Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000.
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be "up to 6" (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GH) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

P. Chapman
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam,

I object to the Narrabri gas project on the following grounds: Failure to mitigate hazards to astronomy.

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset. There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,
Name: DIANE JOWELL
Address: 100A BEULAH ST
          CUNNINGHAM
Date: 7.4.2017

Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.

Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam

I object to the Narrabri Gas Project on the following grounds: Failure to mitigate hazards to astronomy.

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3 SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has underestimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be "up to 6" (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.

Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Signature]
Name: Paula Foster
Address: 36 Dalgarno St,
Goonabalan 2357
Date: 15/4/17

Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GH) and section 5.3.3; SSD 11.5.456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimises the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Name: CMA. 6.3.5. N.H.  
Address: 36. BAL. AW. 5. 
Date: 15/4/2017.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY.

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GH: D) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456.

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456.
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Burrelewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be “up to 6” (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam,

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopy, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze. Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze. Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities. I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

B A Young
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leeuward. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3: SSD 14.6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3: SSD 14.6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.

Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Name: [Name]
Address: [Address]
Date: 15-4-17

Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3: SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset. There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light thescropy, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

E. G. Macintosh
Name: DIAN BEDGGOOD
Address: E.J. HAWKINS LANE
              CONARARA, BRAN 2357
Date: 15/04/2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded. Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

S/Bedgood
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3: SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL 238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulhide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares — at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities. I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely
Dear Sir/Madam,

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset. There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3: SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Handwritten Name]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Liddell and Leeswood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam,

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset. There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bafflewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities. I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Name: Barbara Broekema
Address: FPO Box 53
                    GPO Box 2357
Date: 7/4/17

Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Broekema

As our future is in the stars I feel light pollution should be kept to a bare minimum to enhance this.
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

S. Wallace
3.4.17
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operational of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL 238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.

Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewindle and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_8456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopy, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.

Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flame shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14.6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaming combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares -- at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Name: Steve Chapman
Address: 85 Carrington Lane, COONABABAR NSW 2357
Date: 15-4-17

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix C (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewindle and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be up to 6 (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flaring events but minimises the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment.
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares. In other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Name: Jennifer Johnston
Address: 48 Bullaburra Rd
Bullaburra
Date: 15/4/17

Dear Sir/Madam,

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has underestimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities. I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Johnston
Name: Jeremy Schmidt
Address: 67 Hawkins Lane
              Coonabarabran NSW 2357
Date: 15/4/17

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Name: Mikayla Bissell
Address: 54 Hills Side Road, Nenagh
Date: 4/5/2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_5456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL236 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This IS NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practice on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

Mikayla Bissell
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3: SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Sideling Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has underestimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be up to 6 (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Sideling Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14.8456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.

Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leeurng. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be "up to 6" (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam,

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other International research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimises the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and International astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,

Jenna Jackson

Address: 6 Robert St.
LISMORE NSW 2480

Date: 15/04/17
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset. There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities. I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely,
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3: SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Sliding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze. Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Sliding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely
I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Secretary  
Planning & Environment,  
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,  
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001  

Dear Sir/Madam  

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY  

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456  
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.  
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.  
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.  
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.  
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.  
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze. Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.  
Santos has underestimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.  
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.  
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.  
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.  

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities. I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.  

Yours sincerely  

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory.
Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares -- at one point it is stated that there will be 'up to 6' (5.3.3) pilot well flares. In other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be up to 6 (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos's proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Name: U.B. Bar...  
Address: 99, W. Oak, Valley Rd, Cardiff  
Date: 13-04-17

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix C (GHD) and section 5.3.3, SSD 14_6456

Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.

Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.

There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.

Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.

There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.

Santos has failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bafflewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.

Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.

The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.

Appendix C mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.

The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Name: Chris Storey
Address: 4411 Lessons
       67 Gynne
Date: 15/1/17

Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 330 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3, SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Sliding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescopes, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrogen oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze. Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewood and Leedwood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be “up to 6” (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time. The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Sliding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000.
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recognition of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recognition in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewind and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares – at one point it is stated that there will be ‘up to 6’ (5.3.3) pilot well flares. But in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded.
Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.
I do not consider light and air pollution that will be caused by the Project has been effectively mitigated by Santos’s proposed mitigation measures.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Secretary
Planning & Environment,
Level 22 320 Pitt St Sydney NSW 2000,
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam

I OBJECT TO THE NARRABRI GAS PROJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS: FAILURE TO MITIGATE HAZARDS TO ASTRONOMY

Ref: EIS Appendix Q (GHD) and section 5.3.3; SSD 14_6456.
Santos has failed to ensure that vital astronomical assets of the Commonwealth of Australia, and 50 other international research institutions, are not detrimentally impacted by the operation of a large gas field and gas processing equipment to the north of Siding Spring.
Over the years, major public funds have been invested in these world class facilities for astronomy. Australian taxpayers and science institutions are rightly deserving of protection of this asset.
There is no recogniztion of the cumulative impact of future expansion from PEL238 to other gas licence areas much closer to the observatory.
Santos has not proposed adequate mitigation measures to protect the observatory operations, particularly in not ensuring the clarity of the night sky from light pollution impacting negatively on visible light telescope, and from not preventing an increase in chemical air pollution impacts on delicate instrumentation and mirror surfaces. It has also not recognised or mitigated chemical air pollution impacts on the Narrabri radio telescope facilities.
There is no recogniztion in the Santos EIS that air pollution (Chapter 18) at times will concentrate in certain weather conditions, such as during temperature inversions or cloudy, still nights and drift southward towards the observatory. Air pollution from gas fields is well-documented but has not been correctly identified in Chapter 18. It comprises methane, ethane, butane, and some higher hydrocarbons that can form ozone smog in sunlight, especially mixed with flaring combustion products like nitrous oxide. There is also hydrogen sulphide. This air pollution is not documented in the EIS by Santos. Gas field smog is highly corrosive on delicate instrumentation and can cause smog haze.
Santos have failed to propose adequate mitigation measures to minimise the impact of light pollution from flaring operations - in fact, no flare shielding is proposed. Two major flare stacks will likely operate continuously at Bibblewood and Leewood. Santos has under-estimated the likely continuous operation of these stacks and not proposed adequate shielding.
Santos has under-estimated the amount of light pollution and has contradictory statements in the EIS about the number of flares - at one point it is stated that there will be "up to 6" (5.3.3) pilot well flares, but in other parts of the EIS it is estimated over 25 pilot flares (Greenhouse Gas Chapter 24) will be operational at any time.
The NSW EPA recommends that flare stacks be shielded. Appendix Q mentions the potential high light pollution impact of major flare events but minimise the frequency of such events. This is NOT the experience in the QLD coal seam gas fields. The Santos EIS does not reflect practical on the ground experience of coal seam gas field operations.
The reality of gas fields is that gas supply restrictions mean that gas flaring can occur whenever the market is not drawing gas from the Project. This means that flaring can be a constant feature of an operational gas field. Claims by Santos that flaring will be minimal are simply not supportable.

It is inconceivable that the negative impacts of the Project on Siding Spring would be acceptable to Australian and international astronomers nor to the Australian public who have heavily invested in these world class facilities.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

15/4/17