

MEETING MINUTES

Narrabri Gas Project (NGP)

Biodiversity Advisory Group (BAG)

Meeting # 3

DATE / TIME

08 September 2022
9:30am

LOCATION

Santos meeting room
Maitland Street, Narrabri

FACILITATOR

Garry West

MINUTE TAKER

Lyn Firth

ATTENDEES

- ◆ Garry West (Independent Chair)
- ◆ Servaes van der Meulen (Environmental Consultant)
- ◆ Liz Dunlop (online)
- ◆ Isaac Mamott (Independent Expert)

- ◆ Ken Flower (Community Member)
- ◆ Steve Phillips (independent Expert) (online)
- ◆ Ben Ellisnn (BCD Representative) (online)
- ◆ Todd Dunn (Santos Project Manager)

APOLOGIES

- ◆ Kathryn Hamilton (Community Member)
- ◆ Trudy Staines (Community Member)
- ◆ Samantha Wynn (BCD Representative)
- ◆ Patrick Tapp (Independent Expert)

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSIONS
1. Welcome	The Chair welcomed the Advisory group and acknowledged Gomeroi country on which the meeting was held as well as Elders past, present and future and all Aboriginal persons present.
2. Declaration of interest	The Chair asked if there were any new declarations of interest. Nil.
3. Minutes of previous meeting	Minutes from the previous meeting were accepted with no changes to the circulated copy.
4. Actions outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Santos/BCS/FCNSW/ Steve Phillips – Koala Research Proposal [With DPE for review] • Santos/FCNSW – Hazard reduction burning and timber harvesting within monitoring control/reference and rehab. Sites. [Completed] • Santos/PAG – condition B44 – staged retirement of offsets.[Carried Forward]
5. Correspondence	Nil

6. Presentation

Presentation (as attached) – Todd.

Santos half-year results for 2022 released 17th August

- Reflects first half year since merger with Oil Search
- Upwards pressure on commodity prices resulting in higher revenue
- Purchase of Hunter Gas Pipeline Pty Ltd on 11.8.22
- Final investment decision announced on Pikka Unit joint Venture on North Slope of Alaska.

Narrabri Gas Project Update

Management plans continue to be worked on

Q. Has the bio-diversity plan been approved?

A. Feedback has been received, but it has not been approved yet.

Hunter Gas Pipeline Overview

This has been a well-received announcement

Q. Is the business case based on sharing energy from both Qld and NSW with the rest of the East Coast?

A. The initial focus is to develop the Narrabri to Hexham section of the pipeline that will deliver Narrabri gas to the domestic market. The pipeline could potentially connect the Wallumbilla Gas Supply Hub in Queensland to NSW, providing a second route to southern markets for Queensland gas and add competition to the domestic market.

Q. Will this pipeline be part of this advisory group?

A. No but Santos will provide feedback and updates at these meetings.

Q. Is there scope with regard to the easements?

A. There is an approved corridor, and the easements can be moved within that corridor if necessary. It is a balancing act with regards to practicality, landholder considerations and ecological surveys. We are committed to finding the the right balance.

7. Field Development Plan (FDP)

The Consultation process with regard to the FDP will be to present the plan to the advisory group and then release for consultation. This will be consistent with all the advisory groups. It is hoped that the turnaround time will be relatively short as the Field Development Plan is a summary of the plans submitted to NSW Government for assessment(2-4 weeks). All advisory groups, councils, government departments are engaged in this plan.

The feedback process is set out and is as it has been in the past – see attached slide.

Presented by Servaes van der Meulen (Environmental Consultant) – refer to attached presentation.

The Field Development Plans (FDP) does not provide anything new as such but is a summary of previous Management Plans. It is only for Phase 1 but does not address the Seismic Surveys which will be presented as a future revision.

The FDP provides a lot of detail about individual well pads and identifies constraints mapping process so it clearly states what conditions have been met for each piece of infrastructure.

This presentation will provide a summary or individual examples of that.

Q. Are they approximate locations?

A. No – in this presentation locations are not finalized but, the plan presents final locations. There are many constraints and conditions governing the location of a site, and the mapping shows how these factors are micro-sited for a specific site.

Phase 1 Proposed Infrastructure

Shallow water monitoring bores are on already existing well pads - this is to tie in with the commitments we have made as part of the ground water management plan with DPE Water to make sure we have the monitoring locations placed appropriately.

Locational criteria as per consent condition B1

Sensitive receivers and amenity

Q. What forced the condition of pilot wells being 250metres apart?

A. This was actually a Santos commitment but it was adopted by DPE so that this requirement was part of the formal conditions.

Through discussions with the DPE, there is an avenue within the consent that environmental outcomes need to be improved over time so that if there is an opportunity for the conditions to be reviewed for Phase 2.

Water resources

Q. Are there any wetlands rather than water courses within the area?

A. No. Most of the water courses are ephemeral.

Biodiversity constraints

Q. Will the FDP show any examples of threatened flora shown at the proposed road sites?

A. Yes.

Q. Regarding location criteria, is there a credit expression or is it a barefaced consent?

A. The FDP doesn't address credits because this is dealt with in BMP and biodiversity strategy. This FDP takes the summary and agreement and puts it into action.

Q. Is there just a need to comply with a hectare limit in terms of clearing?

A. Yes. However, there is the catch all condition (A1) reducing environmental impact. Per the clearing procedure in the BMP and taking into consideration high/low value vegetation or plant communities, we are well below limits for Phase 1.

Todd – What we are doing currently is extremely minor. In subsequent phases, we will need to be tracking the numbers and comparing to the consent conditions to make sure we are below the consent requirements for every species across the disturbance area as listed in the consent. We need to make sure that the offsets being acquired will meet these requirements.

Q. The impact per well seems very high and if this is extrapolated out, the entire project will not meet the consent limits.

A. The impact per well is high for Phase 1 due to the required access tracks and gathering system. The entire project is approved for 425 well pads and 850 wells but we do not expect to develop this many.

Q. Are the numbers set out on the biodiversity flora species - is that data from the survey or from the more recent siting?

A. That is from the BMP and the numbers are from micro-siting surveys.

Q. Are these impact limits set out in the BMP?

A. Yes – in the BMP submitted to the Department. The conditions are set out in B4(f). The process is in the BMP and the results of the micro siting plus how we've incorporated that into the final placing is in the FDP.

Q (Steve Phillips) I acknowledge the ecological constraints is based on information available at the time of the original DA and the consent that followed, but the sensitivity analysis and overall understanding of ecological constraints has changed since then. Is there a mechanism to allow the ecological constraints to be reviewed in terms of changes that are happening in the conservation status of some of the animals that has taken place subsequent to the approvals? Does this warrant a heightened review analysis and response for some species that may sit below the ranking system?

A. The assessment is based on the legislation as it stood at the time. As the regulations get updated these can't be retrospectively applied.

Q. What species have had a significant change in that 4-year period?
A. The koala has changed their rating – it has gone from vulnerable to endangered. Some birds, for example, the glossy black cockatoo was affected by the bushfires and its breeding grounds take on more importance. There needs to be an emphasis on the hollow bearing trees, especially the large ones which are important in this context. Breeding birds are sensitive to disturbance. Creek lines need to be buffered.

Todd indicated that they would consider this, noting that the existing consent has consideration for hollow bearing trees and all waterways have existing buffers built into the consent.

Comment - The BMP gives an overall summary of what would be undertaken in a micro siting survey to validate and verify PCT extent and species survey. The devil is in the detail – each species has its own survey period required, target survey, PCT identification verification needs its own processes - needs to be well laid out. Every decision point in terms of getting PCT extent and target survey need to be well laid out in FDP so it can be reviewed as it applies to the consent.

Aboriginal heritage.

Q. What is the legend?

A. Refer to the map - the redder the shaded area, the higher the sensitivity for Aboriginal heritage.

Q. So it that the further from the waterways, the higher the sensitivity?

A. Not necessarily – probably will be on the edge of the waterways and tributaries. This is all micro-sited with buffer distances built into the consent. As you get closer to the ranges, cultural heritage becomes more sensitive or significant.

The approved cultural heritage officers walk any of the areas using micro-siting principles. Santos apply the avoidance principle in much the same ways as the identification of sensitive flora and fauna areas.

Historical Heritage

Extensive survey done and the consent requirement is to locate the sensitive areas and avoid them.

Micro-siting – ecological field scouting

The slide shows one of the well pads. Shows how the original site changed based on the conditions provided.

Q. Will the trees be retained and stockpiled for future rehabilitation?

A. The framework for this is captured in the rehabilitation plan. Hollow bearing trees, logs etc will be reused in the rehabilitation process. Undergrowth will be mulched. Habitat trees will be used. Topsoil will be stockpiled. When the construction is completed, the rehabilitation process will commence. BMP has lots of information about the clearing process.

Q. Is there any assessment technique done for koalas?

A. Everything was provided by the ecological team based on the micro-siting technique.

Q. Will the methodology be in FDP?

A. The micro-siting process was covered in the biodiversity management plan with the detailed assessment to be provided in the FDP.

Construction requirements

Q. How do these air quality constraints compare to farming?

A. Not sure there are any restrictions for farmers.

Performance Criteria

Q. Is the rehabilitation plan with the DPE?

A. The Rehabilitation Plan is with the Resource Regulator for assessment.

Q. Is the restoration plan publicly available?

General Business	<p>A. Not yet. Once approved, it will be.</p> <p>DPE is reviewing the BMP and they will provide that to the Resource Regulator to ensure there is consistency.</p> <p>Q. Ken Flower – What is the relative impact to other infrastructure projects of the Santos project and would this relative impact be available to the public? This is important in terms of the social license. It is important to be able to have this information available to the public in plain English.</p> <p>A. Todd Dunn – High level message is important. The way we site infrastructure minimises environmental impact. Applying the constraints minimises impact. We will take on the feedback to provide fact sheets including any comparisons.</p> <p>Q. Does Santos have any experience in rehabilitation? A. Yes</p> <p>Q. Is Pilliga sandstone conducive to rehabilitation? A. Yes. Santos have rehabilitated around 15 sites in the Pilliga. Santos has a high level of confidence with what they have done in the past. However, the Pilliga ecology is highly responsive to water, so the results are better in the wet years.</p> <p>The Release of FDP</p> <p>Timeframe – Final information is still coming through. The likely time of release is the week commencing Monday 19th September.</p> <p>There are two background documents that form the basis of the FDP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Conditions of consent. – especially B1, B2 and B3. 2) Field Development Protocol – on the website which has been approved. <p>Pre-reading will help the understanding of the plan.</p> <p>Timeframes – consultation will be about a fortnight from when you receive the plan.</p> <p>Nil</p> <p>Meeting Closed 11:10pm</p>
------------------	--

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY	DUE DATE
1	Circulate Draft FDP for Consultation	Chair	ASAP

Next Meeting (TBC) Early November