

TO: Ms Jeanette Radcliffe, Committee Secretary, Senate's Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee, Department of the Senate.

FROM: Laurence Jones, 5 Boorook St, Buddina, 4575 Sunshine Coast, Qld.

DATE: 30th March 2007

MOB: 0404051055

EMAIL: lcjones@aapt.net.au

PHONE / FAX: {07}54441938

I give my permission to make this submission public if required.

Dear Committee Secretary,

This is a formal submission as a part of the Senate Rural and Regional Services and Transport Committee's inquiry into the *examination of all reasonable options*, including increased dam capacity, for additional water supplies for South East Queensland, including:

{a} the **merits of all options**, including the Queensland Government's proposed Traveston Crossing Dam as well as raising the Borumba Dam; and

{b} the social, environmental, economic and engineering impacts of the various proposals.

First, I must question the Senate's motives in inquiring into the increased dam capacity of the proposed Traveston Dam, as dams are a proven safe and reliable source of water supply while *failing to identify or name* the highly controversial, dangerous, expensive, unproven, environmentally damaging and experimental option of the introduction of treated sewage effluent sourced from hospitals, industry, homes and abattoirs, inserted into the public's drinking water supply mains.

I believe that the Senate's motives lie with their decision to hold this inquiry into the Traveston Dam with the hope that it will force the Queensland State Government to abandon their plans to build the dam, just like they did with their planned March Plebiscite, a decision that would most certainly see numerous Direct Potable Reuse Plants built initially in S.E. Queensland and then all over Australia.

THE COURIER MAIL- 27TH MARCH 2007:-

"But it is the technology used by the Western Corridor Recycled Water Pipeline project which is ---because the purified water produced will eventually be used to augment the region's drinking supplies."

and

"It involves several advanced wastewater treatment plants being built to process water from existing wastewater plants and then pipe the finished product to major power stations and industries in the regions West."

Originally, the Queensland State Government failed to mention that 'several advanced wastewater treatment plants would be built.

PETER BEATTIE'S PLEDGE:

On July 30th 2006 the Premier Peter Beattie gave an unequivocal election pledge. He said: -

"In terms of recycled water for drinking, I give this pledge today - we will not do it unless the people vote positively for it in a referendum."

He lied. When both Peter Beattie and his government abandoned the planned March referendum {plebiscite} he took away every S.E. Qld resident's hard fought for, basic human right to freedom of choice to choose the source of their future drinking water supply. Neither the Federal Government nor the Senate said or did anything in support of the people.

Furthermore, that decision forces all S.E. Queensland residents into being used as guinea pigs in a world first intergenerational experiment, which is against the United Nations Charter which states that the community must be in agreement before treated sewage effluent can be added to their drinking water supply, and the National Health and Medical Research Council's {NHMRC's} position that a person's signature and consent must be obtained before that person can be used in any human experimentation.

DESPITE THE ABOVE, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND SENATE STAYED SILENT.

In March 2007 the Premier of Queensland stated that he intended taking over council's water and wastewater infrastructure, despite the infrastructure being owned, not by the councils, but by the community and despite the fact that we are in this crisis now because of the failure of this government to build any new dams. Neither the Federal Government nor the Senate said anything in defence of the public's right of ownership.

I also question why both the Senate and the Federal Government are hell bent on forcing Sydney and S.E. Queensland residents to consume treated sewage effluent sourced from hospitals, industry, homes and abattoirs?

I believe that the Senate Committee has both a legal and a moral obligation {Duty Of Care} to be up front, clarify and name exactly which option the Queensland State Government truly intends to introduce, ***Planned 'INDIRECT' Potable Reuse {through a dam} or, 'DIRECT' Potable Reuse of treated sewage effluent {pipe to pipe after treatment}?***

The above question is relevant when you take into account the Queensland State Government's history of failed attempts to introduce treated sewage effluent 'DIRECTLY' into the public's drinking water supply mains and the fact that both the Queensland State Government and Commonwealth Government have been carrying out research into 'DIRECT' potable reuse since at least 1995, through the 'Consortium for Integrated Research Management' {CIRM}.

CIRM is now a partnership including Queensland Department of Natural Resources, Department of Primary Industries, Environmental Protection Agency, University of Queensland, Griffith University and affiliated campuses and the Commonwealth's owned CSIRO. Queensland Department of Natural Resources manages CIRM.

TOOWOOMBA CHRONICLE- JAN 25TH 2007:

'QLD MAY IMPLEMENT 100% RECYCLED DRINKING WATER.'

That is, 'DIRECT POTABLE REUSE'.

THE COURIER MAIL – WASTEWATER ANYONE? BEATTIE READY TO EMBRACE 'ARMAGEDDON SOLUTION'.

"Brisbane families may be drinking water recycled from sewerage treatment plants within two years."

In order to introduce treated sewage effluent for drinking purposes 'Within Two Years' the Queensland State Government would have to introduce the treated sewage effluent 'DIRECTLY' into the public's drinking water supply mains. Furthermore, that time frame would NOT allow for sufficient time for testing purposes.

The three failed attempts to introduce this concept were at Caboolture in 1996, Caloundra and Maroochydore in 1998 and Toowoomba in 2006. All failed attempts are supported by documentation.

Confirmation that Toowoomba was indeed a 'DIRECT' Potable Reuse Scheme came from the Senate Committee's 'Interim Report' – Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Water Policy Initiatives, Sep 2006, which states that the Senate committee visited Toowoomba 4 days after the plebiscite was held in July 2006, after the residents had rejected '**DIRECT POTABLE REUSE**' and held a public meeting.

The Senate's Interim Report is also misleading when it states that Toowoomba was "*the only Australian City to have considered a serious DIRECT potable reuse proposal.*" The term 'Direct Potable Reuse' is mentioned more than once in the report. What did the Senate Committee know that Toowoomba residents did not know and why did the committee fail to raise the issue with the public well before the Toowoomba plebiscite was held?

The official question put to Toowoomba residents at the July 2006 Plebiscite was quite specific:

"Do you Support the addition of purified recycled water to Toowoomba's water supply via Cooby Dam as proposed by Water Futures – Toowoomba?"

In any person's language, that is Planned Indirect Potable Reuse, {through a dam}, not Direct Potable Reuse .

TOOWOOMBA WATER REUSE PROJECT-1996:

In 1996 the Toowoomba Water Reuse Project was launched when the Government's Environment Industry Development Network initiated a report on 'A WORLD CLASS

WATER REUSE FACILITY". The Report provides the background information for the planned proposal to Toowoomba City Council.

The Reports states:-

"The proposed strategy for this project is to develop a consortium with complementary capabilities from suitable member companies of the EIDN Wastewater Reuse Venture and Toowoomba City Council. This consortium will develop a economically feasible water reuse plant which will supply tertiary treated water to non-potable reuse customers {Stage 1}----- A second scenario of potable reuse is proposed for stage 2, with direct supply to the inlet of Mt Kynoch water treatment plant, via a thirty day storage and retention dam."

TOOWOOMBA WATER FUTURES:

In 2005-6 Water Futures Toowoomba used CSIRO to promote the 'yes' campaign. It stated:-

*"With a view to helping to ensure a guaranteed water supply for Toowoomba now -----
---Toowoomba City Council, in consultation with the Queensland Government and CSIRO, prepared the Water Futures - Toowoomba project."*

CSIRO is promoted as being 'INDEPENDENT'. Not only must it remain 'Independent', it must also be seen to be so. This is another case of the Commonwealth {Federal} Government promoting the introduction of treated sewage effluent 'DIRECTLY' into the public's drinking water supply mains, an issue that CSIRO has been involved in since at least 1995.

The Federal Government, as a condition for part funding Water Futures - Toowoomba stated that Toowoomba residents MUST approve of the introduction of treated sewage effluent through the July plebiscite. The Federal, State, Toowoomba City Council, Australian Water Association {AWA} and the environmental movement threw all they had at Toowoomba, thinking that the 'YES' campaign would be successful.

When the Premier, Peter Beattie abandoned the planned March Plebiscite for S.E. Queensland and made the decision to force the introduction of treated sewage effluent sourced from hospitals, industry, homes and abattoirs into the public's drinking water supply mains he included Toowoomba. The Federal Government said nothing. More proof that there is an agenda, it is to force residents to drink this toxic cocktail and both the Federal Government and Senate are involved.

CABOOLTURE 1996:

**KINHILL METCALF AND EDDY:
REPORT:**

"Council engaged Kinhill Metcalf and Eddy to undertake an investigation into the potential to reuse the effluent from the South Caboolture Sewerage Treatment Plant including the potential for use as a source of potable water."

"The recommended option is ----- Subject to verification [following an extensive

testing program] that the water produced by the treatment plant at South Caboolture meets all the safety standards required for potable water then it would be proposed to discharge the treated water DIRECTLY into the water reticulation network."

The Queensland State Government Department of Primary Industries and Sunshine Coast Environment Council {SCEC}, promoted the introduction of potable reuse at Caboolture in 1996. Documentation obtained under FOI Legislation states that the Strategy was 'POLITICAL' with the government deciding to introduce treated sewage effluent into the public's drinking water supply mains and then taking the step to inform them afterwards.

QUEENSLAND WASTEWATER REUSE STRATEGY {QWRS}

The name of the QWRS was changed soon after to the Queensland Water Recycling Strategy {QWRS}. The strategy was initiated in 1996 but commenced in late 1997.

The purposes of the QWRS was to facilitate the introduction of both Planned indirect and 'DIRECT' potable reuse of treated sewage effluent.

The QWRS consisted of a Steering Committee, an Independent Reference Panel and four Technical Advisory Groups. The Chair of the QWRS and DNR employee was Howard Gibson, member of the AWWA Qld Board in Aug 1996. He was also Chair of the Steering Committee. All four Chairs of the TAGS were also members of AWWA as was the Manager, another DNR employee.

The reports that stated that Queensland had more than enough water for the future came from the Department of Natural Resources. We are now in a water supply crisis which has facilitated the forced introduction of treated sewage effluent into our drinking water supply mains and the privatisation of that infrastructure.

Participation in the QWRS was by invitation only. Companies involved in research into DIRECT potable reuse, some KEY sponsors for the 1995 AWWA Direct Potable Reuse Demonstration Project, Universities already carrying out research into Direct Potable Reuse, CIRM, environmental groups that had been condemning dams and ocean outfalls while pushing the introduction of this concept and representatives from Government Departments supporting government policy {the introduction of Direct Potable Reuse} were involved in the QWRS.

CALOUNDRA/ MAROOCHYDORE 1997:

RECOMMENDED STRATEGY:- OBTAINED FROM THE QLD STATE OMBUDSMAN BUT NEVER MADE PUBLIC.

"The strategy that was adopted by both Maroochy Shire and Caloundra City Councils in August 1997-----."

"Major reclamation plants would be constructed adjacent to the ring tank in Caloundra City and close to the Maroochydore Sewage Treatment Plant in Maroochy Shire. The Maroochydore reclamation plant will be a 'DIRECT' reuse scheme

pumping reclaimed water 'DIRECTLY' to the Maroochy Shire drinking water supply reticulation system."

"The Caloundra reclamation plant will initially provide reclaimed water for the Caloundra ring tank—. The second stage of the Caloundra reclamation plant — allow 'DIRECT' potable reuse of the reclaimed water in Caloundra City. The reclaimed water will be pumped 'DIRECTLY' into the drinking water supply reticulation system."

EDUCATION NEEDS BACKGROUND REPORT, PREPARED BY NEXUS AUSTRALIA FOR THE QUEENSLAND WATER RECYCLING STRATEGY- JAN 1999:

The Report states on page 10A, under the headings, Australia, Queensland, Caloundra / Maroochy Shire Councils.

"Overall, this was a lengthy and intensive study, several questions in the telephone survey contained several conditions for response and could be described as leading, especially when respondents were asked to choose between another option and a dam.

"Further, as with the Noosa Study, {see below}, one sector of the community, {in both cases, environmental groups} is believed to have had a disproportionate impact on the outcomes of the study. The Credibility of the support for potable reuse obtained from this study is therefore open to doubt."

The Queensland State Government had two representatives on the Study's 12 person Steering Committee. Participation in any of the 60 Focus meetings was by INVITATION only. The Project Managers were given a list containing 1600 names to contact and invite to attend.

The outcomes of the study, the introduction of direct potable reuse, to build the AWWA 1995 Direct Potable Reuse Demonstration Project and the introduction of a Water Education Program were all outcomes of the AWWA 1995 Draft and 1997 Final Policies.

CALOUNDRA / MAROOCHYDORE WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY:

In August 1997, after the Study had been adopted by both councils for planning purposes for the next 50 years, the C/MSWM Strategy commenced, or 'Implementation of the Strategy', which was the introduction of treated sewage effluent into the public's drinking water mains, as it was also called.

The Strategy supported Planned Indirect Potable Reuse until 'DIRECT' Potable Reuse could be introduced. The Strategy Steering Committee included all 12 Study committee members, including DNR and EPA, plus Queensland Health.

DIRECT WATER RECYCLING FOR DRINKING PURPOSES:

In April 1999 the existence of the Qld State Government's 'Interim' Strategy in respect of reuse of treated water as a source of potable water was confirmed.

"A moratorium has been put on any decision to introduce 'DIRECT' recycling into drinking water schemes until 1st Jan 2005 so that my Department can evaluate sufficient information about the health aspects and reliability of such schemes. The moratorium is only in respect to a decision to introduce such schemes and not on the research and education aspects of 'DIRECT' potable recycling."

Education and research were not included because the Government Departments of DNR, DPI and EPA were already involved in research through CIRM and Education through the AWA, 'We All Use Water Education Program'. The government's 'Interim Strategy' was never made public.

MOBILE ADVANCED WATER RECYCLING DEMONSTRATION PLANT:

In 2001 the above plant was built. Documentation obtained under FOI states that the design for the plant came directly from the design for the 1995 AWWA Direct Potable Reuse Demonstration Project. The name was changed to prevent the public from becoming aware that they were trying to force the introduction of treated sewage effluent directly into the public's drinking water supply mains. The processes include reverse osmosis which is only ever used for direct potable reuse.

Queensland EPA owns the plant, DNR manages it for CIRM. DNR also manages CIRM.

THE PLANNED INDIRECT AND DIRECT REUSE OF TREATED SEWAGE EFFLUENT SOURCED FROM HOSPITALS, INDUSTRY, HOMES AND ABATTOIRS, INSERTED INTO THE PUBLIC'S DRINKING WATER SUPPLY MAINS:

Planned Indirect Potable Reuse as the government states is planned here is a world first.
Direct Potable Reuse as the government plans here is a world first.

One question that needs to be answered, if the planned processes, including reverse osmosis removes ALL contaminants as the Government wording implies { Purified Recycled Water}, and it has been proven not to do so, why would anyone want to spend the money, treat it through reverse osmosis and then insert it into the dam, taking into account that proponents state that the treated effluent will be better than the dam water it will mix with.

Why contaminate the treated sewage effluent again when the water treatment plant does not have reverse osmosis? The answer. The Queensland State Government has no intention of introducing treated sewage effluent into dams, only directly into the drinking water mains.

CAP OFF RECYCLED LIMITS: THE COURIER MAIL JAN 25TH 2007:

" A maximum limit to the amount of recycled water that could be pumped into S.E. Queensland's drinking supplies has been ditched by the State Government. Acting Premier Anna Bligh said " The advice we have is this water, purified and treated to the appropriate level, is 100% safe."

This is a world first. Where is the proof that these plants can remove ALL contaminants? The above statement is more proof that this government intends introducing treated sewage 'DIRECTLY' into the public's drinking water supply mains, without proper testing.

I believe that there is more than enough evidence to indicate that our present water supply crisis was purposely created by politicians, both Federal, State and Local. No State or Local Government has built any new dams to supply a major urban area since 1989, despite Australia suffering droughts and an ever increasing population. While water is primarily a State and Local Government concern, the Federal Government has not been backward in forcing State Governments to privatise their electricity outlets or Local Governments to privatise their water and wastewater infrastructure, at times, using what I believe has been intimidation and what amounts to bribery, by withholding funding or simply by introducing measures of compliance as they did through the National Competition Policy.

SYDNEY WATER- 2004:

Another example of Federal Government intervention. In 2004 the Federal Government used the National Competition Council to try and force the NSW Government to abandon their plans to build a desalination plant, instead, build water recycling plants to introduce treated sewage effluent into the public's drinking water supply mains.

The Queensland State Government has ignored all scientific evidence, technical, health and environmental concerns to have this concept forcibly introduced without proper, long term testing and monitoring. One such article expressing concerns:-

WEST AUSTRALIAN NEWSPAPER:

The article '*Experts Warn on Recycled Water*', appeared in The West Australian Newspaper on the 22nd March 2007 and states:- "*Internationally acclaimed scientists have sparked fears over the safety of drinking recycled sewage, warning that new man-made chemicals and pharmaceutical products could slip through the filtration process, raising the risk of cancer and infertility.*"

US SENATE AND EUROPEAN UNION.

In 2001 the US Senate was so concerned that they directed their EPA to commence immediate testing to determine which of the 67000 chemicals that could be present in sewage are endocrine disrupters. The European Union followed soon after. The environment movement in both the US and Europe have since forced the delay of that testing.

The Australian Federal Government and Senate supports the introduction of treated sewage effluent for drinking purposes despite the fact that little is known about the short

or long term effects of chemicals, some endocrine disrupters, in parts / trillion, on human health.

GOVERNMENT HEALTH AGENCIES AND THEIR CHEMICAL BROTHERS:

Source- Los Angeles Times, March 4th 2007.

"The U.S. Center for the Evaluation of Risks to Human Reproduction ----- "but much of the agency's work has been conducted by a private consulting company...that has been funded by more than 50 industrial companies."

CANBERRA: ACT:

On the 23rd March the article '*Public to Debate Recycled Water Plan*' appeared in the Canberra Times. The article stated that the project was prompted by the Commonwealth's decision to renege on an 18 year deal to give Canberra's largest water supply, Googong Dam, to the ACT.

Once again, here we have more evidence of the Commonwealth Government using tactics to force Canberra to introduce treated sewage effluent directly into their drinking water supply mains, despite the fact that it is not needed. The article goes on to say that the proposal is already tipped to win approval in the National capital due to a lack of political opposition. All three major parties have lent support.

I do not know the amount of money spent on buying bottled water for Parliament House, But I know it will increase after this concept is introduced. Fortunately, most politicians will leave Canberra to return home after Parliament sittings end.

On the 29th March 2007 the article '*ACT Govt to Examine Recycled Water Concerns*', appeared on ABC NEWS ONLINE.

"Expert Peter Collignon, from the Australian National University, says introducing recycled water to Canberra's drinking supply will increase the risk of disease." "We've got all this extra water, when you look at the numbers-why would we possibly go through this expensive recycled water issue?" he said. Why indeed?

CABOOLTURE:

On March 6th 2007 the following article appeared in the Caboolture Shire Herald called '*Recycled Water On Agenda as Cheap Alternative*'. The article went on, "*Recycled wastewater from Caboolture South's water treatment plant could be added to the Shire's drinking supply, a council report has revealed.*"

This decision comes despite the fact that Caboolture residents rejected this concept in 1996.

The Senate's failure to even mention the intentions of the State Government to force the introduction of treated sewage effluent sourced from hospitals, industry, homes and abattoirs, into S.E. Qld residents drinking water supply mains, a world first, I believe, is further evidence of Federal Government and the Senates involvement in what began as a

strategy in 1992, but what I believe had become a conspiracy from 1995 until the present time.

I believe that the information in this submission is more than enough to force the Senate to initiate an independent, open inquiry into this issue. The public deserves no less.

THE NATION:

The Australian ran the following article, 'HILL WARNS STATES ON WATER':-
"A MULTI-MILLION DOLLAR water war is looming after the Howard Government warned states yesterday they risked losing funding because they had failed to deliver on promised reforms."

The often used excuse that the Federal Government has nothing to do with water as it is solely a state and local government responsibility, can no longer be used.

THE AGE; JAN 2007: ARTICLE 'RECYCLED WATER ? WE'RE NOT THAT THIRSTY'

Prime Minister John Howard recently said "It's part of the solution" and Treasurer Peter Costello said it was the "final step" of measures to overcome shortages."

THE COURIER MAIL:-

As is well known, Rupert Murdoch owns The Courier Mail through News Ltd. Recently, the Sydney Morning Herald, a Fairfax owned newspaper reported that a Murdoch employed journalist who reports on National Politics and Foreign Affairs for the News Ltd, Weekend Australian, Christopher Pearson, helped ghost write 7 speeches for Alexander Downer.

Leading up to The Courier Mail's campaign which led to the State Government's abandoning the March plebiscite, the paper ran numerous articles that I believe, were highly misleading and biased in favour of drinking treated sewage effluent.

APRIL 2007:

{i} The Senate conducts an inquiry into the Traverston Dam.

{ii} Why did the Senate fail to condemn the Queensland Government for denying residents their basic human right to vote on the reuse of treated sewage effluent sourced from hospitals, industry, homes and abattoirs for drinking purposes. How would the Senate benefit?

{iii} Why did the Senate fail to stop what was not in the public's best interest by allowing the Queensland State Government's proposal to use residents as guinea pigs in a world first intergenerational experiment.

{iv} Why has the Senate failed to truthfully and fully inform the public on this issue, despite having extensive documentation and information proving that the Queensland

State Government intends introducing treated sewage effluent sourced from hospitals, industry, homes and abattoirs, DIRECTLY into the public's drinking water mains, the Senate refuses to inform the public on this issue, instead, the Senate tries to prevent the completion of the only safe, proven and far cheaper option in the long term, to supply that water.

{v} Why is the Senate not speaking out about the Queensland State Government's plans to take over Council managed water and wastewater infrastructure, the peoples water and privatise it, especially since we are where we are solely because of the Queensland State Government's incompetence.

{vi} As already stated. No Federal, State or Local Government has built any new dams to supply a major urban area since 1989, despite Australia suffering droughts and an ever increasing population? The reason, Australians would be forced SOONER OR LATER to consume treated sewage effluent.

THE REUSE OF TREATED SEWAGE EFFLUENT SOURCED FROM HOSPITALS, INDUSTRY, HOMES AND ABATTOIRS FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION:

{1} The reuse of treated sewage effluent sourced from hospitals, industry, homes and abattoirs, as is planned here, is a world first.

{2} Its introduction will involve ourselves, our children and grandchildren as guinea pigs in a world first Intergenerational experiment.

{3} The highly contaminated and highly infectious sewage effluent entering the sewerage treatment plant is the same sewage effluent that leaves the plant after treatment. The operators have to give a guarantee that ALL contaminants, including more than 67000 chemicals that could be present in sewage, have been removed. Put simply, they can't.

The above statement is supported by the Queensland State Government in their Queensland Water Recycling Guidelines when it states:-

"The treatment required to ensure safe indirect potable reuse of effluent would have to be determined on a case by case basis. This is because there are many man-made chemicals that potentially may be found in sewage and it is NOT POSSIBLE at this time to set safe concentrations for all of these chemicals. Also, it is not feasible to monitor for all known chemicals that could occur in recycled water sourced from STP's as most chemical contaminants require specific analytical tests that, if undertaken on a regular basis, would NOT BE ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE."

Anna Bligh has already stated that the advice they have is that this is 100% safe. Not only is it not feasible to test for all chemicals, it is impossible. If one does not know what goes into the sewerage treatment plant how does one know what to test for and when?

Furthermore, "would have to be determined on a case by case basis," but Anna has advice that all treated sewage effluent from all plants will be safe. How could that be.

{4} The concept is an option of last resort, an Armageddon solution, as the Premier points out.

{5} The World Health Organisation and all other developed countries state that the best source water should always be used for drinking purposes and that all other uses of treated sewage effluent should be exhausted before treated sewage effluent is used for drinking purposes.

{6} DR DIMITRIAS'S 'ISSUES ENCOUNTERED IN ADVANCING AUSTRALIA'S WATER RECYCLING SCHEMES' STATES:-

"At present, experts are rarely able to agree on risk levels. When technical experts cannot agree, it is unlikely that the general public will have confidence in the results."

And

"A conclusion from the recent conference of the Australian Water Association exploring the topic of 'CONTAMINANTS of CONCERN' was that it would be prudent to wait before producing recycled water for direct water use. This would ensure that we are not inadvertently facilitating the expansion of another as yet unknown long-incubation period malady. It also provides more time to clarify the science of little known interactions of recycled water with soils and biofilms."

Biofilms build up on the inside of water mains etc and can break off, leading to health concerns.

The Queensland State Government has even ignored the advice from the University of NSW Report that reviewed recycled drinking water in the US and Singapore that was commissioned by the Local Government Association of Queensland, after reading the headlines only.

'ALL CLEAR GIVEN TO RECYCLED WATER'

"The 45 page report —found recycled drinking water in overseas schemes was of equal quality to that from traditional sources or better."

That traditional water sources are considerably contaminated, unlike what is found here. Many of the older American cities have combined sewer and stormwater mains.

"Nevertheless, the report said a comprehensive health assessment was necessary before any Australian scheme went ahead."

"While studies undertaken overseas bode well for the safety of recycled water generally, exactly how effectively these studies can be translated to potential Australian schemes is less clear", the authors said.

"Water sources will differ and water treatment processes will differ."

"The report recommended comprehensive water quality testing before recycled water was mixed with existing supplies in Australia."

"This could be achieved either by the construction of a pilot plant or a full sized plant with the water initially being used for non-potable purposes."

Windhoek, Namibia, South Africa only ever used domestic sewage and three other source waters were mixed before treatment. Singapore uses sewage = to 95% domestic sources and only introduces 1% of daily water consumption into their reservoir. Most is used for non potable purposes in industry etc.

**SCIENCE AND HEALTH / INDIRECT POTABLE REUSE WORKSHOP DRAFT
WHITE PAPER: 2002 TAKASHI ASANO PROFESSOR EMERITUS DEP OF
CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA, DAVIS.**

'HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT FOR WATER REUSE'

"Despite a long history of water reuse in California, the question of safety of water reuse is still difficult to define and delineation of acceptable health risks has been hotly debated."

"Four water quality factors are of particular concern: {1} microbiological quality, {2} total mineral content {e.g., total dissolved solids}, {3} presence of toxicant of the heavy metal type, and {4} the concentration of stable organic substances. Particularly for the last two categories, recent studies in environmental toxicology and pharmacology have revealed potential long term health risks associated with chemical compounds such as disinfection by products {DBPs}, pharmaceutically active compounds {PhAC's}, pesticides, and personal care products {PCP's} at low concentrations {orders of parts / billion and parts / trillion}.

Those trace organic compounds along with some organic compounds such as arsenic and hexavalent chromium found in reclaimed water are of special concern for human and ecological health risks. In addition, there are growing concerns among the public and the mass media with those trace contaminants in reclaimed water which were coincided with increasingly sensitive detection techniques that enabled detection at extremely low contaminant concentrations."

'WATER FROM SEWAGE NOT SAFE ENOUGH' : The Advertiser {Adelaide}. Jan 29th 2007.

"The Adelaide scientist who developed Australia's drinking water guidelines says he would NOT drink recycled sewage and would not back its use."

'DECLINING SPERM UNDER MICROSCOPE': May 13th 2004:

'GENDER BENDING' WATER WARNINGS':- May 2nd 2006- *The Australian Financial Review.*

"There are fears a plan to reclaim drinking water from sewage could lead to increased cancers in men."

'SEWAGE DRINK DANGER', HERALD SUN, Dec 27-2006.

"Victorians have been warned not to embrace the prospect of drinking recycled sewage water. Water experts say the cleanliness of such water even after it has been treated, cannot be guaranteed."

Above, are just some of the articles where scientists warn about concerns regarding this concept and the impact on the public's health.

{7} *These recycling plants use excessive amounts of electricity. Like desalination they use reverse osmosis, unlike desalination they also use a great amount of chemicals, have materials such as membranes etc that need constant and costly replacement and testing and monitoring are a major part of the operating costs.*

{8} *These plants produce a brine that is classified as 'HAZARDOUS' and is very difficult to deal with. It can't be put back into the mains and must be disposed of correctly. How does one transport it through cities safely?*

{9} *No real time, long term health studies have ever been carried out on any community consuming treated sewage effluent directly.*

{10} **PRIVATISATION:**

The Queensland State Government has already handed the contract to operate the desalination plant and water recycling pipeline. Is it in the public's best interest to hand over water and sewerage infrastructure to companies with criminal records.

'PIPELINE COMPANY SHAMED'

"A GIANT French company involved in two of S.E. Queensland's biggest water projects has a history of corruption, environmental degradation and price gouging."

'H2O -la-la- FRENCH TO PROFIT FROM OUR DROUGHT': THE COURIER MAIL -JAN 31ST 2007.

"A GIANT French company will reap hundreds of millions of dollars from Southeast Qld's water crisis, with consumers set to pay the price."

"In a little-published deal, French based Veolia Water has been awarded lucrative contracts by the State Government to run the \$1-7 billion western corridor recycled water pipeline and the \$ 1-3 billion Gold Coast desalination plant."

'RECYCLING TO SEND BILLS SPIRALLING': THE COURIER MAIL- Jan 31 2007.

Is that really in the public's best interest?

'LET PRIVATE SECTOR PLUG WATER LEAKS': AUSTRALIAN 21ST AUG 2006:
"Private investors could be given privileged access to public water systems under plans to encourage investment in infrastructure such as dams and irrigation channels."

"The nation's ageing water infrastructure is riddled with leaks and additional supply sources such as desalination plants are required to meet growing demand, says a discussion paper to be released by parliamentary secretary Malcolm Turnbull."

Malcolm Turnbull, as we all know, is now Federal Environment Minister responsible for water. But hang on, isn't water a state and local government responsibility?

QUEENSLAND WATER COMMISSION:

Despite the fact that the Queensland State Government continually states that the commission is 'INDEPENDENT' it is far from it.

PARTNERS: The commission works closely with the State Gov Departments such as Premier and Cabinet, Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Infrastructure, Co-ordinator General, Natural Resources and Water, {manages CIRM }, EPA, { owns the Direct Potable Reuse Demonstration Plant and member of CIRM}, Qld Treasury, Local governments within S.E. Qld etc.

QUEENSLAND WATER COMMISSION'S EXPERT PANEL:

"This highly qualified panel will be responsible for ensuring that all proposed standards for purified recycled water are appropriately assessed to meet all health and safety concerns."

The Chair, Professor Paul Greenfield is Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor of the University of Queensland. The university is a part of CIRM with the Qld EPA, DNR, DPI etc. It is possible that the university could be involved in a consortium that operates the water recycling plants. CSIRO, another member of CIRM is also represented on the panel and face the same possible conflict of interest.

Recently, the QWC announced that the IWC had been retained to facilitate and manage the activities and deliberations of the Panel, an independent body providing advice to the Qld Government. The IWC chair is also Professor Paul Greenfield.

The IWC is a joint venture of University of Queensland, Griffith University, both members of CIRM, Monash University, University of West Australia etc. IWC is supported by the Queensland State Government. IWC is located at level 4 SEQ WATER Building, 240 Margaret St, Brisbane. How independent of the State Government is that? Very transparent.

At the beginning of this submission I was going to state that in 1992 the Federal Government initiated a strategy to force the privatisation of Australia's \$80 billion of water and wastewater infrastructure while forcing the introduction of treated sewage

effluent sourced from hospitals, industry, homes and abattoirs, directly into both Sydney and S.E. Queensland's drinking water supply. I'm more convinced now that I am right.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to share with you my concerns regarding the source of our future drinking water supply.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "L. Jones".