



Impacts of CSG need to be taken into account
Lynden Jacobi to: csg.review

25/04/2013 11:32 AM

From: Lynden Jacobi <lyndenjacobi@gmail.com>

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

History: This message has been replied to and forwarded.



CSG submission to chief scientist.docx It is absolutely necessary to find or commission truly independent sources of information in order to develop fact sheets so that decisions made are not reliant on industry information.

My concerns are

- Unacceptable contribution to global warming through leaking methane and unsustainable use of a fossil fuel
- - Damage to health and well being
- - Detrimental effects on the environment

There should be a ban on CSG exploration and mining as its contribution to global warming is unacceptable.

CSG has been put forward as a transition fuel and is considered to have a lower carbon footprint than coal. Although it is true that the burning of gas is more efficient and releases less carbon than the burning of coal, if the leakage of methane into the atmosphere is taken into account the overall impact over a hundred year period would be only slightly better than coal if at all. The Global Warming Potential of methane is 21 times that of carbon. It is important we don't replace emissions of carbon with methane. Wells do leak. A recent Queensland report found that over 50% of the wells tested were leaking.

If gas is considered a transition fuel to a low carbon economy, why the haste to expand the industry to take advantage of the export markets now? CSG is risky and non-conventional. Surely it would be better to look into other less risky non-conventional methods of power generation that are not reliant on finite fossil fuel reserves. Wind power and solar-thermal power could allow us cleaner and carbon-free energy into the future.

There should be a ban on CSG as there is a real risk of contamination of the water table.

CSG has been shown to have detrimental effects on the environment, health and communities. Environmentally, the CSG is potentially more destructive than coal mining but unlike coal mining, there are no easy rehabilitation measures.

Chemicals and compounds involved with CSG mining can be unintentionally released into the surrounds even without their use by the industry. Many are present in the coal seams and are brought to the surface with extraction. The banning of these chemicals from the extraction process will not stop them seeping into the groundwater or prevent accidental contamination

of surrounding areas through accidental spillage of 'produced' water, or permeation from evaporative ponds into the groundwater, streams and rivers. Contamination cannot be easily remediated.

There should be a ban on CSG as there is an unacceptable risk of damage to the health and well being of the environment and communities.

As well as the contamination of the water there are toxins released into the air by the gas flares at well sites.

There is a possibility that the reduction in pressure when ground water is extracted will cause a drop in the ground/bore water leaving it inaccessible to current bore water users.

Other impacts are noise, dust and sound pollution, increased traffic, and destruction and fragmentation of habitat. Considering the recent suggestion that wind farms have a buffer of 2 km from dwellings, it seems that the 200 meters required for CSG is totally unacceptable. CSG should not be allowed in urban areas, areas of conservation value (which as far as I am concerned is just about everywhere), areas where the water table or river systems may be affected, or agricultural land.

CSG is not necessary and it is outrageous that we are pushing through an industry that, in every country it has been developed, has been shown to cause irreversible damage to health, environment and communities.

It is absolutely necessary to find or commission truly independent sources of information in order to develop fact sheets so that decisions made are not reliant on industry information.

My concerns are:

- Unacceptable contribution to global warming through leaking methane and unsustainable use of a fossil fuel
- Damage to health and well being
- Detrimental effects on the environment

There should be a ban on CSG exploration and mining as its contribution to global warming is unacceptable.

CSG has been put forward as a transition fuel and is considered to have a lower carbon footprint than coal. Although it is true that the burning of gas is more efficient and releases less carbon than the burning of coal, if the leakage of methane into the atmosphere is taken into account the overall impact over a hundred year period would be only slightly better than coal if at all. The Global Warming Potential of methane is 21 times that of carbon. It is important we don't replace emissions of carbon with methane. Wells do leak. A recent Queensland report found that over 50% of the wells tested were leaking.

If gas is considered a transition fuel to a low carbon economy, why the haste to expand the industry to take advantage of the export markets now? CSG is risky and non-conventional. Surely it would be better to look into other less risky non-conventional methods of power generation that are not reliant on finite fossil fuel reserves. Wind power and solar-thermal power could allow us cleaner and carbon-free energy into the future.

There should be a ban on CSG as there is a real risk of contamination of the water table.

CSG has been shown to have detrimental effects on the environment, health and communities. Environmentally, the CSG is potentially more destructive than coal mining but unlike coal mining, there are no easy rehabilitation measures.

Chemicals and compounds involved with CSG mining can be unintentionally released into the surrounds even without their use by the industry. Many are present in the coal seams and are brought to the surface with extraction. The banning of these chemicals from the extraction process will not stop them seeping into the groundwater or prevent accidental contamination of surrounding areas through accidental spillage of 'produced' water, or permeation from evaporative ponds into the groundwater, streams and rivers. Contamination cannot be easily remediated.

There should be a ban on CSG as there is an unacceptable risk of damage to the health and well being of the environment and communities.

As well as the contamination of the water there are toxins released into the air by the gas flares at well sites.

There is a possibility that the reduction in pressure when ground water is extracted will cause a drop in the ground/bore water leaving it inaccessible to current bore water users.

Other impacts are noise, dust and sound pollution, increased traffic, and destruction and fragmentation of habitat. Considering the recent suggestion that wind farms have a buffer of 2 km from dwellings, it seems that the 200 meters required for CSG is totally unacceptable. CSG should not be allowed in urban areas, areas of conservation value (which as far as I am concerned is just about everywhere), areas where the water table or river systems may be affected, or agricultural land.

CSG is not necessary and it is outrageous that we are pushing through an industry that, in every country it has been developed, has been shown to cause irreversible damage to health, environment and communities.