

Re: Murray Darling

I have started to delve into the MDBA plan and find lots of errors, inconsistencies and unprofessional methods. First there is a list of apparent errors and irregularities with some background in italics:

The Murray Mouth and the Lower Lakes

On page 684 of Volume 2 of MDBA plan Table 16.4 shows for The Coorang, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth shows in one column a requirement of 5,100GL/y. It also shows "Flows > 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?

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" relate 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.*

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 the Gulf Country or from St. George and that would not be in time of drought. These assets and the 3 to 15 gigs should be deleted.

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?

Sandy Creek

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

River Red Gums

On page 564 or Volume 2 of MDBA plan Table B7.3 it calls for “a flood frequency of once every 2-3 years to an average duration of 4-7 months minimum...” We are in contact with two farmers who are keen environmentalists who seriously doubt the environmental qualifications of the writers of this section. They claim that the short time frame is environmentally dangerous and financially far too expensive. They would be very happy to debate the situation or as an option suggest that the MDBA conduct experiments and release the results for scrutiny.

Many of the above are unprofessional but the apparent lack of an implementation plan deserves a section by itself. In any large construction project the scope, the cost and the implementation plan are known. The construction cost is estimated to within plus or minus 10% before the project is publically announced. The client would already have defined the scope and made himself aware of the implementation plan and the annual cost of being able to maintain the plant.

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.

We were told that the information we needed was there – we believe that it is not.

After asking searching questions a friend phoned me to say that a friend told him that I was harassing the MDBA. Whether this came from the MDBA or an unknown person I will probably never know.

I do know that I am no longer getting answers from them .

To the committee, can you see why I find bureaucratic publications like the four volumes of the MDBA are so dangerous?

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 are and the implications of plan then five towns will go.

Brian Mills