

61 Dunellan St,  
Greenslopes  
Brisbane  
4120  
4/4/07

**Dear Sir/ Madam,**

**Re: Inquiry into Additional Water Supplies for South East Queensland – Traveston Crossing Dam Information.**

**Purpose:**

**To voice the opinion of a resident of Brisbane – the area set to benefit from the proposed dam.**

As a member of the public affected by the water supply in S.E Queensland I make the following points highlighting my concern process culminating in the decision to go ahead with the Traveston Dam.

- 1) As an ordinary resident living with water restrictions I would rather continue indefinitely with such restrictions than have the Dam built to supply my home with the large (some may say excessive) amounts of water many Queenslanders have become accustomed to.

The Queensland Government doesn't appear to have considered that residents may not want the dam to be built to reduce these restrictions, some may actually prefer to see the cost of water rise to encourage frugality and to pay for infrastructure alternatives to dams. Has there been any objective research done by the QLD Government to test the opinion here? Or has it been assumed all residents demand unlimited supplies of cheap water forever? If the latter appears to be the case it is surely a major oversight. Since the increasing water restrictions have come into place residents have proved they can live with much less. why shouldn't this be an ongoing situation?

- 2) The Dam will not be on-line supplying water for many years.

The current water supply issues need more immediate solutions – e.g. recycled water, water restrictions, rainwater harvesting. These are being invested in now, this should continue. Grey / Black water on-site recycling should also be considered, the cost of subsidizing this for even 50% of households would be much less than the cost of the Dam (or even just the land for the dam) and also create manufacturing, plumbing and maintenance jobs for S.E. QLD. This is

surely a better use of tax payers money available with an impact that occurs with every litre diverted for re-use. It seems that these alternative solutions are required anyway, by the time the Dam is built it could already be obsolete as smarter local solutions will be in place.

Note: currently, as a Brisbane resident if I wanted to pay from my own pocket to recycle my grey water, even to flush my toilet, it would be very difficult to get permission to do this. Yet I would remove my demand from the system.

- 3) Is the move from agricultural use to water collection the most effective use in the Traveston Dam / Mary River location?

Prime agricultural land is at a premium in Australia, there are currently problems in many parts due to the effects of inappropriate crops for the climate, the Mary River area is very productive and close to market. In an age where fuel prices and will continue to rise and water for irrigation more scarce it makes sense to continue having this area supplying produce rather than increasing the amount that has to be driven to S.E. QLD from further destinations. It does not look as though the QLD Government have considered this long term view when concluding that more dams are the answer to water supply issues.

- 4) Is the Traveston Dam site appropriate technically?

My understanding of the chosen site at Traveston is that it would create a dam with proportions that are not conducive to efficient water retention, i.e. surface area to depth ratio such that vast proportions of captured water would evaporate. Also that the problem of silting would mean that over time the dam would hold less and less water, or create a constant public service cost of dredging. Please note that the Chinese are finding silting already such an issue with the 3 Gorges Dam of the Yangtze that they are now building smaller dams upstream to catch the silt, the problem is a never ending cycle. Is this a risk with Traveston? what risk analysis has been done and what would the on-cost be to the public purse to maintain the proposals to manage these problems?

- 5) Has the General Environmental Impact been assessed thoroughly given the short time between the proposal and approval of the project.

The size of the proposed dam is such that the impacts on ecosystems from the dam site to the sea will large. There are endangered species, endangered eco systems and down stream river system changes to name but a few.

There will also be the human impact – loss of long term rural productivity, families and communities impacted with total devastation.

All this is destruction and devastation is being done in the name of water supply for metropolitan S.E. QLD. There are alternatives, I have not seen evidence that the costs of alternatives are even as much, let alone more than the cost of the dam. The nature of smaller localized projects means it is harder to manage and quantify but this should not be a reason not to assess the figures objectively.

Thankyou for considering my opinion

Yours Sincerely

Meriel Chamberlin.