



KEZIA PURICK MLA
Member for **GOYDER**



29th June 2016

Ms. Naomi Hogan
Lock the Gate
Via Naomi Hogan <naomihogan@gmail.com>

Shop 4, Coolalinga Shopping Centre,
Coolalinga NT 0839
PO Box 151 Coolalinga NT 0839
Tel: 08 8999 6556
Fax: 08 8983 3488
Email: electorate.goyder@nt.gov.au

 www.facebook.com/KeziaPurickMLA

Dear Naomi,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on your questionnaire regarding the petroleum (fracking) industry.

As you may be aware, I am not a member of a political party so the views expressed here are my own and at times, reflective of the views and aspirations of my constituents. You may be aware also that my past employment was within the minerals and petroleum industry and as a consequence I have had a lot of information at my disposal from the industry. However, over the last twelve months, I have had meetings and briefings from opponents to the petroleum industry's fracking technology and found these to be very informative and useful.

In regards to the questions, I provide the following comment.

1. The new NT Government should review the Mining Advisory Committee to incorporate the petroleum industry and for there to be people appointed who have expertise and knowledge in the petroleum industry, academics, researchers, community representatives and non-government organisations as relevant. The revamped advisory committee should report directly to the minister. Meetings should be open and papers, agenda, reports be available via the government web sites unless there is commercial in confidence considerations. Changes to legislation may be needed. Alternatively, a separate advisory committee could be established that solely focused on the petroleum industry.

2. Base line studies of water quantity and quality should be high on the requirements of any production of any mineral or petroleum product in the Northern Territory and these results or information should be available to members of the community upon request. The industry needs to be more open and engaged with the community as to environment impacts, assessment and management.

3. I don't support a five year moratorium on exploration of the "fracking" component of the petroleum industry. What I believe needs to take place is for the regulator to put measures in place, including rigorous legislation (which I don't believe exists at the moment) and reporting such that there is proper observation of the industry's activities.

While there is a mining advisory committee, there is no petroleum advisory committee and this needs to change as mentioned previously.

If this is to be the industry that builds and brings such wealth to the Northern Territory then it should have a dedicated advisory committee as exists for hard rock mining. As in the past with the uranium industry, it took many years of hard work between the industry and stakeholders before the industry was accepted as performing to best practice levels.

4. Exploration and production on Aboriginal land as defined under the Commonwealth Aboriginal Land Rights Act (NT) 1976 is subject to rigorous and robust negotiation through the relevant land council and, traditional owners do have the right of veto under the legislation. No work can commence on Aboriginal land unless formal approval and an agreement is in place.

Pastoral land is a different matter as that is under NT legislation management and this area could be improved and the work of an advisory council could oversee this work such that private land owners have their rights respected and observed.

5. All mining and petroleum companies that operate in the Northern Territory have a legislative requirement to provide rehabilitation bonds. If there is a community view and from specific stakeholders that these bonds are not sufficient to cover the costs of rehabilitation, then that should be revisited and an assessment done to ensure that the bonds not only match remedial work required on the ground, but also the community's expectations.

6. It is my view that the current EPA is independent and I am not sure how more independent it can become. Bonds are put in place, monitoring is undertaken and if the regulators do not have sufficient people to manage the industry, that needs to be addressed as a separate issue.

7. I have no issue with reviewing proposed no go areas for any on shore mining or petroleum activities.

8. If a water source is contaminated by an industrial operator, it will not be a difficult scientific exercise to determine who or what was responsible for the contamination. This will be through the identification of the pollutants and variants and results drawn. If there is a breach of licence and off lease, both the EPA and mines department will manage accordingly. It may be that the Water Act, as the main piece of legislation needs to be reviewed in light of proposed on shore fracking activities.

9. I am not sure what you mean by environmental insurance. Refer to my answers to question regarding environmental bonds.

I trust these comments assist you in understanding my position and I would be happy to talk further on any aspect of this letter.

Yours sincerely



Kezia Purick
Member for Goyder