

## Response ID ANON-XVYX-N2C2-M

Submitted to **Independent review of the 'water trigger' legislation**

Submitted on **2015-12-01 14:58:47**

### Upload submission

#### 1 Upload your pre-prepared submission here

**Upload your pre-prepared submission here:**

No file was uploaded

#### 2 Would you like to submit your uploaded file now or continue to the questionnaire?

No, I would like to continue to complete the questionnaire

### TOR 1: Examine the appropriateness of the regulation including whether it is necessary and well targeted

#### 3 Is there a significant likelihood of a substantial negative environmental impact from coal seam gas and large coal mining development on water resources in the absence of the water trigger legislation?

Yes

**Please tell us why:**

Without proper oversight or regulation companies may potentially be causing irreparable damage to the environment, and this is completely unacceptable.

#### 4 Is the scope and focus of the legislation appropriate to the problem being addressed?

No

**Please tell us why:**

I believe that the legislation currently does not go far enough. If companies want to mine then they should take the responsibility to not do any harm to the environment, for the sake of this and future generations.

#### 5 Are there significant gaps in the scope or intent of the legislation?

Yes

**Please tell us why:**

As previously stated, I believe that the legislation should go further than it currently does.

#### 6 Please upload additional information relating to TOR 1 if you wish

**File upload:**

No file was uploaded

### TOR 2: Effectiveness of the regulation in protecting water resources from the impacts of coal seam gas and large coal mining projects, including the role and scope of work given to the IESC

#### 7 In your opinion has the water trigger legislation been effective in protecting water resources potentially and actually affected by relevant developments?

Uncertain

**Please tell us why::**

I am sure that it has helped but I have heard reports that some miners have done environmental damage in mining pursuits, so once again I believe that the legislation has not gone far enough to protect the environment.

#### 8 Please upload additional information relating to TOR 2 if you wish

**File upload:**

No file was uploaded

### TOR 3: Identify any opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the regulation

#### 9 Are there gaps in the scope of the legislation that reduce its effectiveness in protecting water resource from relevant developments?

Yes

**Please tell us why:**

I am sure that there are gaps in the legislation, as time goes by there are always gaps, but I am unsure as to what to do about them.

**10 Are there opportunities to improve the clarity of the legislation? This could include responses concerning the definitions of actions which are covered by the legislation, and whether the approval conditions on those developments provide benefit in protecting water resources.**

No

**Please tell us what type/s of opportunities may improve the clarity of the legislation:**

I feel that the clarity of the legislation is appropriate.

**11 Are there improvements that could be made to the way in which advice is sought by the Australian Government from the Independent Expert Scientific Committee on Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mining Development (IESC) that could increase the efficiency of processes required as part of the water trigger?**

Yes

**Please tell us why:**

I am sure that there improvements that can be made but I am unsure as to what they should be.

**12 Were stakeholders appropriately involved in the implementation of the water trigger legislation?**

Yes

**Please tell us why:**

I feel that the stakeholders were appropriately involved.

**13 Please upload additional information relating to TOR 3 here if you wish**

**File upload:**

No file was uploaded

**TOR 4: Examine the efficiency of the regulation in protecting water resources from the impacts of coal seam gas and large coal mining projects**

**14 Have there been additional administrative compliance and delay costs arising from the water trigger that have affected business, community organisations and individuals?**

Yes

**Please tell us why:**

I am sure that there have been costs arising from the legislation but they pale in comparison to the costs to generations, both now and in the future, if companies destroy the environment.

**15 Has the water trigger been beneficial in providing environmental outcomes, community confidence in the regulatory system of applying science to decision-making and management of environmental risk?**

Uncertain

**Please tell us why:**

I am sure that the water trigger has been beneficial for the environment. But as with most government programs, it has been poorly communicated to the population and I am sure that they would appreciate the governments efforts to protect the environment.

**16 Has the water trigger delivered an overall benefit when regulatory costs are compared to the environmental and other benefits?**

Yes

**Tell us why:**

Yes, as stated before.

**17 Have there been additional administrative and other costs to governments arising from the implementation of the water trigger?**

Yes

**Tell us why:**

I am sure that there have been costs to the government but again this would pale in comparison to the environmental damage if it was not implemented.

**Upload file:**

No file was uploaded

## **TOR 5: Identify any opportunities to reduce or simplify the regulation whilst maintaining its effectiveness**

**18 Are there any opportunities to reduce or simplify the regulation whilst maintaining its effectiveness?**

Yes

**Please tell us more:**

I am sure that there would be but I do not know what that would be.

**Upload file:**

No file was uploaded

## **TOR 6: Identify any recommended appropriate future review points of the regulation**

**19 Are there particular points in time, outside the statutory schedule for the review of the EPBC Act (reviewed every 10 years from commencement) that should be considered as review points for the water trigger?**

No

**Please tell us why:**

Every ten years should be sufficient.

## **Personal information**

**20 What is your name?**

**First name:**

Kirsten

**Last name:**

Eustace

**21 I wish to make this submission anonymously**

Not Answered

**22 Contact details**

**Email address:**

[REDACTED]

**Mailing address:**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Postcode:**

[REDACTED]

**23 What is your organisation (if applicable)?**

**Organisation:**

**24 What has been your involvement with the Water Trigger legislation?**

I am a landowner not directly affected., I am interested because of my environmental concerns/I am responding on behalf of an environmental group.

**Please describe:**

**25 How did you hear about the water trigger review?**

Department of the Environment website

**If other, how?:**

**26 Rate the following sources of information regarding the water trigger review.**

**rank - Department of the Environment website:**

Useful

**rank - Issues Paper:**

Useful

**27 Which of the following sources of information do you find useful for information on coal seam gas and coal mining?**

**Rate sources of information - Media:**

Useful

**Rate sources of information - Government:**

Useful

**Rate sources of information - Scientific and research bodies such as CSIRO and universities:**

Useful

**Rate sources of information - Information from community groups and peak bodies (eg websites, newsletters):**

Useful

**Rate sources of information - Informal sources such as word of mouth:**

Useful