Publishing permitted

Attn: IPC Chair, Steven O'Connor Office of Independent Planning Commission Level 3, 201 Elizabeth St, Sydney, NSW 2000. Colleen. M. Fraser 782 Mudfords Rd Breelong, Gilgandra, N.S.W. 2827 24th July 2020

This is a submission of objection to the Narrabri Gas Project.

I would like to lodge a firm **objection** to this project.

There are a huge amount of reasons why this project should be rejected and I am finding it difficult to understand how, with so many proven problems in the past, this industry is even being considered. I don't believe how statements containing words like **if, can, minimal effects** and **manageable effects** could be allowed to be put forward. If there are **no guarantees** as to the results or effects on anything to do with this industry, then it should not be able to proceed. Other phrases which bother me, because of their lack of total commitment are: **Avoiding developing sensitive areas**. **Avoiding to the greatest extent practicable** heritage items, endangered ecological communities, and threatened species habitat.

This tells me that **if** it is not **practicable** to go around these areas then they will progress over or through them. **All these phrases and many more leave a lot of decisions open and flexible for destruction of the water, environment, heritage items, endangered species etc and habitats.**

The issue of chemically contaminated water spills has happened within recent years. There is a spill site in the Pilliga and, try as they may, the attempts of regeneration over the years, have not been successful. In the Assessment it is stated that the waste treated water will be used for dust retention and pumped into Bohena creek. This treated water, seeing as there are **no guarantees**, would not be suitable to be pumped into a natural water course, both in road gutters and a natural creek.

Santos has stated that there will be a number of people who will be employed in the construction phase of the project and a small amount employed ongoing. The amount of farmers potentially affected from known problems, including water drawdown, contaminated ground water, contaminated rivers and creeks can cause considerable unemployment throughout the wider agricultural industry with a catastrophic effect on farmland, crops and stock. This potential unemployment on the land could be far greater long term than the amount employed by the project over the coming years.

I put it forward that Narrabri and surrounding areas would not have the people with the expertise to construct a gasfield so the majority of the quoted number of potential employees would be brought in temporarily from other construction sites, this would not benefit employment in the local areas. Statistics say that for every 1 gas employee there are 1.8 agricultural jobs lost.

Extremely dangerous **flaring** is occurring in bushfire prone areas. There are very strong laws on fire restrictions and bans within all states. N.S.W. has experienced massive fire events in bushland and on farmland yet, there is an exemption on **flaring** in the Pilliga Gasfield. This practice is still happening risking the lives and livelihoods of many people. In the past our local Rural Fire Services have gone to large fires at the Warrumbungle Mountains, St Ivan's at Dunedoo they also assist out of the area wherever necessary and this was necessary for the wild fires of 2019 – 2020 in eastern states. These fires were impossible to control so how much more dangerous is it when you put a Gasfield into the mix. There are major concerns about the **flaring process** in the Pilliga Forest.

- Excessive summer temperatures and strong windy days causing bushfire issues are bad enough without the added risk of flaring, coupled with regular dry drought conditions.
- An ignited leaf can travel 60 meters and ignite other dry leaves and grass.
- Fire Brigades will have to fight fires in a Gasfield putting many lives at extra considerable risk.

 When the fire brigades draw necessary water from dams and bores in and around the project area to

extinguish bushfires, they could be using unsafe contaminated water. This has raised much concern.

The salt and toxic residue generated from this project will need to be disposed of and this also can cause major issues to surrounding areas. There has been no satisfactory explanation as to how this will be dealt with. The intentions of the disposal of this waste, should definitely be suitabley decided, before the project can be considered, and be dealt with without any contamination to the environment.

NOT MINIMALLY OR MANAGEABLE

CSG is harmful to our health. What price is life? The health of the community should be the Government's main priority. We have seen reports from various places in Australia and overseas where people are getting extremely ill when they live near CSG projects. There are unexplained illnesses found in people who now live near a gasfield. Small children with unexplainable neurological problems. If the people that make the decisions are not compassionate about the community's wellbeing and are prepared to risk the health of the community then maybe they should look at the cost affective side of these ongoing illnesses.

The cost on human wellbeing, life and on our Medical System is not worth taking chances with.

Meat and Livestock Australia require livestock farmers to fill out a National Vendor Declaration. In the document it is required to declare any chemicals given to stock prior to sale. The chemicals pumped from wells producing CSG can contaminate aquifers, then, stock drinking water from bores and dams fed by those aquifers can be affected by toxic chemicals. This would mean that not only are the stock exposed to the toxic chemical risking their life but the farmer is also making an illegal false declaration and the toxic meat will be sold for human consumption. More issues for farmers employment and the integrity of our meat industry. Again, no guarantees farmers won't have their farms and livelihoods put at risk.

A project of this size has a large amount of infrastructure and this will mean a lot more forest removal or taking over farmland for gasfield use. There will be a large amount of extra traffic and trucks on our roads. Wide and heavy loads will be a major issue on the highways, damaging the road surfaces and holding up the traffic flow. This can cause potential traffic hazards and accidents.

We are a community relying totally on ground water and apart from a, hand-picked invitation only, Hydro-Geologist Presentation, headed up by Jock Laurie, on 17th February 2015, we have received little if any consultation. I was invited to this meeting along with a small number of farmers, business people and few Council representitives. Presenters were Jock Laurie, a scientist, a stenographer and 2 "CSG boys". The presentation went through and several questions were asked. We were told with most of the questions that they didn't have the information and would source the answers and get back to us. Apart from the presentation, no communication or answers were received.

- I asked if their was any guarantees that the people in the area would not have there water supply contaminated by this industy and that they could go on with their businesses and farming with confidence, and said, a huge amount of people on the land are working their family generational farmland? This question was answered by Mr Laurie saying "there are no guarantees and he expressed that I was too emotional". Yes, I am emotional. When everything you have worked for and put in for your future and your family is at risk, normal people become extremely emotional.
- Another question was asked to the "CSG boys" about the well integrity and the answer was "it will last into perpetuity". I have noticed this word in the Assessment, Narrabri Gas Project, page v, dot point 6, point 4.

I am struggling to comprehend how anyone who is dealing with this issue can prove that it would last into perpetuity. Research tells me Perpetuity, as of the Perpetuities & Accumulations Act 2009 is 125 years. The NSW Government's Code of Practice for Coal Seam Gas Well Integrity (Well Integrity Code), which reflects international best practice was designed in 2012.

PERPETUITY FOR THE INTEGRITY OF THE WELLS CANNOT HAVE BEEN PROVEN FOR THIS DOCUMENT. THIS PROOF WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE UNTIL, AT A MINIMUM, THE YEAR 2145.

It has been reported that Santos has said,

"Narrabri project can lead the rural regions economy out of the Covid 19 crisis".

Narrabri Gas Project has projected that production could be ready in 2023. They still must secure an approved pipeline and finalise some requirements. Now the drought has eased, farmers are looking more promisingly towards a good season, the rural regions should be able to pull themselves out of the Covid 19 economic disaster. Santos seems to forget farmers have been through economic issues with drought many times before and are a very resilient bunch. We do not need the help off this insidiously dangerous industry which is threatening our lives, families and livelihoods.

I consider all the above points, plus a myriad of others, to be valid reasons to reject this project. In my opinion there are too many ways this project can cause extremely detrimental damage. Damage can occur solely from HUMAN ERROR and there are no guarantees it won't, as it has in the past. People's lives and livelihoods and their huge contribution to the economy should take first consideration. I have been part of a local group of many people who are concerned about their land, livelihoods and families. People just seeking straight forward facts about their futures.

Five years ago my grandson, then 14, told me that he had spoken to his science teacher and asked him to help him research CSG. After reading what it said he called me and said, "Nan, how is it that they are thinking about doing this to the water and environment? It is way to dangerous, and that's NOT ROCKET SCIENCE"!!!!. He is still asking if it has been stopped.

Thankyou for reading my submission and I hope you will consider my many concerns with a straight forward common sense decision. It just isn't safe for our water and lives if there are any doubts.

Signed.

La Franci