

Submission No:	564
Date Received:	25-1-11
Secretary:	SL

25th January 2011

Tony and Committee,

In December I registered to talk to you but was not accepted. I was told that I could Tony, we are pleased that you were the only person to vote against the Water Act but we desperately want to see irrigation water belong only to farmers.

MDBA water requirements ranging from 3,000 to up to 7,600 gegalitres per annum are unprofessional in their lack of accuracy with the upper half of the range equating to death for five towns. How could the Paroo Warrego and others north of the Darling be serviced by the MDBA plan?

Fifty Scientists flooded River Reds and watched them drown

They then asked "why do they all want us to go out of town?"

They flooded irrigation water after dredging the Murray Mouth

When tide overfilled with sand they had to dredge further south

Next they studied hydrological indicator sites by sub-group

But they did not learn how to put individual assets into the loop

After failure after failure "who will listen to what we have to say?"

"Our qualifications mean nothing to anyone except the MDBA."

The MDBA is also in trouble and their problems are mounting with unprofessionally poor communication and dodgy accounting.

MDBA have four glossy tomes which are a bureaucratic morass

Few have read them but ask if they support them they say "I pass"

To follow our plan you will need to lose five towns they say

We say to those who cannot estimate to + or - 50% "No way"

We seek accurate environmental estimates that they are lacking

MDBA is suggesting we harassed them – they must be cracking

Tony Windsor will be making speeches like war time scrambles

but within months MDBA will collapse - their policy is a shambles

Tony and committee, I have always been interested in numbers so when I saw a set of numbers which show a range of values from 3,000 to 4,000 to 7,600 the words which came to mind immediately were "dodgy and shonky." I asked MDBA for table showing the volume required per environmental asset. They sent me some data and advised that the information would be on page 455. The data only went to page 350.

A phone call came through apologising and a whole lot of documentation was mailed out. Meanwhile we asked if the information on years between water requirements and water volumes are there and could THEY find it. This question was deflected by an explanation that individual assets are not assigned volumes but there are hydrological indicator sites and if those groups have sufficient water then all of the assets in that group should have enough water. To us this is as dodgy, as inaccurate and as impossible to monitor as bureaucrats could contrive. Here are some of the problems we found:

The many Paroo River sites

MDBA advised that no environmental assets apply. Why are they on the list?

The many Warrego River sites

The only way that water could be introduced would be from Water from the North which MDBA do not support or water from the Gulf Country or from St. George and that would not be in time of drought. These assets and the 3 to 15 gigs which apply should be deleted.

Adelong Creek

This is the first (in alphabetical order) of 192 sites in Murrumbidgee with Environmental Criteria 4 as described in Volume 2 page 455. Tony, what does that tell me about those 192 sites and the many others in other areas? I asked MDBA to interrogate their data base to tell me which pages show information on Adelong Creek? Tony, why don't they answer me? Could it be that there is no data to describe the infrastructure needed?

Adjungbilly Creek

This creek starts at 888 metres in steep hill country. How could water be introduced? 50 scientists put out full page ads supporting the MDBA. Should they support it without checking? Worse still for Australia did they check but not pick up the errors? The scientists are good at drawing dots, maps and block diagrams but how practical are they? What infrastructure do they need to service the site? How much will it cost to install and how much to maintain? Has power to pumps been investigated?

Sandy Creek

This is the only water source entering Adjungbilly Creek. The same comments as above will apply.

The Coorong, Murray Mouth and the Lower Lakes

On page 684 of Volume 2 of MDBA plan Table 16.4 for The Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth shows in one column a requirement of 5,100GL/y. It also shows "Flows greater than 5,100 GL/y 38% of years." This is seen as a very irresponsible comment for such a large and important item. How much water? Is it 6,000 or even more? The inaccuracy for such potentially huge amounts of water is unprofessional.

Menindee Lakes

*On page 584 of Volume 2 of MDBA plan Table B9.5 shows a very difficult to understand table including columns for Flow Required and Duration. Does "duration" relates to number of days of water injection or number of days of holding level? Is the requirement 3,000 GL/y or much less or even more? It should be noted that if in a year when Murray Mouth and Lower Lakes were close to 6,000 GL/ and if the Menindee Lakes require 3,000 GL/y the total demand would be **9,000GL/y** even if none of the remaining 2,440 environmental assets draw any water. If this applies then even the estimate of 3,000 to 7,600 GG/y by the MDBA would be incorrect.*

Coming back to first principles I set up what I hoped would be a transparent and logical table of data. In theory it is all so simple. The detail in the MDBA plan is so jumbled as though there were 50 scientists with at least 5 different methods of assembling the data. Due to the jumble there needs to be this many columns at least:

1. Number of years between environmental water injections
2. Volume of water required during each injection year
- 3 and 4. Method and cost of getting water to site (2 columns)
5. Years for next three doses (e.g 2014, 2017, etc)

If they had assigned data per environmental asset it would have been simple.

I believe that a necessary first step is to demand that MDBA rework the data to give a table per asset

The complication has arisen due to the use of Hydrological Indicator Sites.

There is no direct link between Hydrological Indicator Sites and Environmental Assets.

The columns for Method and Costs of getting water to sites will be extremely significant. Many assets should be eliminated because getting water - which should be irrigation water - to these sites is often illogical and often far too costly to carry out on a regular basis.

I worked for over 30 years in construction in four countries. Every project was analysed for scope, timing and cost. The client always had an implementation plan to ensure that the completed project would operate at a profit, with controlled operating and maintenance costs. **There is nothing in the MDBA plan to indicate that an implementation plan was produced.** Some environmental farmers have presented their scenarios of the huge infrastructure to achieve the environmental flows during a drought. They expressed doubts about the introduced water going to where it should and staying for the required time. One farmer estimated the infrastructure and maintenance costs and they were astronomical.

If the data is so voluminous and figures so mind boggling that no one challenges them then Government can say "The data was in the Public Domain for months, no one challenged it so we can pass law which allows cuts to general security to 43%."

This is why the bureaucracy is so dangerous. If I am even near correct, if people do not realise what the figures and data are and do not understand the other implications of the plan then five towns could go (as MDBA projected). Over to you Tony and committee.

Brian Mills

Environmental Water per Annum

A	B			C	D	E	F	G			
Reference	Asset Name	Volume per Year	Years *	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Next 3 years	Method of Introducing Water	Cost of Water
1	Adelong Creek	0.40	3	0	0	0	0.40	0	2014 2017 2020	Please Explain	
2	Adjungbilly Creek	0.22	8	0	0	0	0.00	0	2015 2019 2023	Please Explain	
3	Algudgerie Creek	0.41	8	0	0	0	0.41	0	2014 2017 2020		
4	Antills Creek	0.33	3	0	0	0	0.33	0	2014 2017 2020		
5	Back Creek	0.39	3	0	0	0	0.00	0	2015 2019 2023		
6	Back or Grassy Creek	0.24	5	0	0	0	0.24	0	2016 2021 2026		
1900	Menidee Lakes	3000.00	4	0	0	0	0.00	3000.00	2015 2019 2023		
2439	Wonga Lake	0.38	3	0	0	0	0.38	0	2014 2017 2020		
2440	Yarriambiack Creek	0.32	3	0	0	0	0.32	0	2014 2017 2020		
2441	Yeungroon Creek	0.40	3	0	0	0	0.40	0	2014 2017 2020		
2442	Murray mouth incl B16.4	5100.00	1	5100.00	5100.00	5100.00	5100.00	5100.00	2011 2012 2013		
	TOTAL GL/y			5100.65	5100.00	5100.00	5102.48	8100.00			
* Years between environmental injections											
Page 57 of Volume 1 advises 3,000 and 7.600 GL/y as the requirement for the MDBA plan											
MDBA indicated 3,000 to 4,000 GL/y is a likely safe range.											
Volume 2 Part II page 684 Table B16.4 advises 5,100 GL/y for The Coorong, Lpwer Lakes and Murray Mouth and >5,100 for 38% of years											
Volume 2 Part II page 584 Table B9.3 advises a smorgasbord of data perhaps representing 3,000 GL/y											
QUESTIONS FOR TONY											
1. Can you understand the implications of The Coorong, the Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth requiring 5,100 GL/y of fresh water most years and greater than 5,100 GL/y for 38% of years. Does this peak at 6,000 GL/y or more? If this is added to the possible 3,000 GL/y for Meneindee Lakes AND whatever is needed from the remaining 2,430 environmental sites in that year we could go past 10,000 GL/y.											
2. I asked MDBA to interrogate the MDBA data base and advise the page numbers for Adelong Creek. I said that I wanted the data for 25.1.11. Otherwise I would suggest that MDBA is stone walling. Please ask on my behalf.											
3. Please advise why a logical and transparent table as shown above could not be used. In the four volumes there is no table to back the 3,000, 4,000 7,600 or even 10,000 or more GL/y. This range is unprofessionally inaccurate.											
4. Please advise the environmental flow required for Menidee Lakes. Table B9.3 on page 584 of Volume 2 Part II is confusing. If 3,000 GG/y is correct then it represent 75% of the 4,000 (presuming that Table B16.4 Murray Mouth etc is eliminated) GL/y which is the upper level of an acceptable flow. This would only allow 1,000 GL/y for the remaining 2,430 environmental sites											