



PCU070805

62 MACQUARIE ST
GLEN INNES 2370
11-5-17

Executive Director, Resource Assessments
Dept of Planning & Environment
Dear Sir / Madam,



I seek to make a submission in regard to the EIS submitted by SANTOS for its Narrabri / Pilliga gas mining proposal.

I have concerns over whether Santos can meet its claimed high environmental standards on such a large project, particularly in view of past spillages and pollution on smaller scale projects. Santos appears to have been fined such minute amounts, that it gives the Company the go-ahead to pollute and then pay a trivial fine as a minor business expense.

The environmental monitoring conditions that have been imposed by various Governments on mining (especially coal) are never fully enforced, and from my experience working in extractive industries, results are rigged, or monitoring is done when no excavation is occurring. The State Government does not employ enough staff to adequately monitor or assess Company results, and self regulation is a joke.

The disposal of very large quantities of salty water is also of concern. If past practice of mining companies is any guide, large volumes will be dumped, without treatment, into local watercourses.

The project is presented as essential supply to the Sydney market via the Moomba pipeline. However it is likely that the gas will just replace existing gas from the Moomba fields, so that this gas can be exported.

Consumers will have no more reliability of supply, and will still have to pay premium prices (so called world parity, even though Japan gets Australian gas at lower prices than Australians can).

Most wells eventually leak, and methane is a very potent greenhouse gas. Such a large number of wells will result in considerable quantities of emissions. This has been glossed over in the EIS documents.

The project documents claim that only 1000 ha or so will be cleared, as if it were nothing. This is a large loss of valuable habitat, and ~~the~~ roading and clearing will facilitate access by feral animals and weeds.

If this form of gas mining has such low impact, as claimed in the EIS, surely it would be better to site the wells on already cleared private land, rather than have to clear valuable state forest to reduce the fire risk around the wells, and by using cleared land, the impact of roads and pipelines would be much less impact.

I ask that you reject this project in its present form.

Thank you
John Taylor
