

Dear Commissioners,

I object to this project.

I am a student of town planning and have a strong interest in these types of major projects particularly in a rural or regional context.

As a young person I feel the burden of such projects in the long term will be felt by my generation, with the legacy of filled in but potentially leaking wells, climate change, water impacts and the like.

I am not convinced the project will create the benefits it proports to and feel there are too many potentially highly negative and lasting impacts.

The proponent has said this is a low cost project but now information has come to light that it will actually be higher cost but provide 'energy security'.

The high cost of energy and particularly gas is certainly an issue, but I don't believe this project is any part of a solution of the high cost of production. NSW may have to import gas but I do think interstate suppliers are a fairly reliable source for as long as their fields are producing.

This issue should be solved with policy at a Government level to address the issue of exports. Whilst controversial there is also the option of LNG imports.

Another concern is water, which is such a crucial issue for the agricultural industry and the precautionary principle must be applied in my opinion. Previous experience suggests there has been wells run dry at least interstate by gas mining projects.

I am aware there will likely be evidence provided speaking to both sides, however I feel where there are risks to water, the precautionary principle must be applied. There is always potential for negative impacts and incidents despite mitigation tactics.

It is a matter of fact that vast amounts of salt will be produced from dewatering and those will require proper disposal, a mammoth challenge. Any mistakes or subsequent spills from dumping sites could have huge ramifications.

I'm also concerned there is no aerial data or maps provided to show the footprint of infrastructure. Projects of this size could divide or clear the habitat provided by the Pilliga and it's very hard to make much comment without this type of information.

Importantly there is the issue of climate change. Ultimately gas is a fossil fuel and the contribution of fugitive emissions could negate any savings.

For these reasons, in my opinion the project should be rejected.

Yours Sincerely,
[Name Redacted]