

Submitted on Wednesday, November 7, 2018 - 06:43

DETAILS

Company: [REDACTED]
First name: Brad
Last name: Rodgers
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: unsure

Comments:

I don't know about this area

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

Response: unsure

Comments:

I don't know about this area

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

Response: unsure

Comments:

I don't know about this area

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

Comments:

I don't know about this area

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

Comments:

I don't know about this area

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: no

Comments:

While taxpayers benefit from water that agricultural uses, water licenses should not be 100% covered by the tax payer.

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:

As this is a major change I think the following should be looked at and considered:

1. Current 5C licenses I believe are 10 year licenses 2. A phase in period of 5 - 10 years to allow farmers

in agriculture to plan 3. WA aligns more often than not with Qld due to size, agriculture and mining.

4. Therefore WA 's new fees should look to Qld for some modelling which would see a fee of around \$200p.a.

5. This would see approx 2.8M recovery of costs using the 2015/16 figures from your August 2018 paper provided.

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:

If appropriate only.

By that I mean that if most licenses are only issued up to 70% of water resource capacity then the risk is mitigated by the 30% buffer.

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

Comments:

The immediate effect would be on profitability. The medium term effect would be on planning for

new/changed crops and the way to mitigate the new cost.

This would usually reduce on farm employment and put the onus back onto the farmer who already works dawn to dusk.

The long term effect would be on value and investment. New investment would be even harder to find.

*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

Annualised over the term would give time to plan and reduce costs in the renewal processes.

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

Comments:

1. If the water that agriculture uses is collected/stored by infrastructure provided and installed by the owner, then this type of license should be viewed differently than ones that rely on bores for example.
2. If a drought occurred where there was no water for a period of time, there should be an allowance for this as the license in effect becomes useless during that time.