

Dear sir, we object to price increases in the Giru benefited area . We pump out of the Haughton . Attached is our organisations formal reply which we fully support.

Our objection has 3 main parts, lesser supply ,natural flow and capacity to pay.

1/. We receive a lesser product than the channel area, namely the water is 6-8metres below paddock, and we spend \$15/ml on elec to pump and \$15/ml on infrastructure to bring the water to paddock. This is order of magnitude greater than channel costs, and brings our effective price to more than the channel water costs. Therefore we think the increase is unfair.

2/. History shows there is a natural flow and aquifer existence well before the channel and was sufficient for sustainable cane growing. Most of the historical and current reports of the aquifer agree that is mainly replenished by natural flows. Even SunWater efficiency figures of over 100% show that there must be very substantial natural flows. Thus there is no reason to change from the old pricing arrangements vs the channel price. One mathematical modelling report can't undo 99 yrs of historical records.

3/. At the suggested price increases, we will go out of business along with other growers and that will put the local sugar mill at risk.

Yours,

Charmaine Barrett Will Horsfall, pixi pastoral co

I am unable to attach my Organization report, but you no doubt have it already.

BDCG-GBA-RESPONSE TO QCA REPORT 2020-2024 FINAL.PDF