

## fracking inquiry

---

**From:** oliver [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 25 February 2018 10:23 AM  
**To:** fracking inquiry  
**Subject:** Submission to the Fracking Inquiry

To: Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT

Please accept what follows as my submission to the Inquiry.

1) The Inquiry's metric is flawed.

Development should be encouraged if it is good for the community and not allowed if it is not good for the community. Where activities, such as fracking, have some positive and some negative aspects, this needs to be weighed against a metric that recognizes these conflicting outcomes and determines the net result. Where positive, proceed, when negative, do not.

It is not enough to identify the potential hazards, their impacts on specific areas, and methods to mitigate these impacts. This method fails to identify the system-wide impacts of the proposed activity. This method starts from the assumption that all development is good, as long as the negative impacts are not too great. This is the wrong approach, and is back-to-front.

A better approach would be to first identify the desirable positive outcomes for the community, and to weigh any proposed activity against those outcomes. This approach is fundamentally different. Economic growth is one aspect to development. However, by first identifying increased economic growth as the single desired positive outcome, and then addressing impacts to other factors as a second step, the Inquiry cannot maintain the broad perspective that is required to make a balanced decision for the benefit of the whole community. Without the right questions, the answers will be inadequate. Some useful work is ongoing to develop broader development metrics such as this, and their research is freely available (See the work of Fitussi, Sen and Stiglitz 2010). To neglect such an approach, and to continue to follow a narrow economic growth metric, is to wilfully disregard the welfare of the community.

2) The public is underwriting the risk of a private enterprise for too little return.

Evidently fracking poses some risks. If these risks are manageable, private enterprise should be required to have insurance to cover all risks. Where the risk is not manageable, work should not proceed. Where insurance is inadequate, any consequences will be borne by the taxpayers. The cost of cleaning up a contaminated aquifer would be beyond the ability of the NT, or federal, government to pay. Take as an example the costs of cleaning the aquifers under Katherine of PFAS - difficult to evaluate but apparently outside the ability to repair for several generations to come. If we cannot afford the clean-up, we cannot afford to take on this risk.

The government requires all building contractors to have adequate insurance or they cannot get a licence to operate. The government must require businesses that wish to engage in fracking to obtain insurance against any and all potential consequences. If they cannot afford this insurance, they cannot afford to operate.

Sincerely,

Oliver Crowder

25/02/2018

Oliver Crowder  
Saltwater Solar



*technical loving care*

On 14/02/2018 5:00 PM, Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT wrote: