

Question No: 39

Question: Alice Springs Dam

Date: 13/08/91

Member: Mr BELL

To: MINISTER for TRANSPORT and WORKS

1. What contracts has the government entered into in respect of the construction of Alice Springs dam.
2. What variations in those contracts have been required by the stop-start approach to registration of sacred sites in the vicinity of the dam.
3. What further consideration has been given to sites for a dam in the vicinity of Jay Creek and in the vicinity of Emily Gap.

ANSWER

1. A list of all contracts let on the dam project is attached.
Total value of these contracts is \$1 285 238.50.
Expenditure to date is \$919 272.17 which includes \$211 686.06 in administration expenses.
2. Of the twenty-four (24) contracts let, eleven (11) have been suspended or deferred as a result of the federal minister's suspension of work order, and the subsequent withdrawal of the Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority (AAPA) certificate.

One of the suspended contracts has attracted a direct penalty of \$3436. Of the remaining uncompleted contracts, it is likely that further penalties will be imposed in association with re-establishment costs. The amount of these penalties will not be known until work recommences.

In addition, the delay, redesign and further submission to the AAPA has cost \$98 000 to date.
3. The Jay Creek and Emily Gap site have no bearing in terms of flood mitigation for the township of Alice Springs. The rivers concerned have no impact on the Todd River through Alice Springs.

The present proposal is for a flood mitigation dam, whereas this question appears to be directed towards a recreational facility.

There is no potential for any type of dam construction at Emily Gap. However, Emily River has been investigated, as a possible site for a recreational lake, north of Undoolya Road. This proposal has passed initial planning approval and feasibility criteria and is being routinely monitored.

Various sites on Jay Creek were also identified as possible recreational dam/lake sites. However, none met the required planning/feasibility criteria and so no further action is proposed.

To view the table on this page please refer to the printed Parliamentary Record, page 383.

To view the table on this page please refer to the printed Parliamentary Record, page 384.