

Author name: C. Ross

Date of submission: Thursday, 7 November 2024

Your submission for this review:

Using numbering from the issues paper: 1. Engagement the measures sound good on paper but most people are concerned with costs and if the water is clean. Soft measures such as water literacy are nice but fairly meaningless. 2. the reduction in pollution incidents target is pretty soft - less than today doesn't seem at all ambitious. 5. Price increases are steep and based on the text seem to be a result of long term neglect. As for affordability a breakdown of annual increases is as follows for a household using 200kl per year: Water usage : +16% or \$90 Water service: +400% or +\$273 waste water service: +47% or +\$72.80 Storm water: +92% or +\$19.80 With this breakdown of a \$455 increase in water bills each year placing most of the increase into service charges reduces the impetus to conserve water. While a \$90 increase is not insignificant the realistic ability to reduce this might be only \$10-50 for a more modern house that has 4.5/3L flush toilets and front loaders with water saving showers. The proposal that a household decrease annual water use by 87kl out of an average 200kl seems unrealistic. As such this represents a significant increase in the water bill which seems inappropriate during a time when inflation is causing cost of living issues. It also leaves only a very small incentive to reduce water consumption, Significantly reducing water consumption may not be practical for many households and the savings to be made by doing so are unlikely to pay out in the short term, far better to enforce water saving standards on new builds where the incremental costs is lower than doing renovations or buying new appliances. For example it could be enforced to have separate grey water collection which is easier to recycle as water for gardens etc. No justification has been provided for the 400% increase in water service charge vs a 16% increase usage charges. It would appear that it was decided this way to specifically prevent customers from reducing their bill significantly by reducing water usage. A 43% reduction in water use is probably un-achievable for many households and Sydney water is not targeting a decrease in water usage at all based upon current average consumption of 183 kl and a target of 182 kl. 7. my house already has water saver showers, front load washer, water efficient dishwashers 4.5/3l flush toilets and it's a 30 year old house. There seems little room to reduce water usage without taking drastic measure like showering every other day. 8. I note that IPart does not ask about who should finance these expansions for new homes and facilities - I note developers are expected to contribute 3.9 billion out of a total investment of 9.5 billion. So existing household s are expected to subsidise the new homes that are proposed to be built. This does not seem to be a reasonable situation. Likewise spreading the increased charges for stormwater across all customers rather than charging customers who choose to build in an area without sufficient drainage does not seem reasonable. Why should households in other areas finance these decisions/projects. I note Sydney Water claims to be transparent and they have provided a breakdown of charges for residential and business customers along with proposed increases. No data however has been supplied on large industrial customers. What are large industrial customers paying for water on average and how much are their charges being changed? How much of this burden is borne by residential/business and large industrial customers. Is it fairly distributed? This should be revealed for transparency. I recall when working at the former Caltex Oil refinery that they were the largest user in the Sydney region, I was wasn't privy to their charges, but the closure of the refinery should have opened up a lot more supply for Sydney. 11. Regarding Water NSW, Why is this a separate entity? It probably creates a whole layer of complexity charging these items separately. It appears the justification for their rectification program is rather weak. 15. A revenue cap is not justified it's basically a get of jail free card if forecasts are done wrong. It also shows Water NSW is not serious about decreasing water consumption and is most concerned about preserving revenue. Regarding engagement - this is nice to have but it just explains what is going happen, there has been zero engagement about the impact of price changes and the justifications for the same. Just telling us we are being hit for Sydney's development doesn't make it right.