

**“Hinton”**  
829 Emu Creek Road  
Bum Bum Creek  
Via Crows Nest  
Qld 4355

Phone: 07 4698 4743  
Fax: 07 4698 4755  
E-mail:  
[hinton@ecn.net.au](mailto:hinton@ecn.net.au)

4<sup>th</sup> April 2007

The Secretary  
Senate Rural & Regional Affairs & Transport  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Sir or Madam

**Re: Senate Enquiry into Proposed Traveston Crossing Dam**

For your reference, our submission to the Senate enquiry is separated into:

- 1) Guaranteed Water
- 2) Why The Proposed Traveston Dam proposal is wrong in all aspects
- 3) Alternatives

**1) Guaranteed Water**

The proposed Traveston Crossing Dam will no supply South East Queensland with a guaranteed water supply

The only two guaranteed water supply for S.E. Qld can be supplied by either a de-salination plant, using water from the Pacific Ocean, or piping fresh water from Fraser Island, using the fresh water flowing out of Elly Creek.  
(Fresh water from Moreton Island has been used for years to supply the Redlands Shire, south of Brisbane, with its water supply)

Desalination is totally reliable and economic, when compared with the cost per megalitre of water from the proposed Traveston Dam and will supply water at approximately 25% of the cost of water from the proposed TCD.

These plants, be it one or several, can be built close to existing supply pipelines  
The technology and reliability of these plants have now been proven  
The quality of water out of these plants is so unquestionably pure.

The piping of fresh water from Fraser Island can be done, easily and economically.

The flow from Elly Creek has been constant throughout its recorded history, and the diversion of this water supply to S.E. Qld will not distract from the Islands Heritage listing, or biodiversity.

A seasonal guaranteed water supply can be attained by piping water from North Qld, such as the Burdekin Dam to S.E. Qld.

This supply is not constant, but is guaranteed every couple of years by way of tropical rainfall.

This water is presently discharged into the Pacific Ocean.

Although required for the lifeblood of the Great Barrier reef, the large quantity of water discharged over the Burdekin Dam, in periods of high rainfall, and consequently high discharge over the dam wall, could be utilized by way of pipelines and pumping stations to assist in maintaining levels in S.E. Qld catchment dams in periods of diminished rainfall in SE Qld

Recycled Water, now finally being addressed by the Qld Government, but this can only supply a portion of the additional water required in times of drought and climate change

The proposed Traveston Crossing dam, will not, and cannot guarantee SE Qld additional water (refer 2 below)

## **2) Why The Proposed Traveston Dam proposal is wrong in all aspects**

As a Graduate in Agricultural Science, the first thing that is taught when considering the building of a dam, is to locate the dam in a good catchment area, locate the dam in as deep a gully/ravine as possible, reducing the cost of building the dam, reducing the ponded surface area, and reducing the evaporation.

The proposed Traveston Crossing Dam certainly addresses the first criteria, and then totally ignores all other considerations.

Why are Qld Water Infrastructure Pty Ltd (read Qld Govt) proposing to build a dam that is going to have a average depth in stage 1, when full, of only 5.5 metres, in an area where the estimated evaporation is going to be 1.4 metres per annum ?  
Stage 2 average depth, 8.8 metres

Why are they building a dam on prime agricultural land, which produces 12% of Queensland's dairy produce ?

Why are they building a dam where they have to compulsory acquire 7600 hectares of prime agricultural land, disrupt approximately 460 families, when they (the Qld Govt) already own 4500 hectares of land with-in 30 klms of the proposed dam site (refer Item 3)

The Qld Govt, when announcing the proposed Traveston Crossing Dam advised that the total cost was going to be between 800 to 900 Million dollars.

The Qld Govt has since announced that the estimated cost of the dam will be approximately 1.7 Billion dollars.

What is going to be the real cost of this proposed dam ?

My calculations indicate closer to 4.2 Billion Dollars, not including the pipe network to connect the dam to the SE Qld water supply grid.

This cost will be hidden, with-in other works

The proposed Traveston Crossing dam, besides all its disasterous environmental impacts, all of which have been spelt out in other proposals, because of its shallow depth, will become a breeding ground for aquatic weeds, which are already choking the Mary River.

These aquatic weeds will also lead to much higher evaporation than ever estimated by the Qld Govt, and Qld Water Infrastructure.

If the proposed dam is not allowed, under the EIS, or for what ever other reason, the people of SE Qld, if the SE Qld region does receive substantial rainfall, will be extremely short of water it does not rain.

If it does rain sufficiently to fill the proposed Travaston Crossing Dam, Wivenhoe and Somerset will have sufficient storage, and the dam will not be required

### **3) The Alternative**

The proposal to build a completely new dam on Yabba Creek, downstream of the existing Borumba Dam must be considered.

The consideration of this proposal must be done using the same parameters as used in the desk top report generated by GHD from which the Qld Govt supposedly made its decision to proceed with the proposed Traveston Crossing dam.

This dam, which, it appears, can be built on land already owned by the Qld Govt, requires approximately 4500 hectares of land, could have an average depth in excess of 90 metres, store approximately 3.5 times the volume of the proposed Traveston Crossing dam, and generate hydro power.

Should the Qld Govt (or Qld Water Infrastructure Pty Ltd) wish to use this as an off stream water storage from The Mary River, the power generated by the hydro station could be used to pump this water.

The Qld Deputy Premier, Treasurer, and Minister for Infrastructure apparently will not meet with the proponent of this scheme, and the Terms of Reference being offered to consider this proposal does not include the 1999 Rainfall and flood figures, and has to be based on the full extent of the proposal, where the Qld Govt/GHD have included the 1999 rainfall figures, and have based the EIS for the proposed Traveston crossing Dam, on Stage 1 only.

Yours Sincerely

Elisabeth & David Paton