



## ***Katherine – Annette Raynor***

*Please be advised that this transcript was produced from a video recording. As such, the quality and accuracy of this transcript cannot be guaranteed and the Inquiry is not liable for any errors.*

**07 February 18**

***Katherine***

***Speaker: Annette Raynor***

Annette Raynor: My name's Annette Raynor, I'm here on behalf of myself.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Thank you. Yes, whenever you're ready.

Annette Raynor: Right. Good afternoon. Let me start by saying how disappointed I am with this report. I was hoping the community would be heard. However, if you accept all the figures in this report as facts, which I don't, but for the sake of the argument, say I do, well I could still drive the road train through this report. The facts and figures do not stack up. In front of me are the reports relating to your final report. Your final report, the CSIRO Report on well Life Integrity and Life Cycle, the ACIL Allen Economic Report, and the Coffey Social Licence Reports, which are three separate reports. I have read them all.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Thank you.

Annette Raynor: Let me start by saying thank you to the Panel for the recommendations in Chapter, 14 Regulatory Reform, and Chapter 15, Environmental Baseline Data. We all know the NT badly needs this, however as it is already been watered down and as the first time I sat in front of you, I said then it would not be enforced, I will not repeat myself. As far as Chapter 11 goes, as I am not an aboriginal, I will leave this to the aboriginals their selves to respond to. This is to ensure you cannot accuse me of giving any misleading or spreading any misinformation to you, the Panel.

Chapter 9, Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Well this chapter did my head in, but if it's like any of the other chapters, which I do understand, then the figures are simply made up. The only one thing I'll state as a comment on this, is on page 203 of your report, you state, and I quote, "That there is no evidence that the bubbling Condamine River is due to CSG activities." End quote.

All I can say to that, it's a good thing that no baseline data was done prior to the CSG activities to prove it. Chapter 8, Land. On page 169 you state that between 1,000 and 1,500m<sup>2</sup> will be used for the well pad development only. You make this sound insignificant, but this is for each well pad. So, let's put it into perspective.



I have here examples of what is approximately one kilometre squared, and this insignificant amount of land is the size of Sydney Olympic Park Wetlands and Waterways, Belmont Golf Club at Port Macquarie, [Pea Chang] Island in Hong Kong or the Old City of Jerusalem. This is per well pad, yet on pages 316 and 325, for the brief scenario only, you state that the total land use under this scenario is approximately 67 square kilometres. Well, that is approximately the size of Norfolk Island and Macau combined, or it's just slightly bigger than Bermuda. And yet again, on page 327 you reiterate, and I quote, "Land area used by industry is very small under all development scenarios", end quote. Once again you say this is acceptable.

Now, I know that the NT is a big place, and we have a small population, in the scheme of things around the world, and most of the population lives in Darwin, but this is not acceptable. The only other comment for this section is that you talk about landscape immunity, pages 187 through 190, and how small an area this will be, and it will not affect our landscape. Small area is, firstly an understatement, but I would suggest the Panel take a drive across the Barkly Highway at night. It is already flaring, it is already affecting a spectacular unspoiled landscape. This, I say is not acceptable.

Chapter 7, Water. Using your figures and applying it to the PFAS issue here in Katherine that we're now dealing with, the best case scenario is the Katherine River was only contaminated when we found out about it in 2016 and not before. Working backwards using your figures, this took 16 years to get from RAAF Base to north to the Katherine River, 1000 metres per year. Therefore, PFAS reached the Tindall Aquifer in the year 2000, this means that it took approximately 12 years to contaminate or seep down to the aquifer, 'cause Tindall opened in 1988. Now, this would correspond with your figures, on page 140, stating that any spill would take 10 years to reach the ground water, however it contradicts what you say on pages 114 and 137, stating it would only travel metres per year, and would take decades for the water to travel 100 metres.

Now, PFAS is only one chemical, not a multiple of chemicals mixed together put under pressure and then mixed with natural occurring nasties that occur underground, but I'll come back to that. Your matrix, even if I believe that the possibility is extremely low of contamination, the consequence must be extremely high. Unless, of course, you plan to live without water, therefore the overall outcome must be at least medium. You have found 20 water related risks, and it will only take one to have serious consequences. Even with regulations in place, this is not good enough, this is not acceptable.

Jumping out at chapter 10, Public Health. You find a low likelihood and a low to medium consequence, which was on page 231, of affecting any of us, well this ties nicely into the water issue so let's go back to those chemicals and other natural occurring nasties. I have here a list of fracking chemicals used from your website, from Santos and Origin's websites, so I'm going to have a look at just some of those not all of them just some of them. Now, all of these, except one state, 'cause these are all the MDS chemical sheds for them, all of these except one state, and I quote, "Do not allow any of the product to enter waterways, drains or sewers, or do not discharge into



drains, surface water and ground water". All of these state they must be transported under Dangerous Goods Transport Regulations.

All of these state, "If the product does enter a waterway, they must advise the Environmental Protection Authority", and this one states, "the runoff from diluted water may be toxic and/or corrosive and pollute waterways, do not allow this product to enter waterways, drains, and sewers". Now, these are individual chemical, they are not a multiple of mixtures, you cannot find any MDS sheets for the combination of any of the chemicals, let alone the natural occurring nasties that you are now bringing from the ground to the surface. Once again I ask the Panel to look at the big picture, this is not one chemical, one well being fracked once. This is a multiple, this is multiple chemicals, multiple wells being fracked multiple times, and once again you say this is acceptable.

But before I go any further let's have a look at what that word actually means. I've done some research from numerous dictionaries and they all say the same thing, acceptable is barely passable. It's 65%, it's satisfactory. Now, under that terminology I do not want to go to a Doctor that is acceptable, I do not want my pilot in an aircraft I'm travelling in to be acceptable. You may be able to live with that, but your acceptable to me is not good enough.

The Social Impacts, chapter 12, I don't know where to start with this one. You say in that chapter that will be updated when Coffey completes their report, well they have released it, their reports, now in three different sections. Two of the sections deal with how to set up a framework for the social licencing, the other section, which is the section I'm holding, is supposedly the Beetaloo Sub-basin's social licence case study, it's this area I'm going to discuss.

Most of the information in this document, any school age child with who could Google something, could present the information in here. On pages, six and nine, they both state there were two rounds of community consultations, not true. Page 10 says that the Katherine Town Council was consulted, and yet when I spoke to the Katherine Town Council on the 23rd of January, the mayor denied being spoken to, and the CEO could not recall. On page XVII, the conclusion, the report states, and I quote, "Concerns about water resources are heightened by the PFAS contamination in and around RAAF Base, Tindall and Katherine, and incorrect assumptions about water management based in CSG in Queensland", once again, not true.

But this is the only issue of any kind in this document that could even be remotely attributed to the one consultation Katherine had. Now, last time I sat in front of you, I spoke on this subject in depth. This report, and the Coffey report does not take anything previously stated to you into account. However, as far as your report goes, I will question why in bold on page 280 you would highlight, "fly in, fly out activists". After all you mentioned more than once misinformation to create fear, lacking understanding of technical facts, confusing CSG and shale, we're not locals. I thought this was a scientific report, but it seems it's only a scientific fact if it comes from a gas company, a government department whose primary job is the industry, a



consultant company who has never said anything against the gas industry, or a person and/or company who has been paid in some way by the gas industry. And in some circumstances, they are so behind these companies because it's so great, that they're selling their places and moving.

Everyone else who has presented or spoken knows absolutely nothing, finally on this subject, I know of at least two complaints that were lodged to you, the Panel. Over the second attempt of the social licence consultations, neither have been responded to or addressed, as such if you think I can believe this whole section, and take it seriously, well I'd question what planet you're living on. This does bring into doubt, not just this section, but the whole report for me.

Moving on, the last chapter I will speak about is the Economic Impact, chapter 13. I have used yours and ACIL Allen's figures and taken them as facts, and I could still drive that road train through the misinformation contained in this section. I am only using the brief scenario, and I am using your figures in the table of page 315 and 316, now just looking at those figures everything looks wonderful. So let's have a look in a little bit deeper. Increased employment, according to this, we can expect 2,145 extra jobs over the 25 years at an average of 82 per year. But the rest of Australia, loses that amount of jobs. Hm, I wonder where they all went. You admit on page 323 that fly in-fly out workers would be significant and therefore will take most of these jobs.

The other figures that are interesting, that we'll get per year as an average, is 6.2 million in income tax, in other federal and state taxes that's broken down to 3.8 million and 5.9 million giving us a total of 9.7 million. GST, a 14.3 million, payroll of 2.9 million and royalties of 11.9 million. Like I said, it all looks great. But when you go to the Australian Taxation Office, and I have here the ATO for 2013/'14, '14/'15 and '15/'16. And shock horror there's been no income tax paid to the Australian Government in 2015 or '16 by Santos or Origin. Matter of fact, Origin must have made a mistake because they did pay some in 2014. I also have from Santos and Origin, their own reports for 2014/'15 and '16, I am using those reports for the next lot of information. Due to the time that I'm sure is about to run out, I'm only-

Hon. Justice Pepper: No, you've got about 20 minutes left.

Annette Raynor: Oh, I only had 20 minutes.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Oh he put only 10 then. This is all great information so please continue.

Annette Raynor: I'm using only using the 2016 report from both Santos and Origin. Both paid no income tax, both paid no petroleum resource tax, both paid no goods and service tax. In fact, both received tax refunds. But let's look at the tax they did pay; Origin paid four million and Santos paid 5.04 million dollars for fringe benefits. Payroll tax, Origin paid 45 million, Santos paid 2.78 million. Royalties, Origin paid six million and Santos paid 30.26 million. Now all these figures are for the whole of Australia, not just one state, they're Australia wide. So using those figures alone and presuming that all the other



companies are very similar, we can say goodbye to the 6.2 million in income tax, we can say goodbye to at least some of, if not all, of the other state and federal taxes of 9.7 million. And the 14.3 million dollars in GST, we can kiss goodbye.

So this leaves us with maybe the FBT. Now for the payroll tax, I did some figures. And using the intake government own bits and pieces, I have here that we only received 5.5% and I've used their calculation of how to calculate payroll tax. So if we use all of that the amount is proximately, that you, quote, "We will get", is approximately 12% more than what Santos pays in total, Australia wide. Or approximately 6% more than Origin pays in total, Australia wide, not just for the NT. Now, admittedly, this 2.9 million per year would be spread over other companies and it wouldn't be just Santos and Origin paying it. But due to how the payroll taxes worked out, and with that figure in mind, it's just mind blowing that you think we're going to get 2.9 million, when the calculation clearly states that we haven't got hope in what hell of doing that.

Like I said, we only get 5.5% of the total allowable taxable wages that are paid in the NT only. To receive this amount of money we would need, I did a very rough calculation, 19 companies paying 2.7 million in allowable taxable wages in the NT only but, the catch is they also have to have taxable wages in other states of Australia that total at or over 10.4 million dollars per year. Like I said, I've used the NT Government and the federal government information to get that figure. Now that's just totally obscene when you truly look at it but you say this is a fact that's what the book states.

So, finally let's look at the royalties. This is approximately 39% more than what Santos pays now, it's approximately 199% more than what Origin pays now. And once again that's Australia wide. Now once again I understand that there'll be more companies than just Santos and Origin spreading the right load. But really, those figures just don't stack up. They paid no GST, no income tax, no resources tax, they actually received a refund and you expect me to buy those figures. I am truly disgusted and emotive with this report. And the fact that you believe that we would buy this without question, is even more disgusting to me.

I would hope that you would re look, honestly, at the figures that you have presented and the issues that have been presented to you before your final report.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Thank you very much for your very comprehensive presentation. I have to say it's one of the best we've had, so thank you for the effort that you've put in. Have you submitted that as a-

Annette Raynor: Yes, that will go to them.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Excellent, good thank you very much for that and we will certainly chase the matters you have raised down. Just a couple of points, we don't expect you to buy, those are your words, this report. The whole purpose of these consultations is for you to test and challenge the report in exactly the way



that you have done, and I'm very glad that you have done that, so thank you. Page 280, FIFO activists, I've got no idea why that's in bold. I suspect that's typographical ... That's just a mistake, so there was nothing nefarious about that. But it's in quotes because it's come from somebody's submission, but it's a mistake that it's in bold.

The two complaints the Panel, about the second round of Coffey consultation, I'm not aware of those and I do intend to chase those down, who were they? You said you knew of two. Who were they?

Annette Raynor: Mine was one.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Yours was one? Thank you.

Annette Raynor: And Dr. Errol Lawson was the other one.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Okay.

Annette Raynor: And I received an email stating you had received it.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Thank you, was that in a form of sort of a submission, has it been -

Annette Raynor: No, it was emailed.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Do you know the date that you emailed it to me, roughly?

Annette Raynor: When was Coffey here? They were here on the 15th, which was ... It was the following Monday after the 15th of December.

Hon. Justice Pepper: 15th of December, okay.

Annette Raynor: 'Cause I had to call off before I could submit what I've interrupted.

Hon. Justice Pepper: It may, I don't know, it may have slipped through the cracks but I will certainly chase both of these down. Thank you. Yes, Dr. Jones.

Dr. Jones: Just a comment about your time and travel calculation in the Katherine Region here, the water does move a lot faster than the Northern region, here. That's quite correct, we based our calculation, one was in the Central Beetaloo, a very slow travel time, so you are correct in your assessment about the rapid travel time in the north but we will ... Talking about the slow travel time, is extent for that area, and that's exactly why, when you do a risk assessment, you have to look at regional specificities and that's why we're recommending the strategic baseline assessment. So we actually get a much better idea of what those critical differences are.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Any further questions? I came to get a hold of that ... All the details, so we can have a look at it. Yes, Dr. Beck.



Dr. Vaughan Beck: Yes, so thank you very much for that detailed analysis of the finances too, so I'd like to have a further discussions with you on that just to understand some of the details. I just note that, in terms of the ACIL Allen report, they have considered the various royalties and results with tax regimes, and they have presented both gross figures and also average annual figures. Certainly in their resource rent tax case, that only comes into being much downstream of project life, because the resource rent tax is paid after deductions have been made for depreciation and amortisation and it's on the profits of the company after those particular events had occurred.

So the calculations will allow for resource rent tax, that if it's going to occur at all, it will occur towards the end of the 25 year period and so, that may be one of the explanations. But nevertheless, I would like to have some discussions with you on some of the details.

Annette Raynor: I'm just saying, if you look back through their stuff, they're not paying it full stop. And that's Australia wide, so why do you think we're gonna get it here? It's mind blowing to me.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Any further ... Yes, Professor, Hart.

Prof. Barry Hart: Could I just follow Dr. Jones' comment about seepage?

Hon. Justice Pepper: Yes.

Prof. Barry Hart: And just ... You juxtaposition position, what was going on round the Tindall Air Base, and so forth with Beetaloo, we didn't comment specifically on those two differences, but we did point out the parameters that we considered in terms of, if there's a spill, size, distance to the groundwater aquifer, permeability of that distance, 100 metres or whatever. They're very different when you go between Katherine, which is very karstic and very rapid flow of the Tindall Aquifer, so they're not really very compatible. We still have there, as we've said, without SREBA, there are still uncertainties, perhaps a little less for the northern part of Beetaloo.

This in terms of flow rates, recharge and so forth and ground water, but certainly for the southern part. We can't really see with the rainfall and the evaporation. Rainfall, perhaps about 450 ml, evaporation, two and a half metres at least that there's gonna be any recharge there. So, that's part of what has to be obtained but again, going ... I think the PFAS situation is a good one when you look at the overall situation, but I don't think it's relevant for Beetaloo, but I think it is relevant for other areas, and it just reinforces the whole business about, you have to be extremely knowledgeable in terms of your knowledge base of what's likely to occur.

Annette Raynor: My point with using PFAS, 'cause I totally understand that the Beetaloo 's not the same ground as we've got here. My point with that is PFAS was one chemical, you are doing multiple chemicals with other items that come up from the ground. And I don't care if it takes 100 years to seat down, unless you can live without water, then our kids and grandkids and great grandkids, what are they gonna do? We can all say, "Oh too bad we made some



money. To hell with you." Well, I don't think that's good enough. PFAS was one chemical it was safe, the 'furies' were told they could drink it, it was that safe.

Now they all weren't that stupid, 'cause they saw that it took paint off the trucks. But they bathed in it, it was a safe chemical. Now, it might take an extra hundred years to do but I don't care. Unless you can live without water, you're not talking one chemical.

Prof. Barry Hart: True.

Hon. Justice Pepper: True. Anyone else? Yes, Dr. Smith.

Dr. Ross Smith: I might just follow up on that a little bit about mixture toxicity and you've done such a wonderful job of researching background information for making the points you raised. I wonder whether you accessed the two Santos risk assessments for the Surat Basin and Narrabri projects, which we've referenced in the report. I think we're on record of saying we got some concerns about some of the methodologies in those assessments, but they do go into at least desktop assessment of mixture toxicity for fracking fluids. Have you been able to have a look at those reports? Have you got any comments to make on the methodologies that they've used in that?

Annette Raynor: I don't believe a word they say, so no.

Dr. Ross Smith: Okay, thank you.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Thank you very much.

[After Break]

Hon. Justice Pepper: Just before we start, I just want to clarify some things that arose out of this morning's sessions, particularly out of the last speaker, Ms. Annette Raynor. Ms. Raynor claims two complaints were sent to the Inquiry and that they have gone unanswered regarding the complaints about the Coffey Social Impact Assessment, or at least the framework reports. The complaints were from herself, she said, and Dr. Errol Lawson. First dealing with Ms. Raynor's complaint. Ms. Raynor emailed the complaint to the Inquiry on Saturday, the 16th of December 2017. That was regarding the Social Impact Framework consultations held in Katherine on the 15th of December 2017.

The Inquiry responded to Ms. Raynor on Wednesday, the 20th of December 2017, and noted in its contact to her that due to the looming Christmas period, that's a direct quote, it would be obviously put her complaint to Coffey and await Coffey's response and then get back to her. Coffey provided a letter of response to the Inquiry regarding Ms. Raynor's claims on the 31st of January 2018, that is the day after we went on the road commencing in Nhulunbuy and Yirrkala with consultations on the 30th of January 2018.





With respect to the allegation that Mr. Errol Lawson had made a complaint that had gone unanswered, Mr. Lawson provided a submission, not a complaint. That submission is on the Inquiry's website at submission number 530. That was a submission that was provided to us on the 2nd of January 2018 in respect of the Coffey Social Impact Framework and a meeting held in Katherine in December of 2017. Again, the Inquiry has, as it's right and fair to do, put Mr. Lawson's comments and his submission to Coffey. Again, the Inquiry has only just received the letter from Coffey on the 31st of January 2018. That is the day after we commenced our community consultations.

The second matter is the allegation that there were not two meetings in Katherine and indeed there was no meeting that took place between Coffey and Katherine Town Council. There were in fact two meetings and two rounds of consultation in Katherine. The first was on the 28th of July 2017 where Coffey met with the CEO of Katherine Town Council, Mr. Robert Jennings. That has now been confirmed. There was a second public consultation meeting held by Coffey on the 15th of December 2017 and Ms. Raynor attended that meeting. At that meeting, the CEO of the Council was an apology. Thank you.

I should also say that we invited Ms. Raynor to be present whilst I read that material out. She understandably had to go back to work.