From: Max Winders < > Sent: Monday, 25 November 2024 9:00 AM

To: Law Reform Commission < LawReform.Commission@justice.qld.gov.au > Cc: Max Winders < > Subject: Review of mining lease objections process: Dalby Information Session

## Dear Dr Phillips,

I would like to thank Chair Fleur Kingham and yourself for explaining the work of the QLRC with regard to the review of Queensland's mining lease objection processes as far as they relate to coal seam gas extraction at Dalby on November 20.

As an experienced consulting engineer and managing director of environmental engineering consultancy MWA Environmental, I am familiar with the extent to which the Land Court and the Planning and Environment Court take expert witness evidence into account.

I am also aware of the time taken and of the costs incurred by the respective parties - not only of the experts' advices but those of the solicitors and barristers and the courts.

I am now understanding how the QLRC could assist landholders in the future by reforming the relevant government decision making processes with regard particularly to the development of appropriately conditioned environmental authorities enforceable by regulators.

I am the managing director of Wambo Cattle Company Pty Ltd which owns and operates a significant cattle feedlot at the distribution of the attached aerial photomap near the gas-fired power stations at Braemar and whose groundwater resources are subject to the impacts of extraction of groundwater from gas wells in QGC's Pl273, Arrow Energy's PL230 and Arrow/Cleanco's PL194.

I have attached a photograph of my company's production testing of a new bore into the Huttons Sandstones in PL273.

This comprehensive testing was undertaken with a view to establishing the actual extent of depressurisation of the Hutton Sandstones aquifer in this locality which could be attributed to CSG extraction and the extent to which this bore's planned use would be impaired by the release of free gas due to the poorly managed construction of gas wells and the effect upon the potential loss of yield of water bores in gas fields such as PL273 and others.

Without going into the particulars, I believe that I can provide information to the Commission relevant to the processes available to landholders in preparing objections to applications to extend the scope and duration of petroleum gas tenures which involve consideration of the *P* & *G* Act 2004, Chapter 3 of the Water Act 2000 and the Environmental Protection Act 1994.

You might note that the 2017 decision by your Chair, Ms Fleur Kingham, with regard to *Nothdurft and Anor v QGC Pty Limited & Ors* refers to issues which are likely relevant to those which many landholders face in the Surat East section of the GAB which is subject to further

expansion and continuation of the gas industry.

Unfortunately, the current regulatory processes rely unreasonably upon the activities and reporting of the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment in measuring and predicting impacts upon water bores and of the subsidence of Good Quality Agricultural Land.

It is suggested that your Commission should examine the regulatory processes associated with the groundwater impact modelling and reporting by the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment and its management by the Energy and Extractive Section of the former Department of Environment and Science and its successor.

I would be pleased to meet with you and others of the QLRC to discuss the above and how the Commission might be able to suggest changes to the processes used to develop and manage environmental authorities for petroleum gas tenures and to review the role of the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment in managing impacts upon aquifers and upon the subsidence of Good Quality Agricultural Land.

Regards

Max Winders



