From: [redacted]
Sent: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: SUBMISSION - FNC Water Strategy

SUBMISSION - FNC Water Strategy

To whom this concerns,
I have been a resident of Lismore since 1988 and lived in this beautiful region since 1980.
The critical point I wish to make and which underpins the following submission is that the Far North Coast Water Strategy should not rely on Rous County Council's (RCC) Future Water
2060 project because that project relies very heavily what is a most contentious proposal, namely the construction of a dam at Dunoon. Whilst I acknowledge and applaud the work prepared by the Department of Planning Industry and Environment (DPIE) in their "Far North Coast Regional Water Strategy" and its thorough examination of the available options for managing a reliable future water supply, I argue that inclusion of the Dunoon Dam NOT be included and be removed. My reasons for this are as follows:
a) The increased vulnerability to a warming climate has resulted in significant disruption to traditional seasonal rainfall patterns meaning there are no longer any reliable rainfall predictions. Rous Future Water 2060 does not explore in any measure, system resilience
measures to address this vulnerability, despite Water Services Australia warning that new dams
are "high risk" investments and strongly recommends a mix of complementary water strategies. (WSAA, All Options on the Table,2020). It is critically essential to build resilience into a 21st century model. Internationally dams are increasingly being seen as an old technology that is threatening ecosystems and impacting the health of the planet. In the United States roughly 900 dams were removed between 1990 and 2015, with another 50 to 60 more every year. France and Canada have also completed significant removal projects, and Japan's first removal, of the Arase Dam on the Kuma River, began in 2012.
b) When the public was invited to make submissions regarding the Rous Future Water 2060
strategy, 91% of 1290 written and online submissions opposed the Dunoon dam option. Many of
these submissions were from concerned individuals (myself included) who did not use the pro forma provided by RCC. This was because many believed the pro forma inherently biased with limited opportunity to comment on the inherent failings of Rous Future Water 2060. The dam is highly controversial, and resisted by many in our community.
c) Rous Future Water 2060 is flawed because it reflects an out dated, stunted approach to water system planning. The narrow focus on Dunoon Dam has significantly limited water literacy
within our region's populace resulting in their lack of familiarity with options such as those showcased by WSAA in All Options on the Table (WSAA) and on the Cooperative Research
Centre Water Sensitive Cities website. This omission shows lack of leadership by RCC and an unwillingness to educate the community about moving forward with new and necessary
technologies.

I therefore reiterate, Dunoon Dam must not be used to underpin the Regional Strategy.

d) Going hand in hand with this lack of leadership is the RCC's failure to focus on cost effective water efficiencies. In fact RCC omitted mention of options for water efficiencies in its 2020 Integrated Water Cycle Management Development that focused on increasing water supply.

RCC undertook no specialist studies on this. So neglected has the issue of water efficiency

been that during the past 2 years there was a significant amount of time in which RCC did not employ a Demand Management officer. The position is now filled part-time, reflecting the low priority that RCC still attaches to water efficiency. All options need to be given serious attention including water efficiency, roof and stormwater harvesting (including tanks), and water sources that don't need rain such as purified recycled water and desalination.

e) It is completely unacceptable to risk the environmental and Aboriginal Heritage destruction that would undoubtedly occur with construction of the Dunoon Dam. The 2011 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment states "Aboriginal stakeholders are of the opinion that the sites should remain undisturbed and that no level of disturbance is considered acceptable to them". When

RCC promotes the dam as the 'cheapest option' it must be noted that destruction of the Juukan

Rock Shelters was also thought the 'cheapest option' by Rio Tinto, at the time. That is certainly a standard not to be emulating.

Environmental damage would never be reversed or compensated for. There are 62 ha of

Lowland Rainforest Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) on the site. Only 1% of the Big Scrub Rainforest remains. This rainforest is of global significance. The dam wall construction would destroy 92% of the Channon gorge's unique and rare warm-temperate rainforest on

sandstone. Further, the proposed dam would push 9 threatened flora species (2013 Terrestrial Ecology Impact Assessment Report) and 17 threatened fauna species to very possible

extinction. Our koalas are included in this group of 17 species. They were already under extinction pressure even before 70% of them were killed in the North Coast fire grounds in last years summer fires. https:// www.wwf.org.au/news/news/2020/new-wwf-report-koalas-suffer- decline-across-fire-grounds

I urge you to take serious consideration of the issues raised in this submission and decide to remove Rous Future Water 2060 from a revised Far North Coast Water Strategy.

Respectfully yours,