

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&amp;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.&lt;br&gt;</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.&lt;br&gt;</p> <p>Implementing this will ensure the impact assessment follows EPBC policy (<a href="http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/epbc-act-environmental-offsets-policy">http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/publications/epbc-act-environmental-offsets-policy</a>) and is consistent with international practice for impact assessment (see bottom of page 16 <a href="https://www.unepfi.org/fileadmin/documents/biodiversity_offsets.pdf">https://www.unepfi.org/fileadmin/documents/biodiversity_offsets.pdf</a> and principle 7 of <a href="https://www.iaia.org/uploads/pdf/SP3%20Biodiversity%20Ecosystem%20Services%2018%20Jan.pdf">https://www.iaia.org/uploads/pdf/SP3%20Biodiversity%20Ecosystem%20Services%2018%20Jan.pdf</a>). 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



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.<br><br>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. <br><br>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