

20251215

Energy and Resource Assessment
NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to Narrabri Lateral Gas Pipeline (SSI-53307723)

From:

Mr A J Pickard
105 Pattersons Lane
Young, NSW 2594

Pn.0263826579
Email – deere@activ8.net.au

Sir/Madam

Let me get the house-keeping out of the way. I am not a member of any Political Party nor have I donated any money to any Political Party.

I would also like to state that I no longer hold any property in and near to Santos' Narrabri Gas Project. Not that that should have any bearing on the information within this submission.

This submission is by way of an OBJECTION to any granting of approvals for the Narrabri Lateral Gas Pipeline.

My Description of the Application and its relationship to the gas supply from Narrabri Gas Project to the East Coast Market

My take on this Pipeline Application is it is full of maybes and “we will cross that bridge when we come to it”. Why Santos is not even sure if the pipeline will go ahead. This is borne out when Santos stated on page 3.26 of the Chapter 3 – Project Description, “*Construction is proposed to commence around the end of 2026 subject to obtaining approvals.*” But whose approvals? If they are anything like the Narrabri Gas Project going into production by 2026, then it is the Santos Board that makes that decision and that is purely going to be based on “How much Gas” does the East Coast need. If we go into Production then what are our gains and losses, verses all the Exploration lurks and perks that we have now. I seem to recall somewhere in this Application, that Santos regards the Pipeline as being part of the Exploration Phase and it will only move out of that phase once gas is flowing through it, and that could be years from now.

Santos has never been a stupid company, far from it, they know where the profit from the Narrabri Gas Project lays, and they intend to hang onto that while gathering Approvals for Construction and while getting Operation Extensions for those Granted Approvals that may or may not be used in the production and supply of gas to the East Coast Market by Santos “WHEN SANTOS BOARD GIVES THE APPROVAL” (if they ever do), to go ahead with the project.

Do not lose sight of a recent Gas Inquiry that found that Santos was a major contributor to the shortage on the East Coast by buying up all the excess gas from Santos' local competitors, which could have gone into the local East Coast Market and selling it overseas.

So will that happen with the Narrabri Gas? And will the Approving body put in any Approval Document a Condition, that ALL the Narrabri gas goes to the NSW Market with at least 50% reserved for Household consumption.

In 2019 and earlier, “The 2026 Gas Shortage” was the scare tactic once used, now that is in tatters because of the statement above and the fact that rest of the paragraph has another statement “*Operation (of the pipeline) is expected to commence at the end of 2028.*”

I and many others doubt if Santos will have the Narrabri Gas Field and all supporting infrastructure ready by that date.

No this is just another “Get the Approval,” and like so many earlier granted under the EIS and Exploration Applications, this Approval will join all the others that were granted to be stored away and the initial time limit runs out, only for Santos to APPLY FOR AN EXTENSION OF THE TIME. (Santos has already done that with their 2 pipelines – See the Pipelines/NSW Climate and Energy Action at www.energy.nsw.gov.au/nsw-plans-and-progress/regulation-and-policy/our-role-networks/pipelines

The area where Santos wants to route this pipeline is through the very rock material that separates the Southern Recharge Area of the Great Artesian Basin (GAB) from the Gunnedah Oxley Basin (GOB), each with their separate and very distinct waters qualities.

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

My submission will be using a format similar to Government Departments as seen in the Agency Advice section. I will not provide direct links to material but rather give references to documents and submissions and places where the verifying information can be found.

I would also like to state that I believe that this Application will most likely be approved. That would be a shame as well as a blight on a system that seems to have lost its way and in so many ways and as a result, seemingly plays lip service to the notion of listening to public concerns and acting upon those concerns.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

A Brief outline of the Covered Subjects in the Submission.

1 – Naughtiness

Detailed example of “out-of-area studies” being used in Approval Requests by the Gas Companies that was missed by the Approving Authority.

Is this still happening today?

2 – Fauna/Flora - Area Extinctions of at- least 2 Species

As for assistance to locating information regarding the progressive “area extension” of Birds and Mammals, Eastern Star Gas REF’s contain all the information and are well mapped especially when it comes to the Barking Owl and the Koala.

.....

Aquatic life in Bohena Creek

3 – Watercourse Crossings

One person was killed pulling a pipeline under Bohena Creek when it got stuck. Does the Approving Department want another because there is no request for strata information?

Soil and water testing should be

4 – Pipeline Protection and Construction

There are three types of corrosion actions that can affect the metal surface of the pipeline should the outer protective coating be damaged:.....

No Agency Advice from NSW Climate and Energy Action (Pipelines) available in the Agency Advice section.). Yet their website indicates that this new Department has that power.

(The EPA did the right and informed the Approving Department that they are not the regulating Authority but that seems to have fallen on deaf ears within this Department of the NSW Government

Just another concern with regard to the Approval Process and the Department handling it.

5 - Hard Rock Blasting

Blasting produces a transmittable shock wave capable of opening up faults and cracks in places in the GAB/GOB Hard Rock Separation Barrier. A 'Blast' is a FRAC and has the same effect but only shallower.

Concerns in this section are raised without there being Agency Advice from NSW Climate and Energy Action (Pipelines) available in the Agency Advice section. (The EPA did the right and informed the Approving Department that information seems to have fallen on deaf ears).

So which NSW Government Department is responsible for supervising the 'Blasting'

Santos needs to do a proper Strata and Hard Rock Formation surface to see if there are any or likely to be any, existing Faulting before the area given this Pipeline Approval.

If problems with Basin separation hard rock material are found later due to the combinations of the 2 extractors blasting, it is too later and cannot be undone.

Who is then responsible?

6 - Roadwork at the Junction of X-line Road and the Newell Highway

Santos has been granted a time extension, will they now upgrade that intersection or will the claim that a this pipeline is still part of the Exploration phase they do not have to.

For road user Safety, Adequacy of already Approved (SSD-6456) and proposed all Channelised turn-offs should be looked at very carefully. Channelised turn-off's should on both sides of the Highways, as the traffic using these Highway exits and re-joins has now increased by the Pipeline Vehicles (maybe a NEW SSD-6456) should be done?

Remember these Highways are a State and Federal Tax Payer Asset, so who pays to the Damage caused by inadequate Asset Protection Regulation?

Roads within the Forest and in Narrabri Council controlled land are a matter for them, but User Safety by all Forrest users Company of Public must come first. It would be nice to see and have a change to comment on those conditions before any Approval for this pipeline is given.

REMEMBER ONE ROAD DEATH IS ONE TOO MANY ESPECIALLY WHEN A SENSIBLE SOLUTION CAN BE WORKED OUT BY ALL PARTIES. That solution should not include closing sections of the Pilliga Forest and Council controlled roads to the Public and locals. There are many methods of traffic control and they should be used rather than punish people for wanting to get out into nature.

Santos will come back with the old chestnut of "security issues",

7- Job Creation and Workforce accommodation

Very few new jobs created as the Contractors have their own specialised.....

Commercial workforce facilities have proved too expensive and restrictive in the past

Rents increased, some lower paid people move away

The Submission Proper

1 - An Example of Gas Company Naughtiness and of Approving/Regulating Authority failour.

1a - Example 1 – Information that is in presented material has been found to not be applicable to that Application

The information below factual and provable.

Some of Santos' own REF's especially the 'Drawboy' REF can attest to the extent that Santos uses information from outside the area and by Gas Companies that are not Santos related, at the time, This particular REF was required to provide certain studies which were localised for reasons of "effect on that area". The example used here is the Noise Study and the location of the noise receptors. Unfortunately there was bit of "naughtiness and reflects badly not only on Santos and on Eastern Star Gas (who used the area study in a number of out of area REF's of their own) but on the Assessment ability of the Department to thoroughly check all aspects of any Application. The study in question relates to a noise study that was requested to carry out for the Dewhurst 8 (later renamed) Lateral Gas well Pilot, after a complaint I made about the noise carry-over affecting myself and my wife on the neighbouring property "Rockdale".

Now, both the Dewhurst 8 Pilot and my property are at least 200 kilometres from the Santos 'Drawboy' well near Murrurundi, 30 kilometres from the then Eastern Star Gas (ESG) Tintsville Pilot and at least 250 kilometres from the ESG Collarenebri area Exploration Well. So unless drilling/well pad operation noise has some special characteristics, then both Eastern Star Gas (ESG) and Santos gave false information to the then Approving body and that Body failed in its duty of care. Yesterday! Yes, but trust takes a long time to re-establish especially if the people who made the decisions then, are still in that position today.

Based on the factual and verifiable information above, can the Department within the Gas Company Santos be trusted to give accurate and concise information and can the Approving Department be trusted to ensure that the information is correct and factual and if any differences are found, will the Department and Gas Company act in the proper manner?

1b - Example 2 - Lack of proper standards and supervision

Now is as good a time to bring up the poor supervision of the anti-pollution methods that Santos was required to put in place around the existing Hi-point vents on the existing pipelines after the failure in 2015 of an automatic high point vent. Santos was required to place "Save-alls" around each vent and told to lock-off the vents and use them manually only. These 'save-alls' are supposed to collect any produced water, should that occur, and prevent that fluid from entering the environment when the vent is opened manually or there is a malfunction.

As for the save-alls that are in place for that purpose they are useless, THEY HAVE NO WATER-PROOF BOTTOM. That's right, the concrete ring is sitting on the bare or gravelled ground so any fluid spilt just goes straight into the soil. The only purpose of the concrete ring is to hide from passing view if the manual valve is shut, open or cracked to all inspectors passing and doing a mobile inspection. Who is supposed to be checking that the environment is protected!!!! Well whomever job it is or was, they are NOT doing it seriously.

That is one of many reasons to doubt that any conditions will be enforced.

While on that subject, maybe someone should have a good look at all the “bundled sumps” located the well sites and other locations for water retention integrity, especially those with 'sumps' retro-fitted after the bundled surface save-all's with underlying liner were constructed.

2 - “Progressive Area Extinction” of some native to the Pilliga Fauna

The Barking Owl is an example of this “progressive area extinction”. Eastern Star Gas recorded nesting sites in the proximity of Bohena Creek in at least 3 REF's (along with a Koala siting), then nothing was mentioned of either species in later REF's. They only referenced to “habitat suitability”, as this Application does. Now, in this Pipeline Application we find mention of a 1 Barking Owl sighting in 2019, another unrecorded sighting in 2022.

The lack of concern over the lack of sightings of a once frequently sighted bird as found in the “Further assessment column” on page 218 of the Biodiversity Development Report is a “YES” and that is most likely because Santos would like the “Species Credits” that only a good sighting can bring. From the Report it appears that EccoResolve spent a fair bit of time and tried various methods to obtain a sighting, But where?

As for the Koala, a few “scats” in the Pilliga Forest area of the pipeline route, does not make for the return of the Mammal, well, not within the designated Gas Well project area, anyway. According to the information one Koala sighting was made near the agricultural area just outside of the Pilliga Forest near the pipeline route. From the information contained in the 'Maps' there is plenty of evidence for their presence over a large area on the Agricultural Lands to the East of the Forest. Yet the search for the Koala in the Forest was very narrow and restricted to little more than the pipeline clearway width. WHY?

Funny that the Fauna/Flora studies were restricted to a very narrow band within the Pilliga Forest, but based on the many included maps for the Private and Council land areas East and outside of Pilliga Forests; VERY WIDE. Please explain the search area difference. (I doubt if The Approving Department will do so. So prove me wrong).

So: Why are there almost no sightings of either Barking Owl or Koala in the area where the Gas Activity is?

I have a simple answer. The frequency of movements of man and vehicles, the dust and the noise, the “light” for security and to work sites and the night movement of vehicles, along with the Flaring, all created by man and machine working in the Gas Field, has driven them and their prey away. While the silicon based road dust has coated and tainted the leaves of the food source trees, all this along with the pollution of Bohena Creek by the raw discharge of produced water, the various “spills” the leaking liners of the Bibblewindi Ponds (Santos Knows all about this, so ask them), along with the “salt blow-off” from the Ponds at Bobblewindi and now Leewood, the smell of leaking and vented Methane and other gases such as Hydrogen Sulphide from produced waters from the existing operational wells and the water/gas pipelines that service these wells and from the well sites themselves, (many of which have little or no overflow prevention methods and those that are there are poorly maintained and are virtually useless. These well pad bunds were a requirement for the granting of Exploration. But now because of their condition, anything including spilt Chemicals and produced water residue on the pads both past and present just goes off with any overflow water and into the surrounding environment.) This has/had the effect of either killing of the populations, driven them away in an effort to find quieter and safer areas, or completely disrupted their night time hunting habits.

The Lateral Pipeline and its infrastructure are no different in its requirements for looking after both the environment and the Fauna/Flora.

The above is the reason why I refer to the Narrabri Gas Project Area and to some degree the surrounding areas, as the “Area of Extinction”.

If the Approving Department wants to verify what I am saying, ask the EPA and Santos, both know that I have the proof to backup what I am stating.

Bohena Creek Aquatic Life

Before I leave this subject, I would like to point out that Bohena Creek has/had a vibrant aquatic population that

consisted of fish and shell fish as well as water insects. The fish were Perch and Bohna Creek their nursery, the shell fish were of the fresh water mussels (there are middens in places along the Creek). The insects are nothing special except to say that they form the basic part of a food chain which has been drastically altered by the Gas Operation and its poor past supervision by the Regulators. This pipeline can only add to those problems especially as Bohna Creek and its flood plain is an aquifer and a recharge of an aquifer which Santos and locals use.

You see, Bohna Creek, because of its sandy nature sitting above a dense clay shelf, has the ability to store and allow a water flow below the sandy surface of the dry creek bed. It is this ability that allows the Perch and other aquatic life to survive. Perch have an amazing ability to be able to survive they do not always need water they can survive in very moist sand for an extended period of time.

There are examples of finding these fish in NSW Museums and in the older Department of DPI Fisheries Tamworth, Fisheries Ecosystems Unit (March 2012). So why is there no mention of Fish or the Shell Fish in the Fauna Study?

Given the past 'track records', how can the concerned Public have trust in either Santos or the relevant Departments to both give and then properly police the conditions imposed on any granted Approval?

3 - Water course crossings

Santos wants to go under Bohna Creek with the pipeline but shows little to no detail on depth or the location with regard to the ground strata types and depths. They are asking you and everyone else, to just accept their word that there will be no direct cross connection or pollution between the strata. (There is the presence of Iron Bacteria in Bohna Creek around the area of the crossing as well many other places), I do not see any Bacteria mentioned anywhere.

There is also indication of Strata types or depths. Did Santos actually do a strata study, or is this another "Trust us" thing?

The very sandy soils around the Creeks and Water Courses makes pulling a pipeline through this material a very dangerous work practice, especially in a way that is portrayed in this Application.

This method of pipeline laying MUST DAMAGE THE OUTER PROTECTIVE MATERIAL BACK TO BARE METAL. This then becomes a Protection and Detection problem.

One person was killed pulling a pipeline under Bohna Creek when it got stuck. Does the Approving Department want another because there is no request for strata information?

Oh, yes, Sulphate Reducing Bacteria is also a factor! Soil and water testing should be carried out to determine the presence of these metal destroying Bacteria. (For the Department information, I have, in the past, done tests on the Waters of Bohna Creek in the area of the proposed pipeline crossing).

4- Pipeline Protection and Construction

There are two types of corrosion actions that can affect the metal surface of the pipeline should the outer protective coating be damaged:

1 - Chemical Corrosion caused by acid or alkali in the soils, even from residue from the Blasting left in the soils and in cracks formed in the rock strata itself.

2 - "Bacterial" Attack from Sulphate Reducing Bacteria and Iron Bacteria.

Constantly wet, the presence bacteria and sand to abrade is a mix is that even the best protected micro moving pipeline (expanding/contracting with temperature and gas pressure) would have a problem with. No matter how small the movement, over time the pipeline protection will be rubbed and scratched back to bare metal allowing the bare metal of the outer surface to break down sooner than in the dryer areas. Bacteria can

live in the moist trapped cracks on the Hard Rock itself, that is another source of them Santos has not taken into account.

So what protection does Santos propose to use to prevent Bacterial attack?

Santos has not tested for the presence of Bacteria so how do they know they are not present (I have and I know). So is Santos going to about preventing Bacterial induced corrosion?

And most importantly; what is the Approving Department going to say/do on the matter?

As Santos well knows, Bacteria can be transported from one place to another in machinery, yet no mention of machinery "wash-down" is made. Never assume, because it can make "(a)-ass-(of)-u-(and)-me."

My concerns in this section have been raised without there being Agency Advice from 'NSW Climate and Energy Action (Pipelines)' available in the Agency Advice section. (The EPA did the right and informed the Approving Department that they were not the regulating Department for Pipelines that information seems to have fallen on deaf ears). Another concern is with regard to the VALIDITY of the Approval Process and the Department handling it due of this missing Government Pipeline Regulating Department Advice information.

I must say I am impressed with the images of the open country pipe laying in good soft soil, but in places, this pipeline is not going in those soils types, it is going in country with soils (if you can call them that) that range from straight sand, to a very sandy loam, to clay, to loose pebbly combination of all the afore mentioned, to sandstone infused with traces of Iron stone and hard quartz, to almost pure hard Iron Stone and quartz. It is the latter that Santos has briefly touched on that may need "blasting", and that requires a whole new 'ball game' of approvals and Departmental supervision.

With regard to the cathodic protection; there are at-least 2 type areas of concern, the wet Bohena Creek under crossing and other water course crossings and the areas that contain quantities of Iron Stone.

Exactly how is Santos planning to ensure that the cathodic protection will be protecting the protective coated steel pipeline especially in the area of large concentrations of the Iron Stone (Ships still corroded way even though they have a protective paint layer and Cathodic protection) should the outer protective coating be damaged and the metal underneath exposed?

It is all very well for Santos to give an expected life of the steel pipeline, but scratch that protective coating away and expose the bare steel and corrosion will start, and that is a very basic fact.

Pulling a pipeline through this abrasive material in a way that is portrayed in the Application, MUST DAMAGE THE OUTER PROTECTIVE MATERIAL BACK TO BARE METAL. This then becomes a big Protection and Detection problem.

I see no mention of how any visual external checks will be carried out in these and other areas.

Do not lose sight of the fact that the steel pipeline will move with expansion and contraction caused by temperature and pressure within and outside the pipe, natural soil and rock movements caused by temperature and area surface and below surface disturbances. Any movement has the potential to scratch the protective coating from the pipes surface and expose the metal below.

Then there is an underground coal mine nearby which leaves void spaces behind that led to surface and underground subsidence. It is also on record that they will be blasting and removing coal, resulting in "localised fracturing" of surrounding rock strata (Narrabri Underground Coal Mine Stage 3 Expansion Project Appendix D Preliminary Ass. Part 2 , included a the Figure Model on page 81, shows that the Hard Rock Basin

Barrier has cracks in it and that the Underground Mine will create more.) and void spaces which lead to subsidence and earth movements.

And Santos wants to have the option to “blast” and maybe make new cracks and fissures and/or open up those existing ones further. Remember a “blast” creates earth movements, so existing laid pipes will be subject to that surrounding material movement.

Santos' Application does not tell us what type of bedding material they intend to surround the entire length of the pipeline with and where that bedding material will be coming from. The rocky and hard rock areas are of a concern, but no info given for those areas.

Then there is the Bacteria. This is naturally occurring having the ability to live in the harshest, driest and wettest of environments. Santos cannot use Chemical control as they do in the waters of the gas wells and ponds, so then what method does Santos has in place to firstly;

1 – To locate the Bacterial Attack and treat/prevent any Bacterial Attack over the entire length of the pipeline?

and:

2 – How does Santos intend to locate, treat, repair or replace the sections of the pipeline that underlay the Creek crossings, especially the Bohena Creek?

Gone are the days when a company says, “Trust me we know what we are doing”.
This Approving needs to respect the Community more.

Because there is no provided information, I have a problem with the relationship between this Lateral Gas Pipeline and any infrastructure layout that Santos may have with the Narrabri Gas Project Gas field and that includes, gas and produced water pipelines, Electricity cables that Santos is going to use to power the Gas wells. I do not know what the gas field final layout will be, but I do know that this pipeline will divide part of the field from the Bibblewindi gas gathering complex. There are questions around vibration, vehicular movements and stray electrical currents that could affect the buried pipeline and its protections.

Santos should have had this information in the Application, so why wasn't it. Therefore to approve this application would be a complete denial of the right to fully informed Public Comment based on ALL the accurate facts supporting the Application being provide with the Application.

As mentioned above I do have concern around what effect the produced electric/Magnetic field around the current carrying well supplying electric cable will have on the on the metal pipeline and the cathodic protection in all areas especially those with Iron concentrations, such as the sandy creeks,etc..

Of-course the scavenging device (known as a 'pig') can, while moving along a pipe removing water and other material, create a small magnetic field/electrical charge also.

Just a few more problems that need to be answered by Santos and others because the Agency Advice from 'NSW Climate and Energy Action (Pipelines)' was not included in the Agency Advice part of the Information available to the public.

5 - Hard Rock Blasting

Blasting produces a transmittable shock wave capable of opening up faults and cracks in places in the GAB/GOB Hard Rock Separation Barrier. A 'Blast' is a FRAC and has the same effect but only shallower. Yet

Santos wants approval to Blast a part through the Impervious, harder solid Iron Stone separating the waters of GAB from the waters of GOB.

The other area of concern is the “Blasting” that Santos indicated that it may need to carry out in order create a trench to bury the pipeline. So what is the result of a blast; surface, and sub surface shock waves which can travel long distances in dense rock, these shock waves can also cause earth movements on soft loose material, with unintended consequences such as Water Bore collapses.

In effect a made-made “blast” is a man-made earth quake.

Right now would be a good time to remind the Approving Department of what Narrabri Underground Mine Stage 3 Expansion Project – Gateway Application (dated Jan 2019), have a look at Fig. 10 “A conceptual Model” as found on page 81 of Appendix D Preliminary Groundwater Ass. Part 2. There is a very short written piece in an earlier Appendix. However Fig. 10 tells the story: The GAB has natural cracks in it (but not enough to allow the GAB and GOB to exchange waters), the Fig. 10 goes on to show that blasting from the underground mine extension will both open new cracks (faults) and increase the size of others. Now Santos wants to do surface blasts in a very hard rock which will transmit the shockwave, which has the potential to create new cracks and further open the existing cracks (faults). I do not see any information on this subject in the Application. WHY?

If the Narrabri Underground Mine is willing to admit to the existence and to creating new faults and cracks in the Hard Rock of the GAB/GOB separation Strata THEN WHY WONT SANTOS?

Santos and the Department need to obtain and release this information along with full strata mapping and give the public time to comment on this information in the form of a new submission, or at least advertised public submission time before the any Approval for BLASTING is considered.

If problems with Basin separation hard rock material are found later due to the combinations of the 2 extractors blasting, it is too later and cannot be undone.

Who is then responsible?

6 - Roadwork at the Junction of X-line Road and the Newell Highway

Just like Transport for NSW (TfNSW.), I am concerned that the proposed Public Highway channelised Intersections may not be long or wide enough to accommodate the Pipe Transporting vehicles with their increased length. The upgrades to the X-Line/Newell were proposed when there were NO pipelines being proposed and the intersection upgrade was only to accommodate Drill Rigs and associated Vehicles, a much smaller and less frequent traffic flow and a shorter (lengthwise) vehicle.

Santos states it will upgrade and channelised the left turn (southbound) for the X-Line/Newell Highway junction, under the Narrabri Gas Project (SSD-6456). But when?

Santos has been granted a time extension to this intersection upgrade. So, will they now upgrade that intersection or will the claim that this pipeline is still part of the Exploration phase they do not have too thus enforcing the conditions of the Time Extension Agreement? *The Ball is in the Approving Departments court on this one.*

I have concerns over other Channelised Upgrade sizes and length of the turning lanes, such a “in” and “out” of Leewoods’ access Mill Road from the Newell Highway. X-Line/Newell Highway and the “in”/”out” from the Kamilaroi Highway to the Leased Property at Baan Baa. Santos has considers that they are essential to the pipeline construction for material, equipment and workforce access.

There are also the same concerns over the 'Temporary' exits from the Newell to local Forest roads, which Santos proposed on page 34 of the Technical Report 9.

Some form of Traffic control needs to be provided in both directions well before any point where the Pipe carrying trucks enter or leave a Highway Newell or Kamilaroi Highway. *Reason Highway user safety.*

Sight availability is poor South Bound on the Newell coming up to Mill Road due to undulating road in the area of the floodway, and poor looking South along the Newell due to a sight "bump".

Highway speed limit down grading may have to be looked at.

Remember these Highways are a State and Federal Tax Payer Asset, so who pays to the Damage to these Highways caused by inadequate Asset Protection Regulation should these Channelised be inadequate for the job at hand?

Roads within the Forest and in Narrabri Council controlled land are a matter for them, but User Safety by all Forrester users Company of Public must come first. It would be nice to see and have a change to comment on those conditions before any Approval for this pipeline is given.

REMEMBER ONE ROAD DEATH IS ONE TOO MANY ESPECIALLY WHEN A SENSIBLE SOLUTION CAN BE WORKED OUT BY ALL. That should not include closing sections of the Pilliga Forest and Council controlled roads to the Public and locals for the purpose of pipeline construction. There are many methods of traffic control and they should be used rather than punish people for wanting to get out into nature.

Santos will come back with the old chestnut of "security issues". In response, I ask the question: has Santos reported any property damage or interference that was committed by the public of late? My guess the answer is NONE but I am willing to say Santos will dream up something to suit the occasion.

7- Job Creation and Workforce accommodation

Santos talks about 200/20/2 jobs depending on the 'phase', these people already have jobs working for the various companies that could be contracted to build, test and commission the pipeline. I doubt if there is any more than 5 local jobs created and then for how long will those locals be employed?

Short term employment does not give a long term benefit.

The benefits from the workforce using the local commercial workforce facilities remain to be seen. This has been put forward before only to end up with the workforce staying in rented houses, because the commercial facilities are too expensive, too restrictive and too far from town distractions, as a result there is a rent price increase and many lower paid workers leave town because they cannot afford the rents.

Santos has in the past, provided its own workforce camps, and may even do again if required.

Thank you