

# Delivery Share Review Community Meeting Outcomes

The Victorian Government is reviewing delivery share arrangements in northern Victoria to support irrigation communities and districts as they adjust to rapid, continuing changes in land and water use.

This is part of action 4.3 in *Water for Victoria* to examine how delivery shares are working now, and how their future use can support affordable and resilient irrigation districts that are attractive to businesses.

The Preliminary Findings Report and Community Discussion paper were released on 24 July 2018 to inform people of work on the review so far, and invite input from irrigators and stakeholders.

Three community meetings were held at Mildura, Kerang and Shepparton in early August. Over 161 people attended the three meetings to hear about the Preliminary Findings Report and provide feedback on the initial options put forward by the government.

The Delivery Share review will be incorporating the suggestions, feedback and submissions from community meetings and submissions made through the Engage Victoria website, in to the next phase of the review, which will provide recommendations to the Minister.

This summary outlines the feedback received at each of the community meetings in August 2018.

Mildura – Wednesday 1 August	
<b>Total attendees (35)</b>	<b>Chair: Peter Ebner (LMW)</b> <b>Presenter: Toni Radcliffe(DELWP)</b>
<b>Agencies represented</b>	Lower Murray Water, Mallee Catchment Management Authority
<b>Key Points:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Many community members do not believe there are major issues with delivery shares.</li><li>• Main concerns on delivery shares were on different arrangements for districts and private diverters.</li><li>• The community would like a “stick with current arrangements” option on the feedback form.</li><li>• The review should consider the impact of any changes on property prices and allocation prices.</li></ul>

<b>Other issues/Parking Lot</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where is LMW getting delivery share for SMP2.</li> <li>• What benefits will the irrigator receive from any change to how delivery share is managed.</li> </ul>
---------------------------------	---

<b>Kerang – Wednesday 2 August</b>	
<b>Total attendees (42)</b>	<b>Chair: Anne Hodge (Torrumbarry WSC)</b> <b>Presenters: Toni Radcliffe (DELWP) and Daniel Irwin (GMW)</b>
<b>Agencies represented</b>	Goulburn Murray Water, Agriculture Victoria, Victorian Environmental Water Holder, Loddon Shire Council
<b>Key Points:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Termination fees are too high and unfair.</li> <li>• There needs to be more transparency around GMW pricing, particularly around the Infrastructure Access Fee.</li> <li>• Delivery shares are a symptom of bigger problems, but changes could help to improve things.</li> <li>• Delivering water through natural carriers (e.g. waterways) should attract a charge as well, as they are also part of the system.</li> <li>• Delivery share review should consider the possibility of making sure all water holders contribute to the costs of irrigation infrastructure and how this could be achieved.</li> <li>• Suggestion that termination fee arrangements could be improved, but not at the expense of remaining irrigators who will have to meet the costs of those who terminate.</li> <li>• The allocation of the 75 GL 'efficiency dividend' from connections project should be considered through the review.</li> <li>• Allowing termination fee discounts according to years in which fees were paid with no water use should be considered.</li> </ul>
<b>Other issues/Parking Lot</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACCC rules and fairness.</li> <li>• Natural carriers as part of irrigation system.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate Delivery share applicable for individuals trading water.</li> <li>• Costs of river delivery and costs of environmental impact of e-water delivery to be reviewed.</li> <li>• Transparency in relation to the GMW Pricing and transformation.</li> <li>• Consideration of termination of delivery share after having paid annual fee for 10 years and over.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Shepparton – Friday 3 August</b>	
<b>Total attendees (84)</b>	<b>Chair: Craig Reynolds (Shepparton WSC)</b> <b>Presenters: Toni Radcliffe (DELWP) and Graeme Hannan (GMW)</b>
<b>Agencies represented</b>	Goulburn Murray Water, Agriculture Victoria, Goulburn Broken Catchment Management Authority, Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC), Victorian Environmental Water Holder, Murray-Darling Basin Authority
<b>Key Points:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question raised if fee for delivery infrastructure is needed.</li> <li>• Significant concerns about the viability of the Goulburn Murray Irrigation District due to water leaving the region.</li> <li>• Concerns about the role of ACCC rules in linking fees for irrigation infrastructure to landholders and setting rules on termination fees.</li> <li>• Delivery share review should consider the possibility of making sure all water holders contribute to the costs of irrigation infrastructure and how this could be achieved.</li> <li>• The GMID infrastructure footprint needs to be reduced to reflect reduced water use - how will this be achieved.</li> <li>• Strong demand for an investigation of all water charges and for transparency on who pays what – including the environment and speculators.</li> <li>• The impact of delivery shares on land prices should be considered – i.e. cost of land with-in versus out of district.</li> <li>• The review should look at whether a greater proportion of costs could be put on to water use, rather than fixed costs.</li> <li>• Charges need to recognise changes that have occurred in the system (30% of water now held by the environment and 10% by non-land holders).</li> </ul>

**Other issues/Parking Lot**

- Comparison of annual use limits and delivery shares.
- Delivery cost shared across all water owners.
- Modelling of cost, charges and volumes.
- Water ownership and use patterns to be identified – greater proportion of cost on use and storage (non serviced property).
- Holdings by investors who are non-water users.
- Land values (district and outside districts)

## Photos from Community Engagement Meetings



Shepparton



Mildura