

Submitted on Tuesday, October 30, 2018 - 09:12

DETAILS

Company: [REDACTED]
First name: Cath
Last name: Miller
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: yes

Comments:

We have a 30 ha block of native forest that would benefit from strategic shelterwood thinning to improve the long term health of the forest in our drying climate. It would be good to have a permit that covers the area for 5 or 10 years to allow us to meet the market for any thinnings rather than being limited to a single year.

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

Response: no

Comments:

what difference does it make to the department what the clearing is for?

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

Response: no

Comments:

for our 30 ha \$2000 would make any thinning operation economically nonviable.

There are only limited markets for thinnings and the return on this area would make it not worth considering which means that the health of the forest could decline as we would only clear so much for our own firewood.

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

Comments:

We would not be able to protect the longterm health of our forest by doing a commercial thinnig operation and would have to forego the small income stream which could be reinvested into fencing and planting new areas.

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

Comments:

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:

Yes, the majority of taxpayers in urban areas are the ones who eat most of the food produced in the regions from the water licenced for extraction. The water is not free to the farmers, they have to pay to sink the bore, service the bore and run the bore - with increasing electricity prices. Any additional costs could be passed on to the food eating customers/taxpayers, but as we know prices are sensitive and if our WA farmers are priced out of the market, we could lose our agriculture sector and have to rely on "cheap" in price, food from china etc.

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:

\$600

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: no

Comments:

what difference does it make as long as the water is licenced within the allocation for the specific basin/aquifer. it can vary by volume but it shouldn't mater if the resource is 30% or 90% allocated.

9. What would be the likely impact on your business or industry if water licence and permit fees were introduced?

Comments:

the SW provides most of the dairy and potatoes for WA as well as other high value products like sweetcorn, pumpkins etc as well of course grapes for table and wine.

*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: annual

Comments

AN annualised payment would be more acceptable to help spread the cost back to the customer/taxpayer.

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

Comments: