

[REDACTED]

From: Inquiry into Unconventional Gas POV eSubmission Form
<cso@parliament.vic.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 10 July 2015 10:32 PM
To: EPC
Subject: New Submission to Inquiry into Unconventional Gas in Victoria.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Inquiry Name: Inquiry into Unconventional Gas in Victoria.

Mr David Charleson
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SUBMISSION CONTENT:

--

Dear Committee members,

I am a concerned parent, Victorian, and grew up as a farming community member. My extended family are farmers or work in directly related industries serving farming. I also work for one of the major corporations set to benefit most from the expansion of onshore gas exploration, and have first hand insight into the industry.

I am concerned at the potential substantial impact to the environment that unconventional gas threatens. I do not believe the potential gains justify the risks, and do not support exploration, gas mining (including coal seam gas, tight gas, shale gas & underground coal gasification).

My family live in a community that has conducted a survey. We, and the community, have removed the social licence for this industry to operate in our area and that we will never support it, no matter the potential regulations put in place.

Self regulation or even government regulation are not a sufficient protection, and the outcomes of any incident are drastic and long lasting.

The existing moratorium must be maintained as a minimum, however I recommend that Victoria ban all unconventional gas drilling permanently.

The single-shot benefit to one industry sector cannot come at the risk or expense of the long term future of agriculture, tourism and numerous other areas.

In relation to the Terms of Reference:

1. the prospectivity of Victoria's geology for commercial sources of onshore unconventional gas;
This generation does not have the mandate to risk the future water supply or agricultural productivity of numerous generations to follow.

Also at risk are community health, food security and jobs in other sectors such as agriculture & tourism for

little or no financial gain.

2. the environmental, land productivity and public health risks, risk mitigations and residual risks of onshore unconventional gas activities;

Experience in the US, Queensland and NSW have demonstrated risks cannot be adequately controlled nor addressed. Heavy metals and dangerous chemicals have been released to water supplies in all these areas.

3. the coexistence of onshore unconventional gas activities with existing land and water uses, including. Agriculture is worth a substantial amount to the Victorian and national economy. This benefit is ongoing. The benefit of gas extraction are a once-off benefit, and do not justify a risk to our agricultural and associated industries.

Even if water supplies are not impacted, the infrastructure required for gas wells (all weather access roads, cleared well pads, compression stations, evaporation dams) would make the day to day running of many farms unviable.

Victoria is a more densely populated region than Qld and even areas in NSW. As such the impacts of disruption by mining infrastructure will be further exaggerated.

My family's business rely on the dairy industry in Gippsland, as they are contractors servicing the farming infrastructure of dairy equipment, principally building rotary dairy sheds for medium to large farms.

Any disruption to the dairy industry would have catastrophic consequences to this business, and its employees and local suppliers.

The experience in other regions of Australia has demonstrated an unfair and unAustralian impact to the legal rights of property owners and the impact on property values.

The economic potential of onshore unconventional gas resources is questionable, given the substantial subsidies and concessions given to the mining sector.

Unconventional Gas is a fossil fuel. By definition, unconventional gases are harder to extract than conventional gas, which is why they have not been pursued to date.

Alternative affordable energy sources exist for domestic consumers and industry. Also, the gas is not planned to be utilised locally. As such the business case is reliant on competing with gas transported and exported through ports in QLD and competing with international energy prices in coming years.

Problems also exist with the CO₂ and fugitive emissions from UCG comparing these to renewable energy sources, as well as the potential health impacts to those living locally.

Substantial resource knowledge requirements and policy and regulatory safeguards that would be necessary to enable exploration and development of onshore unconventional gas resources.

Even with this in place we have seen time and time again both locally and internationally the failure of these controls to fully address and contain the associated risks and threats.

From the perspective of an employee working within a company that is involved in the industry, I do not believe that any level of mandated controls and regulation are sufficient to protect from environmental impacts if UCG is pursued. The consequences of these risks are catastrophic.

The industry has had a long time to prove that their practices are safe and yet have been unable to do so. The secrecy regarding the chemicals used in the process dictate that those communities potentially impacted are now able to properly asses the situation they are placed in.

UCG should not be is pursued. The potential impacts to a great many Victorians far outweigh the benefits to a few.

--

File1:

File2: