

First name (required)	Last name (required)	Email address	I consent to my personal information being provided to the proponent.	I consent to my name appearing in the published summary of consultation.	I am commenting on behalf of an organisation.	Organisation (required)	Comment on proposal including any objections or claims	Attach files	Add attachment	Add another attachment	ID	Created
Tim	Macknay	TMacknay@edowa.org.au		Yes		Enviornmental Defenders Office	Please view the attached document	Attachement 03 - REDACTION NOT REQUIRED - FOR PROPONENT - Public Comment - Scarborough Proposal - Woodside Energy Limited	Attachement 04 - REDACTION NOT REQUIRED - FOR PROPONENT - Public Comment - Scarborough Proposal - Woodside Energy Limited			
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		Yes		Western Gas	Please view the attached document	Attachement 01 - REDACTION NOT REQUIRED - FOR PROPONENT - Public Comment - Scarborough Proposal - Woodside Energy Limited	Attachement 02 - REDACTION NOT REQUIRED - FOR PROPONENT - Public Comment - Scarborough Proposal - Woodside Energy Limited			
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	No	Yes	No		<p>It is clear reviewing all combined impacts from the scarborough project that offsetting residual impacts (e.g. on protected matters impacted including but not limited to pygmy blue whales, other whales/cetaceans, seabirds, whale sharks, turtles, commonwealth marine area. In addition, cumulative impacts of the O&G industry operating on the NW shelf should be taken into account here i.e. considering what's there already and what is planned to come and what may reasonably be expected to come in future, the cumulative impacts on the MNES of the marine environment are nothing short of significant) should occur because the project is not delivering net biodiversity benefit. EPBC policy and international impact assessment process (hierarchy of control) requires offsets to be considered in such circumstances which result in a net biodiversity benefit from the project.
</p> <p>Note, I don't think like for like offsets are appropriate or required in the case of scarborough, however there should be a strong case of indirect offsets which add value to the broader region from a biodiversity perspective.
</p> <p>Implementing this will ensure the impact assessment follows EPBC policy (http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/epbc-act-environmental-offsets-policy) and is consistent with international practice for impact assessment (see bottom of page 16 https://www.unepfi.org/fileadmin/documents/biodiversity_offsets.pdf and principle 7 of https://www.iaia.org/uploads/pdf/SP3%20Biodiversity%20Ecosystem%20Services%2018%20Jan.pdf). These standards, and many more like them apply to setting the acceptable levels of impact of the project as a whole - no net loss of biodiversity.</p>					

30/08/2019 4:42PM

iinuzegocol	upplakovac	eupoqala@eerr.namnerbca.com	Yes	Yes	No	<p>http://mewkid.net/order-amoxicillin/ - Amoxicillin Online &Amoxil Side Affects</p>	31586	30/07/2019 13:25
evaehaxa	axoeequbab	uvovarit@eerr.namnerbca.com	Yes	Yes	No	<p>http://mewkid.net/order-amoxicillin/ - Amoxicillin Without Prescription &Amoxicillin No Prescription</p>	31585	30/07/2019 12:59
█	█		Yes	Yes	No	<p>Great to see another project in the planning. W/A and communities like Exmouth need these projects to go ahead to create secure long term jobs</p>	31583	22/07/2019 14:34
█	█	█	No	Yes	No	<p>Its great to see these projects going ahead and delivering much needed employment opportunities and opportunities for local businesses under the companies local content policy. In particular the Exmouth community has suffered from all this activity happening offshore for many years now yet very little economic benefit to the town or meaningful contracts for the town and its community.

Get it going as soon as possible and push as much work through Exmouth as practicable. Dont let the loud voices of the minoritys drown out the support of the silent majority. The Exmouth community wants it and it is in line with the shire councils strategic plans.</p>	31582	15/07/2019 17:43
Michael	Wilson	michael.wilson1946@gmail.com	Yes	Yes	No	<p>The Scarborough Development proposal is an excellent opportunity for further expansion of Australia's gas resource potential.
This development should be fully endorsed by all Australians for the benefit of all Australians.</p>	31580	11/07/2019 9:27
Peter	Aird	kingdom_drilling@msn.com	Yes	Yes	No	<p>What capping plan is in place to meet highest risk ie a spill results from a leaking well.
We know from Macondo failings majority of loss / risk resulted from spill.
Why has little been done by operators / regulators to assure that a faster safer capping system is not in place for offshore projects.
Ie a system designed around a Xmas tree that can be kept on site in the field to be able to respond to cap and kill a well in hrs vs days or weeks of spillage that could result to meet worst case needs?
There are systems available eg Abel Engineering well control specialists etc.
Why is such a safer better cheaper faster response system not to be used?</p>	31579	7/07/2019 14:32

Michael Wyatt michael.wyatt159@yahoo.com.au Yes

Yes No

I think that this project should go ahead with the caveat that cheaper gas is made available for Western Australia.

What would be even better is that the AU government develops the fields, undertake all production and distribution / sales of LNG. That way Au would have a sustainable income for years to come. Not only that all future exploration and development of fields should be under the control of the AU government not a foreign government or company.

With this then could be the AU engineering rig/ship building capability to ensure jobs and growth for AU

31578 6/07/2019 17:30