



# Review of Water Supply-Demand Options for South East Queensland

*Final Report*

*Prepared by*

**Andrea Turner (ISF, UTS)  
Greg Hausler (Cardno)  
Naomi Carrard (ISF, UTS)  
Alex Kazaglis (ISF, UTS)  
Stuart White (ISF, UTS)  
Aneurin Hughes (Cardno)  
Trevor Johnson (Cardno)**

*for*

**Mary River Council of Mayors**

*Institute for Sustainable Futures  
University of Technology, Sydney  
PO Box 123  
Broadway, NSW, 2007*

*Cardno  
PO Box 388  
Toowong, Qld, 4066*

© UTS February 2007

Document status and history:

No.	Description	Date
1.0	Draft report	09 January 2007
2.0	Draft report	31 January 2007
3.0	Draft report	5 February 2007
4.0	Final report	14 February 2007

Cite this report as:

Turner, A., Hausler, G., Carrard, N., Kazaglis, A., White, S., Hughes, A. and Johnson, T. (2007) *Review of Water Supply-Demand Options for South East Queensland*, Institute for Sustainable Futures, Sydney and Cardno, Brisbane, February.

Disclaimer:

While all due care and attention has been taken to establish the accuracy of the material published, UTS/ISF and Cardno and the authors disclaim liability for any loss that may arise from any person acting in reliance upon the contents of this document.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

This independent Review aims to assess the Queensland Government's proposed strategy for meeting the long-term water supply-demand balance for South East Queensland, of which the Traveston Crossing scheme is a major and controversial component. The Review, conducted by a team from the Institute for Sustainable Futures at the University of Technology, Sydney and Cardno, concludes that a diverse portfolio of options can ensure supply security for South East Queensland (SEQ) well into the future, certainly to 2050. Such options include: increasing water supply availability (supply-side options); decreasing the demand for water (demand-side options); and meeting water supply needs during deep droughts (drought response options).

A number of the elements of such a portfolio are already being implemented as part of the current Queensland Government strategy. With the extension and addition of low unit cost demand-side options and supply-side drought response 'readiness' options, a clear conclusion of this Study is that the proposed dam at Traveston Crossing on the Mary River is neither necessary nor desirable as a part of the portfolio for ensuring supply security to 2050. The increase in supply from this proposed dam will not assist in the short-term during the current severe drought in which water (from savings and supply) is needed over the next two to three years. Planned completion of the Traveston Crossing Dam Stage 1 is in 2012. Additional time will be needed for the Dam to fill, which could take an additional two years, resulting in the yield from this source only potentially being available in 2014. Neither is the Traveston Crossing scheme needed for supply-demand balance in the longer term with the suite of other more appropriate drought response measures being implemented by the Queensland Government and strategy being proposed as part of this Study. The proposed dam at Traveston Crossing on the Mary River represents a high total cost, high unit cost, high risk and high environmental and social impact option. Hence using key decision-making criteria the Traveston Crossing scheme should not be considered for implementation and human and financial resources currently allocated to this project should be re-allocated to dealing with the response to the current drought.

The objective of urban water planning is to ensure that supply availability (system yield) meets the demand for the planning period at the least economic, environmental and social cost. In the current planning for the SEQ system, estimates of system yield for SEQ have been significantly reduced from 635 GL/a to 450 GL/a. This is primarily as a result of recent changes in the way system yield is calculated and the assumptions regarding the level of restrictions (frequency, depth, duration) that are deemed acceptable by the community. The assumptions now being used are very conservative, and differ significantly from standards that apply in comparable cities. In addition there is no clear evidence that these changes have been based on any surveys or community engagement processes to determine what is deemed acceptable to the community.

The projections of business-as-usual (or reference case) water demand assume a residential demand (not including non residential and non revenue water) of 300 litres per capita per day for a period extending to 2050. Climate, lot size and the proportion of single detached households compared to flats and units and the associated number of occupants play a major role in how much water is used per person and per household. The figure of 300 litres per capita per day being used for projections is significantly higher than the demand in comparable eastern seaboard capital cities. This projection being used to forecast to 2050 is therefore likely to be a significant overestimate, as it does not adequately take into consideration expected downward pressure on water demand due to changes in land use (urban consolidation and the shift to more flats and units with the associated reduction in lawn and garden area) and the improving efficiency of water using equipment such as dual flush toilets and washing machines.

The Queensland Government estimate of the supply-demand gap is considered to be extreme and unjustified. The combination of these projections of reduced yield and elevated demand has implications for the supply-demand balance in 2050 of several hundred billion litres per year (GL/a). This difference in the supply-demand balance estimate is significantly greater than the yield of the proposed dam at Traveston Crossing on the Mary River. Nonetheless, for the analysis in this Study,

we have used the yield and demand projections as stated in SEQ planning documents to enable direct comparison with publicly available Queensland Government data.

The suite of supply and demand-side options currently being implemented by the Queensland Government to address the current drought, not including a dam at Traveston Crossing on the Mary River will mean that the long-term supply-demand balance will be met until around 2030, even using these extreme projections of yield and demand. These options range from groundwater, source renewal, desalination and demand management to reuse.

To meet the supply-demand balance beyond 2030, a diverse range of additional supply and demand-side options have been assessed, in order to develop a robust strategy. The package of options with the lowest economic, environmental and social cost, which is sufficient to meet the assumed supply-demand balance to 2050, comprises a diverse suite of extended and new demand management options. The most effective option, based on current experience in many places around Australia, including Pimpama Coomera on the Gold Coast, focus on improving the efficiency of water use and increasing recycling and rainwater capture in new developments. New developments are driving the increase in demand, so a strategy which directs attention towards this growth sector, is likely to be most effective at curbing the upward pressure on demand. Other options include water efficiency standards for water using appliances and fixtures, extending the existing rebate, retrofit and business water saving programs and outdoor water efficiency programs.

With the implementation of these demand-side options, in addition to the existing suite of supply-side and demand-side options proposed by the Queensland Government, there will be no need for a dam at Traveston Crossing on the Mary River, or other additional supply infrastructure, in order to meet the supply-demand balance over the period to 2050. Depending on how such demand-side options are implemented this suite of options has the potential to save over 180 GL/a of water by 2050 at an average unit cost of \$1.15 /kL. For comparison, the Traveston Crossing scheme will supply approximately 150 GL/a by 2050 at a unit cost of approximately \$3.00 /kL, which is likely to increase further as the cost estimates for this scheme are refined. Further, the proposed strategy will reduce greenhouse gas emissions relative to the Traveston Crossing scheme by approximately 1,000,000 tonnes per year.

In the event of a deep drought worse than the current drought (which is itself the worst on record for the Wivenhoe-Somerset system) or a worsening of the current drought, 'readiness' options, which are non rainfall dependent, offer a much lower risk and lower unit cost alternative to the Traveston Crossing scheme. The idea of readiness options is that the planning, design, land acquisition and approvals are all obtained. However, the construction is triggered only in the event of a deep and prolonged drought, thus offering effective insurance against a low probability event and the ability to adaptively respond to changed circumstances. The risk-weighted cost of such a strategy is a fraction of the cost of pre-emptively building new supply options, especially such a high cost, high-risk alternative as the proposed dam at Traveston Crossing on the Mary River. Suitable candidates for such a readiness strategy include indirect potable reuse in a range of locations, followed by scaleable desalination capacity at Bribie Island. Indirect potable reuse is preferable in terms of the greenhouse gas emission intensity and other environmental benefits, but is dependent on suitable community engagement processes. Indirect potable reuse was to be the subject of a plebiscite in March 2007. However, the plebiscite was cancelled as this report was being finalised and indirect potable reuse will now be used to assist in the current drought strategy as part of the Western Corridor Recycled Water Scheme.

This Study outlines a robust strategy for meeting the supply-demand balance within the planning horizon of 2050, without needing to construct a dam at Traveston Crossing on the Mary River. This is a strategy that has significantly lower costs, reduced greenhouse gas emissions and reduced environmental and social impact. It also offers an adaptive approach to changing circumstances in terms of yield and demand. This Study also makes a series of recommendations to improve the transparency and level of community engagement in water planning in SEQ.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background .....	1
1.2	This Study .....	1
1.3	Approach.....	2
1.4	Report Structure.....	3
<b>2</b>	<b>THE STUDY AREA.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Boundary of analysis .....	4
2.2	SEQ demographics .....	5
2.2.1	Current and projected population.....	5
2.2.2	Current and projected water demand.....	8
2.3	SEQ water supplies .....	12
2.3.1	Urban Surface Water Supply Systems.....	15
2.3.2	Urban Groundwater Supply Systems.....	15
2.3.3	Irrigation and Surface Water Supply Sources .....	16
2.3.4	Strategic Reserve – Water Resource Plan .....	16
2.4	Levels of Service.....	18
2.5	The current supply-demand balance.....	20
<b>3</b>	<b>SEQ PROPOSED SUPPLY-DEMAND STRATEGY.....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1	SEQ water management: drought response and long-term planning .....	21
3.2	Demand side initiatives .....	22
3.3	Supply side initiatives.....	26
3.4	Gaps and opportunities in current planning.....	34
<b>4</b>	<b>STUDY TEAM PROPOSED STRATEGY .....</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1	Overview of approach.....	36
4.2	Economic analysis.....	36
4.3	Demand-side options .....	37
4.4	Supply-side options.....	42
4.4.1	Groundwater Sources.....	44
4.4.2	Surface Water Sources.....	45
4.4.3	Desalination.....	46
4.4.4	Recycled Water (Indirect Potable Reuse).....	47
4.4.5	Recommissioning of Existing Inactive Water Sources .....	50
4.4.6	Acquisition of Rural Water Allocation.....	51

4.4.7	Transfer of water from Northern New South Wales rivers .....	52
4.4.8	Benefits of Interconnection of Sources .....	53
4.4.9	Supply-side Readiness Options.....	55
4.4.10	Summary of costs and yields.....	56
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Options Comparison .....</b>	<b>58</b>
4.5.1	Quantifiable indicators .....	58
4.5.2	Greenhouse Gas Impacts .....	61
4.5.3	Other externalities and impacts.....	63
4.5.4	Community engagement.....	66
<b>4.6</b>	<b>The Strategy .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>75</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 2-1	STUDY AREA .....	4
FIGURE 2-2	VARIATION IN POPULATION PROJECTIONS .....	6
FIGURE 2-3	POPULATION GROWTH AREAS.....	7
FIGURE 2-4	A SNAPSHOT OF EXISTING WATER DEMAND BY LGA AND SECTOR .....	9
FIGURE 2-5	STUDY TEAM PROJECTED REFERENCE CASE DEMAND BY SECTOR .....	11
FIGURE 2-6	STUDY TEAM PROJECTED REFERENCE CASE DEMAND BY LGA (GROUPED BY GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION) .....	11
FIGURE 2-7	EXISTING WATER SUPPLY SOURCES – SEQ.....	14
FIGURE 2-8	THE SUPPLY-DEMAND BALANCE.....	20
FIGURE 3-1	SEQ DEMAND-SIDE INITIATIVES .....	25
FIGURE 3-2	SEQ PROPOSED SUPPLY-SIDE INITIATIVES .....	30
FIGURE 3-3	RELATIVE YIELD FROM SEQ PROPOSED SUPPLY-SIDE INITIATIVES COMPARED TO POPULATION GROWTH AREAS .....	31
FIGURE 3-4	THE SEQ PROPOSED SUPPLY-DEMAND BALANCE .....	32
FIGURE 3-5	SUPPLY-DEMAND BALANCE .....	34
FIGURE 4-1	SEQ AND NEW STUDY TEAM PROPOSED DEMAND-SIDE OPTIONS .....	40
FIGURE 4-2	SUPPLY CURVE OF NEW STUDY TEAM PROPOSED DEMAND-SIDE OPTIONS (2050).....	41
FIGURE 4-3	POTENTIAL WATER SUPPLY SOURCES IN SEQ .....	43
FIGURE 4-4	DIAGRAM ILLUSTRATING MULTI-BARRIER TREATMENT PROCESSES IN IPR.....	48
FIGURE 4-5	DIAGRAM OF PROPOSED SEQ WATER GRID .....	53
FIGURE 4-6	UNIT COST AND YIELD OF VARIOUS OPTIONS VERSUS THE TRAVESTON CROSSING SCHEME (2050) .....	60
FIGURE 4-7	GREENHOUSE INTENSITY OF OPTIONS.....	61
FIGURE 4-8	GREENHOUSE IMPACTS OF OPTION PORTFOLIOS.....	62
FIGURE 4-9	THE ROLE OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN WATER SUPPLY-DEMAND PLANNING (FROM WHITE ET AL. 2006B). .....	67

## LIST OF TABLES

---

TABLE 2-1 PIFU 2006 POPULATION PROJECTIONS BY LGA (MEDIUM SERIES) .....	5
TABLE 2-2 POPULATION PROJECTIONS.....	6
TABLE 2-3 EXISTING URBAN WATER SUPPLY STORAGES IN SEQ .....	13
TABLE 2-4 ALLOCATIONS FOR THREE SUNWATER WATER SUPPLY SCHEMES.....	16
TABLE 2-5 COMMITMENT OF STRATEGIC RESERVE .....	17
TABLE 3-1 TARGETS FOR RESIDENTIAL WATER DEMAND IN SEQ .....	22
TABLE 3-2 SEQ DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS AND ANTICIPATED WATER SAVINGS.....	24
TABLE 3-3 SEQ PROPOSED SUPPLY-SIDE INITIATIVES.....	28
TABLE 4-1 EFFICIENCY LEVELS IN THE RESIDENTIAL SECTOR .....	37
TABLE 4-2 STUDY TEAM PROPOSED NEW DEMAND-SIDE OPTIONS .....	38
TABLE 4-3 SUMMARY OF COSTS AND SAVINGS OF NEW STUDY TEAM PROPOSED DEMAND-SIDE OPTIONS.....	41
TABLE 4-4 STUDY TEAM NEW SUPPLY-SIDE OPTIONS.....	42
TABLE 4-5 ESTIMATED SET-UP COSTS FOR BRIBIE ISLAND DESALINATION CAPACITY .....	56
TABLE 4-6 SUMMARY OF COSTS AND YIELD OF STUDY TEAM NEW PROPOSED SUPPLY-SIDE “READINESS” OPTIONS.....	56
TABLE 4-7 SUMMARY OF COSTS AND YIELDS OF STUDY TEAM NEW GROWTH SUPPLY-SIDE OPTIONS.....	57
TABLE 4-8 SUMMARY OF COSTS AND YIELDS OF VARIOUS STAGES OF THE TRAVESTON CROSSING SCHEME	57
TABLE 4-9 SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIABLE CRITERIA CONSIDERED.....	59
TABLE 4-10 BRIEF SUMMARY OF NON QUANTIFIABLE EXTERNALITIES .....	64

## APPENDICES

---

APPENDIX A SEQ PROPOSED OPTIONS – FACT SHEETS

APPENDIX B NEW STUDY PROPOSED OPTIONS – FACT SHEETS

APPENDIX C CALCULATION OF UNIT COST