

-----  
DETAILS  
-----

Company: [REDACTED]  
First name: Rod  
Last name: Copeland  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Suburb: [REDACTED]  
State: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]  
Phone: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Sector: Agriculture

-----  
NATIVE VEGETATION CLEARING  
-----

\*1 . Would a strategic approach to clearing, through a strategic purpose permit, benefit you?\*

Response: no  
Comments:

---  
\*2. Is the 'purpose component' reasonable to apply considering the added complexity of assessing this type of clearing permit?\*

Response: no  
Comments:

\*3. Is the proposed fee structure fair and does it adequately reflect differences in the financial capacity of clearing permit applicants?\*

Response: no  
Comments:

\*4. What is the likely impact on your business or industry of the proposed clearing fee structure?\*

Comments:

Shires have to pay, the fees are increased so they will want to cost recover

(CR) through rates. Once again those who are NOT in a position to CR will have to pay.

\*5. Additional comments regarding Native Vegetation Clearing not addressed in the questions above.\*

Comments:

I firmly believe that too much land has been cleared but that was a mistake of conditional purchase land.

There is still need to clear land but it needs to be done properly but the governing bodies have to have costs that reflect the job.

-----  
WATER  
-----

\*6. Do you consider it reasonable for taxpayers to pay 100 per cent of the cost of assessing water licence and permit applications and if so, why?\*

Response: yes

Comments:

We live in regional WA and do not get to Perth or elsewhere to have any use of taxpayer funded/subsidised amenities or public utilities such as Elizabeth Quay, the train services, King's Park and the great road network. Instead we have to put up with travelling long distances to attend anything at our own cost. We do not have a reliable mobile service, all the things that people take for granted. No water or gas delivered to our door through subsidised networks. We provide good green food for the population, under an ever increasing mountain of government red-tape and are fighting a myriad of pests and disease problems, all the time working longer hours than most people and we get minimal help to do it. And you want to introduce license fees.

\*7. If water licence and permit assessment fees were introduced, what do you consider to be an appropriate fee for a water licence or permit application?\*

Comments:

I do not, and i'll speak like a politician and repeat it for those hard of hearing, I do not consider that it is reasonable to introduce water license fees (WLF) so therefore NO FEE is appropriate. for applications or anything else.

Water license holders (WLH) get no assistance to conduct hydrology searches, drill holes, supply casing, supply pump and column, bring in power and buy water-meters and above ground pipe work. We are on our own and have to suck up the losses. DWER would not guarantee the quantity or quality of water that they would be charging for and now the government has allowed the insidious, toxic practice of FRACKING to put it all at risk.

\*8. Would you consider a risk-based model for determining water licence and permit application fees to be appropriate? If not, what basis could the department use to structure fees?\*

Response: yes

Comments:

I would consider a risk based model. I'll risk it and if it doesn't come to fruition, the government will pay for it just like they have raised money to pay out taxi-plate holders for loss of value in their investment.

BUT NO FEES \*9. What would be the likely impact on your business or industry if water licence and permit fees were introduced?\*

Comments:

It would be another nail in the coffin, so to speak. Our industry is under the pump from the very government that wants to introduce fees, we are facing increased opposition from overseas and even Australian product, from areas that produce cheaper than us, and the pest and disease problems are increasing annually. The costs of facilitating all these programs means we have to employ another person to keep up but the down side is we will re-evaluate what we grow and how much.

We have to meet extra regulations about employing people so will change to crops the need less people but so will everyone else, so there will be an oversupply which means loss of revenue for the tax office, perhaps mortgagee sales of properties.

We're not asking for big handouts but we do want some consideration. Everyone who sits down at meal time to eat should be aware of how much is put into producing their meals.

\*10. If water licence and permit assessment fees were introduced, how could the collection of fees be timed to better support your business or industry?

For example, would you benefit from paying fees up front, at the end of a licence assessment or annualised over the term of the licence?\*

Response: unsure

Comments

I do not agree with WLF so collecting would be hard.

If they have to be introduced, and i hope not, about the year 3000 would be appropriate.

\*11 . Additional comments regarding Water licences and permits not addressed in the questions above.\*

Comments:

It's a no-brainer. We do all the work, take the risks and you want to charge us for that privilege.

Give the government one foot in the door and the next thing is increased fees will be advised in the budgets.

I/we do not trust this government to keep their word.

Moreover the next thing will be volumetric charges for water used.

i am disgusted with how this government has approached this chase for a few bucks.

If you are serious, the government should be looking at cost recovery from prisoners in gaol, they are being subsidised by my tax-payer dollars.

Did not have the decency to contact individual WLH by normal channels, instead tried to back-door the issue. Very low tactic that.

There were so many WLH that had NO idea of what was happening, that it is a sad indictment on the people that had to deliver the message.

Cancelled one of four meetings before anyone knew about it, and only had 4 in the whole state, but

under pressure from a thoroughly disappointed industry, held extra briefings.

It is totally ludicrous that there will be at least 300,00 bores, drawing water from aquifers around Perth

and right across the state that will not be captured by this blatant grab for cash, and instead a vital

industry has to bear the weight. To quote what many polities call out in the houses of parliament

"SHAME! SHAME!

I'm a firm believer in 'one in-all in' or 'one out-all out' so forget trying to plunder 13,000 license holders

and that is my recommendation, to the Minister. FORGET IT! Its unfair and targeting the wrong people.

Throwing money at something not performing too well will not improve services, in actual fact

performance will drop off.

i do thank our local politicians that, even though they were unaware of the confusion, stepped up to the

plate and pushed for a DWER sanctioned meeting and engineered an extension of time for submissions,

which I've endeavoured to use, so that I could weigh into the subject, the recommendations of the

fracking inquiry to base my final thoughts.