

Action Item 32.1 Questions to Santos

Question to Santos at the April 2018 NGPCCC

To SANTOS

From the February 2018 Meeting Summary

- Representative from People for the Plains tabled a question directed to Santos from a member of that group in relation to Sulphate Reducing Bacteria which will be responded to out of session.

31.5 Questions tabled by PFTP to Santos – Sulphate Reducing Bacteria STO

Q. When will I get the response concerning the levels of SRB in the Aquifers surrounding the gas wells?

The initial response to my question was did not answer the original question, which was a question around the levels of SRB in the groundwater on the outside of Santos' Gas wells.

When the question was resubmitted Santos was provided with a water analysis that Santos had provided to the earlier Santos CCC which showed SRB in a Santos operated water bore at Bibblewindi which is very close to Bibblweindi 1 and another at Bibblewindi 5.

Can I please have the response in writing as indicated by the referenced Action number 31.5?

RESPONSE:

Refer response to Action Item 31.5 *Questions tabled by PFTP to Santos – Sulphate Reducing Bacteria*

From the April monthly Activities Update

Q. Why is the Lucerne crop at Leewood not being irrigated?

Santos in the REF for Leewood Produced Water Treatment and Beneficial Reuse Project (Leewood Phase 2) put forward a business case to grow a Lucerne crop to absorb most of the treated water and as such the time taken for any passage of salts into the ground water table would be long compared with say growing Wheat/Cotton rotation. (500 years verses approximately 50years).

Q. What will Santos now use the Treated Produced Water for if not to Irrigate a 5 cut per year Lucerne crop the was expected to return to Santos and the local economy economic benefits along with employment.

In the Information Request Response dated 22 February 2018 concerning the Lucerne Crop and the sale of that crop Santos' answer indicated that Santos never had any intention of selling the Lucerne to make a return on it. Yet in the REF, named above, Santos mounted a strong business case based on 5 cuts of Lucerne per year "which will increase the net productivity of the area from the current low productivity pasture (table 5.4)". (Reference page 27 of the Beneficial Reuse Project Agricultural Impact Statement)

I will also point out that the REF in question went to great lengths right throughout the document to point out the Benefits to the Local Economy and employment of using the Treated Produced Water from the coal seams.

Table 5.4 gives a total benefit from the Lucerne over and above grazing as being \$113,974.00.

This Business Plan would have increased the prospects of having the REF approved.

Q. As the response to the question indicates that the first cut was not sold and the responses to questions 3&4 indicate that the Lucerne was not grown for stock feed then why did Santos place into the REF information that would indicate that a good financial return would be made from Lucerne irrigated with Treated Produced Water from the coal seams?

Q. Will Santos inform this CCC and the inquiring members of People for the Plains what happened to the plant matter that was the First Cut Lucerne?

This question has been asked of both Mr D Banks and Ms A Moody, both had not responded.

Q. Will Santos now concede that the Lucerne experiment was an ill-advised venture or is Santos planning to keep growing Lucerne as per the REF, using the Treated Produced Water?

Last year Mr P Mitchley informed this CCC that Santos would not be responding to the following matters raised by a Government Department and the broader community.

These being: The Salts disposal, The Power and Compression Station, the Pipeline (The latter is understandable as it is not part of the Project EIS).

Q. In the Response to Submissions on the EIS for the Narrabri Gas Project, Is Santos still of the view that it will not answer concerns regarding the Salts and the Power/Compressor Station and if so what are the reasons for this decision?