

Inquiry Name: Inquiry into Unconventional Gas in Victoria.

Mr Brian Steadman

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SUBMISSION CONTENT:

--

My rationalisation for reasons to go slow on new coal seam gas expansion are :-

1./ There are enough un-burnable reserves that exist now that must be left in the ground if we are to avoid breaching the carbon budget for a safe 2°C world.

2./Unconventional Coal Seam Gas which uses fracking in a food bowl area risks lowering and damaging the water table at the expense of the farmers currently working the land.

2./Unconventional Coal Seam Gas which uses fracking in a food bowl area would risks contaminating the water table and render the farmland unuseable for foreseeable future. Would this then be up for compensation? who pays, the gas company or the government who granted the licence. Then we all will be forced to pay an additional cost on sourcing food from elsewhere possible imported also loss to economy as well.

3./ What independent baseline research data will be used to verify methane leaks to post gas production, to account for Co2e?

4./ Does this locks in long term fugitive emissions beyond the lifetime of the investment.

(Disclosure: I own shares in the gas industry)

There are many factors to consider in getting the balance right :- jobs, industry, landowners, and the long term environmental impacts.

To date decisions have mainly valued the environment as financial benefit to exploit.

With the new low carbon economy necessary to limit a safe 2°C world we must see past the short term. I look at it this way “you can not have your carbon cake and eat it” or why create stranded assets that cannot be justified, or are you writing a cheque that cannot be cashed without destroying the environment.

Climate change is anthropological environmental vandalism, we are the weather makers and of our future fate. It is the same dilemma as the xl tar sands pipeline approval is in now.

Regards Brian Steadman