

Response ID ANON-XVYX-N2HJ-H

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

Submitted on **2016-01-29 15:18:58**

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:

I think this is rather obvious if you consult the majority of scientists, traditional owners (First Nations People), or anyone whose family has lived and managed the land in a particular area for multiple generations.

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

No

Please tell us why:

Scope should apply to ALL onshore unconventional gas extraction.

Only states that Environmental Minister must "take into consideration", ie. there is no binding rules.

Needs to apply to related activities such as water treatment facilities associated with CSG, coal mine borefields, and

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

Yes

Please tell us why:

Give the IESC the power to set mandatory standards for all coal and gas and related industries. Standards the Minister must abide by.

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?

No

Please tell us why::

The example of the Santos Narrabri gasfield project come to mind. A loophole is allowing activities to proceed simply because Santos are installing wells incrementally rather than all 850 at once. There are 35 wells in currently and there is already contamination found in the Great Artesian Basin, as well as salt inclusions found kilometers away as a result of pressure and concentration variations (documented by a source at Macquarie university)

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:

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:

If water table has already been contaminated, such as near Narrabri, then the project should be rejected. There should be no wriggle room for the minister here.

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?

Uncertain

Please tell us why:

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?

Yes

Please tell us why:

Concerned citizens of all walks of life have been slowing developments to the Narrabri csg project. This causes the company much money. It also allows crime rates to rise in nearby small communities when police are coerced by the company to drive out and deal with the people who are looking out for the public interest.

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:

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?

Uncertain

Tell us why:

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:

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:

jason

Last name:

mclean

21 I wish to make this submission anonymously

Not Answered

22 Contact details

Email address:

Mailing address:

Postcode:

■■■■

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.

Please describe:

25 How did you hear about the water trigger review?

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:

Neutral

Rate sources of information - Government:

Not 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:

Not useful