

Dear Sirs

I have become aware of your review into the infrastructure pricing and your request for submissions. My young family went down to Perisher this year for a week for the first time. We stayed at a lodge that my wife's parents belong to. The only reason we ever considered having a holiday in Perisher was due to the lower cost of accommodation. Even with the lower cost, the week's holiday will have cost us close to \$5000. Our children are under 5 years of age and so we had the additional costs of ski school and crèche. We also had the costs of oversnow transport each day from and to the lodge as it wouldn't have been possible to get down to the centre otherwise.

So why did we consider going to perisher. The accommodation costs. When I was a child, my family never went to the snow, it was cost prohibitive. In fact this was my first time skiing. However due to the cheaper accommodation costs we decided to let our children have an opportunity that I never had, a skiing holiday, and they loved it. We are all keen to go again next year, cost dependant. The cost of going to the snow for a holiday is such a major thing because everything costs money, a lot of money. We can have a family holiday on the coast in the sun and go to the beach and the cost is dramatically less, particularly if we camped. Again why the snow, to give our kids an opportunity.

I don't pretend to understand all of the issues associated with the infrastructure development within Perisher. I have read through the Issue Paper. There are a couple of things that appear to stand out to me however:

- The new development at Perisher and its increased loads on infrastructure. Someone is going to financially profit from the new development, Perisher Blue P/L, the NPWS or whoever is behind the development. It would not be happening if someone was not going to make a considerable profit. Any increase in infrastructure required as a result of the new development should be met by the developer, not by the existing lessees, not by the day skiers, but by those that are going to make money. If they were not going to make a profit form the development they would not be going ahead with it. If it wasn't going ahead then there would be no cost involved with increasing infrastructure. Cause and effect, if you cause the issue then you bear the effects of your proposal.
- Cost spread of infrastructure upgrading. Again I do not pretend to be an expert, but from what I am told and have read, due to the current structures in place in Perisher only a small percentage of the charges go into Perisher, unlike Thredbo or in Victoria. The remainder of the charges (gate fees, rent etc) goes elsewhere within NPWS and the government, I assume to be spent elsewhere in NSW. Surely this is illogical. Yes Perisher only has a very short period of high use, but surely all the money that goes into the region in that time period should be used for upgrade and expansion and maintenance of the region, not elsewhere. With that logic comes a user pay scenario. The money people spend skiing ultimately goes back into improving the region. Improved roads, water, sewerage etc benefits all users of the region.

If your review recommends an increase in charges in the snow fields and particularly to the lease holders this will flow on to the fees charged by lodges. Skiing in Australia is not a cheap holiday. The lack of ski fields reduces the competition factor, the distance to the ski fields increases costs to travel there, the knowledge that everything in the ski fields is charged at a premium from lift tickets to food. All of these elements discourage people from going skiing. It would not take much of an increase for us to not go skiing. It's just not cost effective. I'd rather fly my family to New Zealand and have an overseas adventure including skiing. Be very careful not to kill the proverbial 'golden goose'. With a planned additional 1320 beds and the planned increase to facilities and snowmaking at Perisher/Blue Cow/Smiggins I would expect that the expected revenue increases in the coming years to be extremely significant. Maybe the Issues Paper should carefully analyse where this future revenue is going to go? I would expect that the planned future infrastructure spending would only be a percentage of the future total resort revenue gain.

Thank you for your time.