

**Ben Fawcett**

**Mullumbimby Water Supply Strategy Mon 5/09/2022 3:22 PM**

Following review of the Hydrosphere report 'Mullumbimby Water Supply Strategy, Dec 2021' the following three items must be discussed at the upcoming WSAC Workshop on this subject:

- The report was completed before the new Rous County Council came into being following the December 2021 elections, and therefore does not make any reference to a possible Dunoon Dam being included in the RCC Future Water Project 2060. This change in RCC's future strategy is very significant, in terms of environmental and social impacts, and is likely to change community acceptance of any recommended strategy for Mullumbimby's future water supply. The recommended strategy, S3, only considers the various impacts of the current RCC sources, Rocky Creek Dam and the Wilsons River, plus Tyagarah groundwater.
- The cost of Scenario S3, Permanent connection to RCC regional supply, recommended in the report, is highly dependent on the cost of water from RCC, spread over the 25 years to 2050. A relatively small percentage change in this cost, over 25 years, could easily make the NPV of Scenario 3 close to that of Scenario 4 Groundwater, if not more expensive.
- The TBL Assessment weighting and scores are highly contestable and could easily be adjusted to modify the result of that assessment, changing the recommended outcome.

In addition, I should like clarification of the following questions:

- I note that Figure 46 shows modelling by Hydrosphere, based on 130 years of data, which indicates that the inflow to the Laverty's Gap weir has, during that period, equalled or exceeded the projected raw water demand for Mullumbimby in 2050 (approximately 2 ML/d) on at least 96-97% of days in the data period. Whilst this modelling is not part of the calculations for a secure yield from the weir, how do these two calculations interact? A discussion would be useful.
- Section 10.1.1 states that the *Water Sharing Plan for the Richmond River Unregulated, Regulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2010* was to be reviewed by June 2021. Has this happened and if so, what is the outcome in relation to future abstraction from the Wilsons Creek at Laverty's Gap?
- Figure 70 for Scenario S4, supplementary groundwater, shows a 'Groundwater WTP' between the bores and the new municipal WTP. Why is an extra WTP needed for the groundwater and what would this comprise and cost?

In summary, I believe that a water supply from Laverty's Gap weir should be maintained for the foreseeable future, with a new abstraction pipeline, treated at a new WTP, and supplemented by groundwater wherever that can be found, with supply from RCC to all parts

of Mullumbimby in emergencies. While offstream storage would be desirable, the projected cost of this option appears to rule it out.

Regards,

Ben.