

**From:** [Kerrie L Matchett](#)  
**To:** [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Narrabri Gas Project  
**Date:** Friday, 21 August 2020 4:57:27 PM

---

Dear Commissioners

RE: NARRABRI GAS PROJECT

*The Department has concluded that the Narrabri Gas Project represents ESD as it:*

- *is development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs;*

I disagree with the department's view. This project will see draw down of water pressure and damage the recharge bed within the lifetime of current and future generations. Santos' own submission acknowledges that these negative effects may take years or decades to be fully realised, and possibly hundreds of years to recuperate if ever.

Communities and industries in the NorthWest region rely on the security and integrity of the G.A.B. and this project does compromise their ability for current and future generations to meet their needs.

The project is also not necessary to meet the needs of the present generation. There are other already approved projects that could service the current gas needs, there is a glut of gas on the world market that could be tapped into, there are policy mechanisms that can be implemented and explored first, and the AEMO has stated that the present demand for gas is not as pressing as Santos or the Department of Planning have indicated and that demand is highly likely to decrease over the coming decades as more renewable energy comes into the energy market.

- *would exploit a significant natural gas resource in a sustainable way and provide substantial economic and social benefits for NSW and the Narrabri region;*

*The exploitation of the natural gas in the Southern Recharge (Pilliga State Forrest) is not 'sustainable'. It is a once-off affair. The economic and social benefits for NSW, and Narrabri region in particular, will not be 'substantial' especially in light of the Chief Scientists Recommendations not being implemented yet including current conditions around royalty payments and the community benefit fund. The Department of Planning has also not taken into account the significant economic risk and burden that landholders will bare through insurance and other risks. Nor have they considered any examples of the economic and social burdens on communities with CSG projects in QLD.*

*would not cause serious or irreversible environmental damage;*

Current operations by Santos, including spills, have already caused serious and irreversible environmental damage. The Department cannot guarantee this would be the case due to the uncertainty and limited data on the lowest layers of geological formations (under the aquifers)

The Department admits this when they refer to the Precautionary Principle.

While there is some scientific uncertainty about the likely localised impacts of the project, principally due to the limited information available on the deeper geological strata due to the lack of development in these strata historically, the Department considers these uncertainties have been adequately addressed in the assessment through the use of conservative assumptions, and that this assessment clearly identifies the range and magnitude of the potential impacts of the project.

The Department appears to be taking the view that what has occurred elsewhere, such as negative impacts in Qld or the United States of America, does not need to be considered as a precaution. They appear to be assessing this project on 'assumptions' that there will not be the same irreversible effects and then argue that they require to drill to gain data on this localised area before the precautionary principle can be assessed or applied.

Communities have heard this argument over and over. That damage in another region shouldn't be considered because the geological strata is different to "insert current project location" and although we don't know *how* different it is, we will know after we drill and then we can adapt our management of the project to suit. Fast forward 10 years and the same problems and negative effects occur. I urge the IPC not to take the Department's view of the precautionary principle as we are guaranteed to see the same irreversible problems and damage to our Great Southern Recharge, Pilliga State Forrest and the Agricultural businesses of the private landholders affected by the Narrabri Gas project.

Kind regards  
Kerrie Matchett  
Moree 2400

P.S. Santos' submission has a lot of missing information including sentences that finish mid way and missing data on Appendices.