

RE: Submission for Goulburn to Murray Trade Rule Review

This Submission is sent on behalf of: MT & MM Bryant (Mark & Monique Bryant)

Our farm.

We are third generation farmers. Agriculture runs deep in both our families. Together with my wife we run a dairy/lucerne/beef operation.

Across these farms we have 5 pumping sites connected to the Broken Creek. We have approximately 10 Kilometers of creek frontage and 5 pumping sites. We also have irrigation properties in zones 6 and 1A.

After Reviewing the proposed changes to Goulburn to Murray Trade Rules we have the following views:

1/ This is a severe Restriction of Water Trade for Zone 6B Customers.

Customers along the Lower Broken Creek will be subject to the following limitations to Trade water in for use:

-Zone 6 into 6B – Subject to Barmah Choke Rule and virtually never allowed.

-Zone 1A into 6B – Subject to IVT open. Highly competitive and rarely open. Farmers will be unable to compete with water Brokers and Large Investment companies to access IVT trade.

-Zone 7 into 6B – Subject to Back trade Opportunity and usually at a higher cost to 1A and 6 water. Access to this water would see farms along the Broken Creek unviable in their local markets, as their water costs would be representative of the Zone 7 area.

-Zone 6B into 6B – This is a very small pool of water available for trade. Which is historically very rarely available. When it is available it is at an exorbitant price.

-Tagged 1A/6B accounts not subject to IVT Rules, only provide for Irrigation Use from 15 August, when our Irrigation season starts, to 15 October.

2/ Limited Access to Trade Water is a De- Valuation of Land Values.

Like us many farmers along the Broken are irrigation farmers. We have all spent considerable time and money upgrading irrigation infrastructure. Many farmers participated in the foodbowl modernization project resulting in state of the art irrigation infrastructure. If our current water trading rules change this will have a detrimental impact to all farms along the Broken Creek. There is a real possibility of not having access to any water. State of the art irrigation infrastructure will sit idle.

Farms will be devalued. Who would want to invest in state of the irrigation infrastructure farm with no security to access water?

3/ Consultation with Lower Broken Creek Customers has been poor.

The DWELP team engaged in consultation with a small group of irrigators along the Broken Creek. They outlined the preferred changes. We found they were receptive to feedback and they did engage in two-way communication. The problem was both DWELP and/or GMW did not notify ALL customers along the Broken Creek until a few days prior to submissions being due. Many customers have little or no knowledge of the proposed changes. They have not been given the chance to consider the full effects to them and their businesses.

6/ The volumes of water along the Broken Creek are a very small part of the entire scheme for the Murray System

Our understanding is 6B water right is 26GL in total. On the grand scheme of things this is a very small amount of water. It is also our understanding that GMW has been able to meet all irrigation requirements along the Broken Creek both 6B and tagged allocation use. We can therefore see no reason to change the current trading rules for the lower Broken Creek.

THEREFORE

WE BELIEVE THAT THE CURRENT INTERIM RULES (STATUS QUO) FOR LOWER BROKEN CREEK SHOULD CONTINUE UNCHANGED.

HISTORICALLY THIS HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE CASE AND WE HAVE NOT SEEN ANY PROOF FROM DWELP THAT THIS NEEDS TO CHANGE.

Yours Sincerely,

Mark & Monique Bryant

[Redacted]

[Redacted]