 271,411 Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 195		Cannary Dat			Cannary Dat	a Lake Glaiell	uon. 22 itais			
Target Release: 210,560 462,000 1,408,500 Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 196	Total Water Rele	ased.		808 23			50 307			271 411
Average released per year : 2,279 2,291 6,031 Average % of Design Capacity: 30% 11% 19%	Target Release			210 560			462 000			1 408 500
Average % of Design Capacity:2,2172,2170,00111%19%	Average release.	d ner vear ·		2 10,300			-+02,000			6 031
Tronago / Tronag	Average % of De	sign Canacity		30%			2,231			10%
Median Release : 1.465 1696 1696 1696 1696 1696 1696 1696 16	Median Release	:		1 465			1 696			5 183
Releases in Years : 20 out of 28 15 out of 22 41 out of 45	Releases in Yea	· rs:		20 out of 28			15 out of 22			41 out of 45
Below Dead Storage: 29% 32%	Below Dead Sto	rade:		29%			32%			9%
		U ·								570

Appendix 2.

351 Rocky Gully Rd Coominya Qld 4311 1st November 2019

Mr Darren Page Queensland Competition Authority GPO Box 2257 Brisbane Qld 4001

RE: Atkinson Dam Irrigation Water Pricing 2020 - 2024 Price Path

I am an irrigator on the Atkinson Dam Scheme and was present and the workshop held by the QCA at Atkinson Dam on the 10th October.

My water allocation from Atkinson Dam is 482 ML, and I am one of the larger irrigators on the scheme. As you are aware there has not been a release from the scheme for some 3 years. We calculate the average water delivery since inception at 19% and your presentation indicated 16% efficiency. We are both in total agreement on the poor long term performance of Atkinson Dam.

I wish to highlight that by 2024 it is intended that water charges proposed for Part A are \$62.07 (65%) + Part B of \$32.61 (35%) = \$94.68 in total. Based on this my actual cost for water delivered from the scheme is tabled below by announced allocation. The real cost of water delivered is over \$600 ML and not the artificial representation proposed of \$94.68.

Allocation %	=%/ML	Part A @	Part B @	Combined A & B	\$/ML
	Delivered	\$62.07/ML	\$32.61/ML		
5	24.1	\$29,917.74	\$785.90	\$30,703.64	\$1,274.00
10	48.2	\$29,917.74	\$1,571.80	\$31,489.54	\$653.30
16	77.12	\$29,917.74	\$2,514.88	\$32,432.62	\$402.38
19	91.58	\$29,917.74	\$2,986.42	\$32,904.16	\$359.29
25	120.5	\$29,917.74	\$3,929.50	\$33,847.24	\$280.88

Over the last 20 years that I have been on the scheme I would have been lucky to average 10% because of all the years that we've had zero water. As you can see in my table above, 10% is equivalent to \$653.30/ML. My Part A charge alone would be \$29,917.74 per year.

Please explain to me how I am expected to pay over \$600 ML water charges when I cannot even generate an income because of the scheme's poor performance? Mr Page, could you please provide a written response to the question, how do I generate an income to pay \$30K per year Part A charges and avoid the financial destruction of my business ?

The 2020 - 2024 price path being recommended by the QCA for Atkinson Dam will be the last straw, many of the irrigators will go out of business and State of Qld will end up with stranded assets.

It is time the QCA stepped up and provided some strategic direction to the Qld State Government that addressed the fundamental issue that Atkinson Dam and the other schemes in the Lockyer Valley are mitigated failures. It is not viable to have an escalating price path of fixed cost recovery when no product (water) is delivered.

Regards

Ray Mayne gldchickens@bigpond.com Mob. 0403 340 139