

**JOHN SEECK** JP(QUAL)

*157 Happy Jack Creek Rd Cooroy. QLD 4563*

*Ph 07 5447 9707 : Fax 07 5447 9747 : Mob 0428 879 617*

*April 4, 2007*

The Secretary  
Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport  
Parliament House

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: Inquiry into additional water supplies for S E Queensland –  
Traveston Crossing Dam**

The purpose of this letter is to highlight some of the questionable assumptions in the selection of the above proposed dam site.

The Project Update supplied by Queensland Water Infrastructure P/L (QWIPL) of March 2007 has supplied rainfall data which is supposedly there to provide proof of the effectiveness of the site for a dam. The concern is that the data supplied is taken as an average over nearly 100 years, therefore totally excluding consideration of the now proven inevitability of climate change. The comparison put forward with the Wivenhoe catchment as proof of the suitability is also suspect, as the Wivenhoe average is obviously biased low, since the figures used are for an additional 20 years, most of which were below the mean average. Even allowing for the average of 1300mm per annum to be met, it is generally accepted that due to the large surface area and shallow nature of the proposed dam that evaporation and leakage losses will amount to about 1500mm per annum. Therefore a net loss of 200mm per annum exists over the surface area of water and only runoff is actually supplying water for use and storage.

The flow in the Mary River for nearly a year has only occurred through release from the Borumba dam which is now down to nearly 50% from nearly full a year ago. Not an impressive runoff rate I think you will agree!

On the recent (April 1) ABC Landline programme the CEO of the Australian Water Association, Chris Davis was interviewed and asked his opinion on the building of dams. His response included the observation that most of the major dams in Australia had been built in the 1960's and 70's and that most of the suitable sites had then been selected and used. This Mary river site was evaluated in the 90's and found to be unsuitable, *and that was when the rainfall was still considered to be reliable!*

So what now has changed to make the site suitable at such vast expense; financially, socially, environmentally and emotionally?

I respectfully request that this Senate Inquiry includes the above information in their considerations as to the validity and viability of the proposed project.

The basic realization is that; ***dams STORE water they don't MAKE water.***

Yours hopefully

John Seeck