

Firstly I think the names Compensation and Incentive Payment need to be changed , to

# 1 Land Access Agreement Payments ,

#2 Progress Payments for CSG Production on Landholders Properties ,

#3 Compensation for Damages from CSG exploration and Production .

IPART .Some points that need to be taken into account are ,Payments for Land Access This whole process of developing a frame work for payments before regulatory controls are in place is wrong

The very fact that this process is underway, and that the Govt is preparing legislation to change the current system is proof enough that there aren't adequate provisions in place. Given that's the case, the Govt should support moves by other political parties for a moratorium while the regulations are put in place and the balance restored.

Agreements largely depend on how good a negotiator a person is compared to a highly resourced highly skilled Multinational Company this is not a level playing field

This process for compensation for damage done I find hard to digest The CSG industry should not be allowed to go ahead if there is any chance of damage , I have been on the Narrabri Community Consultation Committee for 5 years and the best Santos,s Peter Mitchley can come up with when asked about well integrity and leakage is " we (Santos) are quietly confident that there will be no damage "

People should of course be compensated for damage done: we know CSG does a lot of damage – it introduces weeds, interrupts businesses, and even family life.

People in Qld get moved off their properties to hotels, for goodness sake. So yes, all the damage it does should be compensated, but in the first instance it should be prevented, and frankly, for as long as NSW doesn't have the laws in place to prevent people getting sick and water being contaminated, then no amount of compensation is going to assuage the communities' fears about this industry.

If you look at attachment 1c. under "Special Reviews" you will now see that IPART has no real power to act on Access Compensation, but rather it is being used by the NSW Government to confuse the simple folk into believing that they will get a binding outcome. This NSW Government, under pressure from the CSG lobby to be more precise, has blatantly sought to add some sort of official stamp to Access Agreement Compensation without really making any firm commitment to any decision.

Thus will assist the gas companies to gain more credence with wavering farmers for access agreements.

Serious concerns about page 15 stating that "royalty arrangements for neighbours would be affected over time by the Community Benefits Funds because every \$2 paid into CBF is a \$1 reduction in royalty payments, capped at 10%" how can IPART be discussing and deciding on compensation for landholders when the CBF process is still outstanding and these decisions impact landholders and their neighbours?

Deeply concerned with the fundamental basis that landholders are to be "no worse or no better off than before the development came" as this is an assumption that all facets of a landholders' life that will be impacted can be firstly identified ahead of time and secondly a dollar figure put on it. how do you put a dollar figure on the following real life examples of impacts – the school bus having to have a pilot vehicle to negotiate the high traffic roads, the holding of a government media event about "co-existence" on your property without your knowledge, the closing of the local school, sporting clubs and community groups due to the irregularity of FIFO working hours and nature of this type of workforce, not allowing your children to play outside at certain times because of dust and other impacts, increase in living and business costs that go along with and have been proven in other areas from the construction phase of this industry and most importantly the mental health issues from the daily living with this level of stress. How do you fit these into "injurious affection" as a % of your land value?????????

Landholders must be better off to a huge degree in dollar terms to be subjected from a peaceful lifestyle to a 24 hr, 7 day a week ,52 weeks a year CGS nightmare .

Gas Companies do not have enough resources money wise to cover compensation for major environmental damage if it affects hundreds or thousands of people.  
I could spend hours pulling apart this case but quiet frankly I am submissioned out week in and week out 3 or 4 submissions it never stops .  
Ron Campey