



Health Effects of CSG

Sally Chapman to: csg.review

25/04/2013 07:18 AM

From: Sally Chapman <yarras.sal@gmail.com>

To: csg.review@chiefscientist.nsw.gov.au

History: This message has been replied to and forwarded.

Dear Sir or Madam,

It so happens that my mother resides in the US State of Pennsylvania. Because of HER dire situation, I was greatly dismayed to hear that this dangerous technology was about to be imposed upon the residents of nearby Gloucester, indeed upon all my fellow citizens.

There are health risks that are associated with the emissions and the dust. There are health and safety issues associated with the increase in truck movements, and in the potential for the spread of toxins through their activities.

But even these serious matters are relatively benign compared to the many, many health hazards associated with the WATER involved.

Water in the seam must be extracted, bringing up heavy metals, radioactivity and a range of salts from deep underground -- 'produced water.' This is usually stored in vast plastic-lined ponds. Leaks occur. Floods occur, spreading the 'produced water' over a wide area, and mixing it into the flood waters covering the land. There are cases where this water is being used on roads for dust suppression.

The 'fracking fluids' used in the process of CSG extraction are a toxic stew of chemicals, sand and water. Injected deep underground under very high pressure -- high enough to crack rocks! over a vast area -- thus releasing the gas. Unfortunately, the gas can also seep into the disturbed aquifer, either from the fracking process itself or from casing failures. (The casings maintain their rated integrity for approximately 15 years -- approximately the duration of a fracked well's productive life, which portends dangerous additional risks to health in the future) Farmers and graziers find their bores spoilt; they and their animals ill from the poisons that seep into their environment. In Pennsylvania, the abundant natural water can no longer be used for residents' needs. A truck delivers potable water to each household's 'buffalo tank'. The poisoned water is, however, still being used for agricultural purposes, with the outcomes of that experiment on people yet to be determined. Does not the precautionary principle apply to the expansion of this industry into rural Gloucester? Or anywhere?

The potential cost of the negative effects of CSG extraction are so high that it seems reasonable to at least consider that cost in the decision making process. The externalities imposed upon the wider community are far too great for this industry to be expanded. Living things just don't stay healthy in a poisoned environment.

Yours truly,

Sally Chapman

PO Box 230

Wauchope 2446

(02) 65877244

yarras.sal@gmail.com