

Agriculture And Environmental Committee
Parliament House
Brisbane QLD 400
aec@parliament.qld.gov.au
7th October 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 (Qld)

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to make a submission to the proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 (Qld).

I understand the need to protect the environment, that is why I work for a company like New Hope who protects the environment and therefore I support the intention of the Bill, I do not in any way support how this process was undertaken I goes against what this government stand for, collaboration and listening to the people..... I also cannot support the limited time that was provided to make the changes to the approval process, this is unreasonable with no benefit to current projects that have been through the land court process and already had groundwater assessed, this will be a costly unnecessary exercise for both the government and the resource companies.

I am proud to say I work for New Hope Group, they are leaders in many areas including rehabilitation after mining, they have received a national award for their work in this space.... They have proven that they care for the people and the environment....

New Hope have been in court for months instead of weeks based on limited to no science which is a poor process and bowing to the very few that shouts the loudest (environmental extremists). New Hope have spent weeks in court on groundwater management after collaboration with your state water specialists (DNRM hub in emerald).

I am asking you to consider:

Firstly why should a project that has already been through the land court process be subject to that again?

Secondly there must be better transitional arrangements for a project in the latter stages of the approval process? Why put a company that has been through land court on groundwater in the position to go back to land court, if the court has ruled on this why would it need to rule on it again? And should the project that has been assessed by the land court have

And finally, for the project I am working on this unreasonable last minute change will delay the project and will result in hundreds of direct jobs, including my team been made redundant. This will have a major effect on me and the team including the community in general for example New Hope and the staff have over the last year supported fundraising I arranged to a value of over \$25,000 for the disability area. My family is currently a single parent income family due to having a very high special needs child, I currently fund all my daughters medical treatment that costs in excess of \$15,000 per year (average over the last 10 years).

I ask you to consider changing the transitional arrangements to allow the water licence application be allowed in conjunction with the ML application for applications that have been challenged in the land court, I also ask you to consider only allowing one land court challenge per project application for groundwater.

Thank you for taking your time to read this submission.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Patrick Tyrrell', written over a light blue horizontal line.

Patrick Tyrrell

