

Response ID ANON-XVYX-N2BV-Q

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

Submitted on **2016-01-29 10:27:55**

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:

Coal Seam gas mining is a terribly risky enterprise and has proven itself to be dangerous, sloppy and destructive.

We shouldn't need to remind anyone that the Great Artesian Basin supplies nearly all of Australia their water and SANTOS are already contaminating it.

There's the results, right there.

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

Uncertain

Please tell us why:

Yes and NO.

I feel that this is positive that the legislation is being addressed, but the fact that it even has to be questioned shows that the gravity of the environmental and social impacts of CSG mining are NOT being taken into account. It shows big business is far more important to our government than the wellbeing of the people and the land.

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

Uncertain

Please tell us why:

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'm not certain. I'm just certain that I must do whatever I can to have my opinion heard that CSG mining is dangerous and ANYTHING we can do to further protect our grandchildren water sources MUST be implemented.

Please.

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:

Potentially, I think that the fact that we are even having to address this, that we are even having to wonder whether protecting water resources needs more attention shows gaps in consciousness, gaps in wisdom and future planning and foresight.

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.

Yes

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

Always was to improve clarity of legislation. This area is not my forté so I cannot comment further yet to say that there are always ways we can further our clarity, in all areas of legislation, communication and care.

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:

Improvements would be to remove any person who is working for the government that is being paid by the oil industry. Improvements would be to closely assess the integrity of the people making huge decisions on behalf of millions of us.

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

Uncertain

Please tell us why:

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?

Uncertain

Please tell us why:

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?

Yes

Please tell us why:

I think we are all just relieved that there is some legislation that carries some wisdom around protecting our MOST important resource.

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

Uncertain

Tell us why:

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

No

Tell us why:

I cannot imagine that spending money on armed forces should be more important than spending money on protecting our water. No water, no people.

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?

Uncertain

Please tell us more:

Reducing regulation or simplifying must NOT come at the cost of protecting the waters. All T's must be crossed and I's dotted. We CANNOT mess around with this!

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?

Uncertain

Please tell us why:

Personal information

20 What is your name?

First name:

Christina

Last name:

Charley

21 I wish to make this submission anonymously

Not Answered

22 Contact details

Email address:

[REDACTED]

Mailing address:

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

23 What is your organisation (if applicable)?

Organisation:

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

I am a resident of a community where coal seam gas/large coal projects are imminent or current., I am a resident of a community not affected but I am interested in giving my views on the matter., 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?

Community organisation or peak body, Word of mouth

If other, how?:

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

rank - Department of the Environment website:

Neutral

rank - Issues Paper:

Neutral

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:

Rate sources of information - Government:

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