

**Submission
No 169**

INQUIRY INTO COAL SEAM GAS

Name: Mr Adrian Ingleby

Date received: 2/09/2011

GPSC5 GPSC5 - Submission

From: "Adrian Ingleby"
To: <Gpscno5@parliament.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 02/09/2011 1:30 PM
Subject: Submission
Attachments: CSG article.pdf

From: Adrian Ingleby

An article in the Daily Telegraph (see attachment) Friday, 19.08.2011, quotes Energy Minister Chris Hartcher as saying to "Coal Seam Gas protesters"; "Offer, "scientific" proof or make way for exploration and mining on Crown land across the state."

I submit the following view to your inquiry:

+ All State Governments have a 'conflict of interest' in that A. they reap the monies from mining the gas and have a strong interest to support it, no matter what, so as to help their budgets, B. CSG is happening on the east coast and will no doubt be national in the not too distant future. Therefore the mining of CSG should be made the responsibility of the Federal Government under Federal Legislation so that every State's rights can be looked after in the SAME WAY and at the SAME TIME. This is a National problem and should be dealt with nationally.

+ It is the responsibility of STATE and FEDERAL governments to protect our state and national environments. IT IS NOT, as Mr Hartcher is alleged to have said, (the people's or), PROTESTERS RESPONSIBILITY "TO OFFER SCIENTIFIC PROOF"

It is governments (State & Federal) first responsibility to look after the Australian land and its people NOW AND FOR THE FUTURE. At great financial expense we send people to war, some of whom die and many more who are seriously wounded to protect this country. Mr Hartcher and other State and Federal Politicians are well paid and well looked after with pensions other benefits to TAKE ON SUCH RESPONSIBILITIES. So don't try to put the RESPONSIBILITY of "scientific proof" onto people who are genuinely concerned and are raising those concerns. It is clear that Mr Hartcher and the new Liberal Premier are keen on the idea of receiving a 'new revenue source' to get this State moving again. But at what potential adverse cost to the environment now and for future generations.

+ What RISK ASSESSMENTS were done in regard to possible/probable ADVERSE AFFECTS of CSG before the CSG Licences were issued?

+ Who prepared the RISK ASSESSMENTS and what are their qualifications? Were they independent?

+ A RISK ASSESSMENT prepared by an APPLICANT for a CSG Licence IS NOT INDEPENDENT.

+ The documentary "Gasland" in regard to the American experience should be a good warning. Has an 'independent review' of the American experience been conducted in America and if so do we have a copy. Has the NSW State Government or Federal Government done a review of the American experience. If not, then we should pay to have an independent professional scientific review of the Gasland experience AND LEARN FROM IT. Dick Cheney changed the law (one

paragraph) to allow CSG mining, all for the love of the AMERICAN DOLLAR; but at what devastating cost to the American environment now and into the future. The Americans also reduced the staff of their Environmental Protection agency staff. Was this done so that no one could RAISE THE ALARM, and therefore stop the money rolling in.

- + Is CSG clean, greenhouse reducing energy? Not if methane is leaking into the atmosphere! Something else for the experts to look at.
- + A team of Australian and World Scientific experts are needed to examine the risks. Any present leases should be stopped before their finding is released. No further licences should be issued until such expert finding are released.
- + I suggest the RISK is high. Why? You drill down 200 metres to 1000 metres, then horizontally across coal seams. You pump water and sand and chemicals in etc., then pump the gas out. If any of the material finds its way into aquifers, the water table or rivers how do you FIX THE PROBLEM AFTER IT OCCURS. I don't think you can. Water and liquids move where ever they can move continuously (for all time ie long after mining has ceased) through cracks in the subsurface picking up contaminants (as it did to form our aquifers) and it will travel along these MAN MADE drilling holes that are used for CSG for ever.
- + Our water supplies and our limited Agricultural land are our FUTURE. Planet earth is over populated and in the next 20 to 50 years; billions of people will be dying from starvation due to the world's inability to grow enough food to feed it's people's. That's when agricultural food/land will be far more valuable than Coal Seam Gas or gold for that matter. So don't stuff the LAND up up now for the short term gain of dollars for the bottom line of our State budget.
- + Do the CSG operators, have INSURANCE? to cover if a "catastrophic" adverse event occurs. Do the CSG operators have to pay into a "Trust Account" so that there is money available in the event of a 'catastrophic event" that has to be fixed, that is if it is at all possible to fix the problem of contamination of our land and water. Who pays for 'repatriation" if they go broke and declare themselves bankrupt or if they paid all their share holders dividends but there's no money left in the bank. I'll take a guess, they close down; then open up a new company under a different name and start again. ALL THEY CARE ABOUT IS MAKING A PROFIT, AS LARGE AS POSSIBLE AND WHEN THERE'S NO CSG LEFT, THEY WILL LOOK TOWARDS THE NEXT MONEY MAKING VENTURE. YOU SEE IT'S THE GOVERNMENT WE RELY ON TO PROTECT OUR ENVIRONMENT. Tell that to Mr Hartcher.
- + How long do the CSG site's last for. What happens when they close because they have taken all the gas available, and they're no longer making money. What happens to the pipes and infrastructure above and below the ground. Can the surrounding land that has been damaged during the life of the mining, be repatriated. Will a company that no longer operates there want to spend money trying to fix the flora and land. If they do want to repatriate the large land area; will they have any money, or desire to spend money on a mining operation that has closed and is not making money for them.
- + The legislation written and in place for Coal Mining is not SPECIFIC to the potential long term inherent environmental problems associated with this new and untested Coal Seam Gas mining and it requires it's own specific legislation.
- + I suggest that the staff working on this inquiry liaise with Queensland communities affected by CSG mining, where it is well established, to get a better view of its affect on them and any potential

long term effects. The Queensland Government will automatically give it a green environmental tick, because they're making money from it.

Regards,

Adrian Ingleby.