

**From:** [Sonya Marshall](#)  
**To:** [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#); [Sonya Marshall](#)  
**Subject:** subsequent objection to the NGP  
**Date:** Friday, 21 August 2020 2:38:46 PM

---

## **Subsequent Objection to the NGP**

### **Second Deadline Friday 21<sup>st</sup> August**

#### **In reply to Santos additional material entitled “Submission to IPC following Public Hearing”.**

We still object to the NGP. Santos have not provided any further information that allays our fears on any topic but these will all be covered by other people. One of our main concerns is the GAB but these will be covered by independent experts in their field.

Insurance will be a major concern for our business. My queries per my first submission still stand. The assertions Santos made have not been backed up by any hard evidence. They have not provided the names of any companies that will provide the insurance required by either the landholder or our bank – which effectively owns the asset. They talk about general insurance or public liability but that is only the minimum insurance required. Why, when we have spent years building relationships with our insurers do we have to suddenly change due to something we don't even want? If we can get all required insurance with no extra work, cost, onus of proof of who/what caused the insurable incident on our behalf – show us. We need written proof, on letterhead, that our insurance and also our finance arrangements from our bank are all still available.

What happens when we do not ‘host’ the activity and have no conduct and compensation agreement? Neither Santos nor our insurance company will insure us.

How does ‘self insure’ work if they have sold out, gone broke or simply left as the gas is all gone. Problems will not stop because they have left. The infrastructure, bores etc left behind will be a harmful legacy forever. Well integrity will be a permanent problem. Please see Dr Anthony Ingraffea's submission.

The government response to the *The implementation of the recommendations contained in the NSW Chief Scientist's Independent Review of Coal Seam Gas Activities in New South Wales* is due on Thursday 27/8/2020.

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/committees/inquiries/Pages/inquiry-details.aspx?pk=2557#tab-reportsandgovernmentresponses> If they have not brought this to your attention you must ask why. It will be similar to the Departments late submission to the IPC and will say they have met many of the Chief Scientists recommendations. Just remember they said that before and it took this NSW Inquiry to determine just how many of the recommendations had not been met.

If both Santos and the Department say any issue is ‘sorted’ why can't we see the proof. Words are meaningless, we need proof of all their assertions prior to any work on or under our land.

Thank you,

Sonya Marshall.