

**SUBMISSION REGARDING THE COMMISSION'S DRAFT DECISION ON
THE QUITE LAKES
BORE FLUSHING TARIFF**

5 Apr. 17

I make this submission on behalf of the (39) thirty nine residents living in Stage 2 of the Illawong retirement village.

The remarks are also applicable to Stage 1 but I am not authorised to write on their behalf. I understand Nannette Stubbs may make a submission for Stage 1

1. Equity

The residents I represent accept that as the lake is private / semi private they should contribute to its maintenance. However, they believe the cost should be shared equitably between the various property holders around the lake.

The current proposal is completely inequitable; a resident with a (5) five meter frontage to the lake and property value around (\$280,000) two hundred and eighty thousand dollars is called on to pay the same as a property holder with a (25) twenty five meter frontage and property value in excess of one / two million dollars.

I am aware that situation arises as Melbourne Water is not permitted to charge variable rates. There is however, an equitable solution:

Illawong Stage 2 is actually a single identity with accommodation units spread around it.

Melbourne Water and South East Water accept this as a fact since there is only (1) one water meter and one water bill for the site. The fact that South East Water splits the bill into (32) thirty two equal charges is only a convenience matter for themselves and site management. (If they did not do this problems of residents not / refusing to pay might arise.)

Since Melbourne Water and South East Water accept that Stage 2 is a single billing entity the water pumping charge should be charged to that bill. The actual cost could then be proportionated in the same manner as the water bill.

This would be a much more equitable manner of charging the cost!

Accepting the number of residences paying the cost would fall by about (69) sixty nine a small increase the charge might have to be imposed to recover the lost revenue. However, this would be a small cost compared to the much greater equity that would be achieved.

2. Pumping Efficiency

If the residents around the lake are to be required to pay for the flushing the efficiency of the flushing must be improved.

2.1 The current system

The current system is as follows:

- The inlet point to the lake is in the north corner and the discharge point the in the south corner
- There is almost a straight line flow path between the entry and discharge points
- Water follows from Lake Laguna into Lake Illawong propelled a low hydraulic head
- As the water enters the lake it is in or very close laminar flow
- It the flows under laminar conditions to the discharge point
- There is little or zero back mixing
- From the discharge point the water is pumped into Eel Race Creek

The result of this flow condition is that there is very little flushing of the (2) two large bays on the eastern side of the lake. Residents around these bays are being called upon to pay for a service, lake flushing, that they are not getting.

The other problem for the flushing system is the turnover time. I do not have proper figures but Melbourne Water at one point quoted a period approaching (2) two months. This figure is well outside accepted guide lines for water turnover.

Melbourne Water may state / claim that these problems have nothing to do with them. However, it would be interesting to hear their defence if some child comes down with severe illness as a result of exposure to lake water.

2.2 Possible Solution

There is a fairly low cost solution that would reduce, not eliminate, some of these problems:

- A recycle line/s should be run from the output point of the discharge pump to the far ends of the eastern bays
- This would mean the bays are flushed and to some extent mitigate the low urn over rate.

I would be interested hear your thoughts on this proposal along with the barrage of reasons why it could not be done.