

Bill Liley  
PO Box 51  
Kandanga QLD 4570

9 February, 2006

Project manager – Traveston Crossing  
Dam Project  
SEQ Infrastructure (Water)  
The Coordinator-General  
PO Box 15009  
City East QLD 4002

Dear Sir or Madam,

RE: Draft terms of Reference for Environmental Impact Statement – Proposed  
Traveston Crossing Dam

Purpose

The purpose of this letter is to provide feedback on the Draft terms of Reference (TOR) for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) dated December 2006 regarding the proposed Traveston Crossing Dam.

The social impact of the proposal has been devastating on the immediate communities concerned. There is a body of evidence emerging to suggest that the handling of this controversial, and highly political decision, lacks public support in SE Qld. The behaviour of employees in QWI has been inappropriate placing unnecessary pressure on residents to voluntarily accept resumption agreements; valuations have been inconsistent

and below market value; and proposed contracts have not been presented on request to enable residents fair opportunity to seek independent legal advice. The social impact of this proposal must be emphasized and the TORs strengthened to enable the community to provide a full account of lost personal and business opportunities resulting from this proposal now, and into the future.

The EIS provides an opportunity to analyse the environmental impact of alternate water sources for SEQld. These alternatives especially point of use collection and storage, which reflects supply capacity in the changed rainfall patterns and fresh water generation opportunities, should be included in the TORs. All alternatives used in Australia and overseas must be considered with rigorous commitment to their suitability, viability and applicability. Full environmental impact study is necessary for each alternative.

Anna Bligh told me directly, that it would take at least 2 years to complete an EIS for this project. The current plan to complete EIS within 6 months is pathetic. A full and appropriate EIS must be made into this project regardless of the time frame required.

The TOR should include an assessment of the locations impacted by the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) with the proposed dam and without the proposed dam. A similar exercise should be undertaken in relation to the 1% Annual Exceedence Probability (AEP) i.e. the 1:100 year flood, including the hydrodynamic effects in the regions around the inflows to the ponded area.

The Head of QWI is Mr Graeme Newton was responsible for the building of the Paradise Dam project which has failed to deliver promised economic, social and environmental outcomes. My experience of Mr Newton's confrontational interpersonal manner leads me to be concerned about the social, emotional and interpersonal environment that will be thrust on the community by this or any project managed by Mr Newton. On the basis of this track record, he is unfit to be involved in any other similar project. Similarly, the EIS needs to demonstrate that the project managers and contractors are capable of delivering their contractual and social, environmental and economic responsibilities. I

want the EIS to include an analysis of the effect and manner of the project managers, staff and contractors, in their interactions with members of the community affected by the project and other members of the public. I suggest that the project be redesigned and run in alignment with the United Nations Brisbane Statement on Community Engagement, 2005. The EIS TORs need to be wide enough to enable community members to provide information relevant to the environmental impact of the proposal.

The EIS should contain a demonstrated program of implementation of mitigation measures with consequences for non-implementation and fully documented performance criteria, particularly as it relates to feral pest and weed management. It is evident that this was not put in place for the Paradise Dam and many of the proposed mitigation measures either do not work or have not been implemented. Paradise Dam is a shame and an embarrassment, and similar processes should not be replicated.

The EIS should review the proposed land use and management plans for land beyond the surrounding proposed Traveston dam pondage and buffer zones, for the environmental, social and economic impacts. In particular, various population densities and land use models for humans and other species must be considered. The TORs must be expanded and strengthened to enable the EIS to fully account for the impact on surrounding bird, flora, reptile, mammal and marsupial populations and their habitats. Therefore, potential subdivision, commercial, residential and industrial land usage must be accounted for and analysed with respect to their influence on the current community activities and endangered species. The EIS needs to explain why there may be rezoning and denser residential land uses right up to the buffer zone, and if there is what will be the effects on the endangered and endemic flora and fauna.

The EIS must include an analysis of the effects of all flow modeling on the communities and flora and fauna between the Traveston Crossing and the tidal barrage in the Mary River near Tiaro.

In conclusion, I believe the integrity of QWI is so compromised by their membership and history that the EIS process needs to be managed by a completely independent and suitably qualified consultant. I would like an opportunity to review the final draft TORs before they are finalized and given to whoever is charged with approving and implementing the EIS.

Yours sincerely

Bill Liley