

From: Julia Siddall
To: [fracking inquiry](#)
Subject: Potential risks fracking on water & land
Date: Friday, 21 April 2017 3:36:33 PM

As a compliance auditor on a large gas project I came across numerous issues - some significant - which were largely ignored if assessed to be 'low risk'. Low risk [to a large wealthy corporation] is classified according to 'cost' and likelihood of an event coming into the public domain - to quote one senior manager 'only interested if it's front page of the Sydney Herald'. One of my concerns was the prolific use of 'biocides' which are thrown down all drill holes and had not been risk assessed. Many biocides produce formaldehyde and other toxic substances which shouldn't contact soil or groundwater. To my knowledge no testing is done by the company to check for any contamination and indeed users were totally unaware of the risks to themselves or the environment as in many instances had been supplied with an incorrect SDS and/or had not read it. Substituting the product would affect schedule it was decided although the SDS was removed from the official company web page - many still appear in search results. I informed the Health & Safety Office in my State but had no reply and experience has resulted in a lack confidence in State Officials impartiality or rigour. Biocides are under review by the European Chemicals Agency and it is likely that some of the chemicals currently in use may not be approved - this does not stop global companies exporting these for the unsuspecting Australian end user due to weak fractured regulatory bodies. I believe that a government that espouses sustainable growth should be able to support a resources sector but only once verified that company is a good corporate citizen: robust national legislation, much stiffer penalties, ensuring that risk assessments are provided for all materials and/or only approved fracking fluids are used, a proactive stance from government with more government auditors from industry trained backgrounds doing unscheduled audits - according to risk of course. Codes of practice created by the very industries you wish to monitor should not be mistaken as 'best practice'.