



Fw: Terms of reference for CSG review
Mary O'Kane to: CSG Review
Sent by: **Rebecca Radford**

23/04/2013 03:29 PM

History: This message has been forwarded.

----- Forwarded by Rebecca Radford/SRD/NSW on 23/04/2013 03:29 PM -----

From: "Margaret Jackson" <mejackson@aapt.net.au>
To: <nswchiefscientist@chiefscientist.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 23/04/2013 12:49 PM
Subject: Terms of reference for CSG review

Dear Chief Scientist,

I have had a look at the terms of reference for CSG review and wonder where the elephant in the room is: Q: why is CSG mining even being considered in water catchment? No reference is made to this obvious question. Why not?

For your information: no recreational activities are allowed in schedule 1 lands of Sydney's water catchment for fear of water contamination. Schedule 2 lands (where my home in Oakdale is located), ban entry for walkers with dogs (even with dogs on a lead!), bicycles, trail bikes, canoeists, campers, horses, control of biocycle management, restricts growing of grapes, farming of pigs etc etc. How can CSG mining possible be considered a lesser risk than these activities? I face a \$11000 fine for walking into catchment with my dog: will Apex AGL etc face this too?

Yours faithfully

Margaret Jackson
18 Janette Place
Oakdale 2570