Customer submission
Essential Services Commission

My name is Dudley Bryant and I wish to make a submission to the Essential Services Commission regarding the proposed Pricing Submission which is being implemented by Goulburn Murray Water on behalf of Murray Valley Irrigators, irrigating from the Broken Creek in Northern Victoria.

Just a little of my farm history, In 1981 my wife and I shifted from a family farm in Strathmerton on the Murray Valley irrigation system to a property in Kaarimba still on the Murray Valley system, but pump irrigating from the Broken Creek. This was by far the one major requirement to our shifting to another property, that we had delivery of irrigation water from the Murray system, for obvious reasons, reliability and the age of the system.

In this submission I wish to bring to your attention several important points:

1 The consultation with Murray Valley customers was conducted by Shepparton Water Services Committee Chair and Shepparton manager in Cobram.
Their desired outcome was obvious, it lacked supporting figures/ savings.

2. Murray Valley Water Services Committee never supported Broken Creek leaving Murray Valley.

3. After a disappointing first meeting in Cobram, Anne Telford offered a second meeting with full Murray Valley Water Services. Where a number of Broken Creek Customers were invited, only to be advised the submission by Goulburn Murray Water had already been submitted to Essential Services Commission.

4. Shepparton Irrigation District claims they can achieve hugh savings- why haven't they already achieved savings to date and how is this going to be proven when all districts are together - easy to hide figures.

5. Two Billion dollars has been spent on the other five districts with modernisation.eg rationization of channels land meters and regulators, none of which has been done in Shepparton district. (Have we just wasted 2 Bill.) No we haven't but obviously Aither has not calculated these savings in five modernisated districts.

6. Shepparton District was not part of Foodbowl Modernisation and in their 160 mil Futureflow plan very little rationisation was achieved. Has Aither taken this into account. If so please. Make figures available.

I believe Shepparton should not be joining the other five irrigation districts until price savings have been proven and relevant figures released.

The Broken Creek delivery share should not be used to subsidies Shepparton District delivery share.

I refer to the Aither report page 16. "The relatively low operation costs of running Broken Creek"

There are 17 draining channels that drain both Murray Valley and Shepparton district which attract revenue through drainage rates. At time Goulburn Murray Water is being paid twice for some water.

Water is supplied from both Murray Valley and Shepparton District, at the moment both irrigation districts are supplying to downstream users (almond growers, grape growers etc) at no cost to them. Why are Broken Creek customers any different.

Would be happy to pay to both Murray Valley and Shepparton Districts the same as down stream users pay zero dollars. Murray Valley and Shepparton have been supplying 400ml a day (250 Shepparton and 150 from Murray Valley) for three months to by pass the Barmah Choke for free, exactly the same service as Broken Creek customers pay $30ml for.

My conclusion: If the status quo remained, delivery share on combined districts would be under $2000.00 delivery share.

My major concern going forward is when Shepparton district cannot justify cost savings and districts are split in future, The Broken creeks customers should not have to stay in the Shepparton district.