

## Response ID ANON-XVYX-N2FJ-F

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

Submitted on **2016-01-31 14:34:35**

### 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?

Not Answered

Please tell us why:

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

Not Answered

Please tell us why:

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

Not Answered

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?

No

Please tell us why::

In the case of Shenhua on the Liverpool Plains, all water studies were based on the theory that aquifers impacted were contained and not connected to each other. Prof Merrick has recently released a report to show that in this area, and in fact, as the National Water Commission has stated, that all aquifers are connected.

#### 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?

Not Answered

Please tell us why:

See previous answers

**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.**

Not Answered

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

As I have mentioned before. My apologies but the internet service here is intermittent and I am trying to keep this submission factual, short and to the point.

**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:**

Funding is required by those groups seeking independent advice. A mining company has far more resources than eg a group of farmers and stakeholders.

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

No

**Please tell us why:**

See previous answers

**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?**

Not Answered

**Please tell us why:**

One of concerns in our region is the impacts on aquifers of large projects such as Santos, Shenhua and BHP,. The impacts are not known. These assessments must be of the highest integrity because a whole farming region will be impacted. For the farmers, we have spent thousands of dollars trying to get impartial and accurate assessments of the impacts.

**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?**

No

**Please tell us why:**

It has not been beneficial in this area because of the large gaps of knowledge which the proponents have dismissed.

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

Uncertain

**Tell us why:**

Farmers are all about long term sustainability. Miners simply help themselves. Rehabilitation looks that it may be not enforceable by govt agencies. Rehabilitation is yet to be proven to be done successfully. Miners should be made to proceed with all caution because of the short term nature of their industry. Farmers make huge investment in their farming enterprises.

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

Uncertain

**Tell us why:**

If there has been, so be it. Operating a mine in prime agricultural country and in the largest catchment area of the Murray Darling Basin needs to be done with the most care and must create confidence in stakeholders.

**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?**

No

#### **Please tell us more:**

It needs to be more thorough. In high risk areas such as the Liverpool Plains, the utmost caution and care must be practised.

#### **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?**

Yes

#### **Please tell us why:**

Should these projects proceed, they must be assessed at regular intervals and there must be the ability to halt a project - for rehabilitation and stop it completely if the impacts are too great.

## **Personal information**

### **20 What is your name?**

#### **First name:**

Rosemary

#### **Last name:**

Nankivell

### **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:**

SOS Liverpool Plains

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

I am a landowner potentially affected by coal seam gas/large coal exploration or extraction., 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?**

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:**

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:**

Neutral

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

Neutral

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

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