

## Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracture Stimulation in WA Noonkanbah Public Meeting – 12 April 2018

### 1. INTERESTS REPRESENTED

- Tumakarraji people
- Wilirrkarra people
- Nyinyijarti people

### 2. SCOPE OF DISCUSSION / ISSUES TO ADDRESS

- a) Scientific analysis of risks: environmental, health, agricultural, heritage and community.
- b) Describe regulatory mechanisms that may be employed to mitigate or minimise risks to an appropriate level.

### 3. CONCERNS / RISKS

#### 3.1 Chemicals

- Concerned about chemicals that go into the ground, what the chemicals are, where they go, how long they stay there (persistence), their effects on water, land and air

#### 3.2 Regulation/monitoring

- Regulator (government) is not actually checking wells; no visits or inspections; but local people go and check up on what is going on as observers
- Government rules for operations are good, more strict than the United States, not worried about them

#### 3.3 Water

- Need to protect water
- Water is underground and surface; what about the flood season

##### Water quantity

- Risk to water supply; how close
- Concerned about water supply, food for cows and environment

##### Water quality

- Risk of fracking to quality of underwater springs; how close
- Bore water used for cattle

- What are specific ground conditions? Worried about well integrity, downstream impacts, surface impacts, water hole protection
- How do they know wells won't leak into water system, affect community and those further away

### **3.4 Human health**

- Primary concern – long term impacts; put the local people first; so far no impacts
- Health and safety, particularly during flaring

### **3.5 Environmental health**

- Kimberley is unique as a land mass; difference between soil in Australia and in the United States
- Soil and environment changes over short distances
- No concerns regarding wildlife or habitat loss from gas developments, including roads/tracks for exploration
- Evidence that vegetation on cleared tracks through the bush recovers in only a few years, and no erosion from tracks noted
- Ponds properly fenced off, all good - issue could be liner leakage
- Worried about gas leaks and may kill fauna
- Concern that impacts on water quality and quantity will affect animals, flora and fauna
- Flaring incident, near miss, but didn't damage any trees etc (all plants protected)

### **3.6 Country/community/amenity**

#### **Aboriginal cultural matters**

- Protection of the land should be a priority
- When working on existing wells, community took time to educate workers on environment and its importance

#### **Amenity**

- Unconcerned about increases in traffic
- Increase in local movements – potential to upgrade roads, bridge; currently have problems with access, particularly during wet season

#### **Sense of place/community/jobs**

- Not enough respect – local people will look after their own land
- Companies need to train local people with real jobs, bring resources back to community
- Looking for employment opportunities; jobs are a big priority

- Main issue is jobs, also need services; is a question of uncertainties v. opportunities; need future for kids, permanency (not short term); company provided training and jobs in security and with machinery; want to know what future is
- Good for young fellas to do work and stay in community
- Projects provide employment for young people
- Need companies to train locals to work on projects, not fly in fly out people, who have no respect for area; employed locals bring money into the community and it would help with community understanding of fracking
- Jobs is key concern for women; suicide rate a concern; workers don't interact with community
- Know about mine disasters in Papua New Guinea – white people issues; companies only care about money, not community

### **3.7 Information/communication issues**

- Cultural awareness training every three weeks
- Company took community/30+ people on a tour; got to see what was going on; community took company around and showed them the plants and animals, how to protect land, educated workers on environment and importance
- Communication with company and access was good
- Agreement with company (Asgard 1 well) that if anything went wrong, they would shut down the operation; waiting to hear results of fracking (gas or not)

## **4. Regulatory considerations; What regulatory mechanisms may be employed to mitigate or minimise risks to an acceptable level?**

- If mining goes ahead, community wants regular presentations so they understand; want involvement of the elders
- Community wants the company working locally to keep them informed of plans and developments
- Some concern about closure and rehabilitation
- Rehabilitate land, put land back to original state – how will this be done; Western Desert old wells still there
- Community wants to know what happens and who is responsible if something goes wrong

-oOo-