

27 December 2014

Rob Spalding
A/Compliance Delivery Manager – South Qld Compliance
via email: southwest.es@derm.qld.gov.au

Re: CR64570

Dear Mr Spalding,

Thank you for your letter re complaint re noise, light and fumes from Orana Gas Processing Facility (CR64570).

Having reviewed your response on 12 November and the subsequent letter referenced above, I have the following feedback and requests for further information or clarification in the report.

1. Light Assessment

- a. I was in town until approx. 9.30pm on the 5 November and noticed in my log that the light from the flare that night was extremely visible from town and visible all the way to when I turned off at Flett's Road (as I was then driving in the opposite direction to my residence).
- b. I did not note any person/ vehicle undertaking any measurements.
- c. I specify in my complaint that the flicker and light is particularly visible from the western windows of my home. In fact, the difference in the degree of visibility from our front gate to the point specified in the complaint is significant.
- d. I do not recollect being asked to give permission for someone to access our property to undertake testing at the location specified in the complaint. Therefore do not understand the reference to measurements being taken at the "Dougal property"
- e. I do not understand the value of the measurement given if not taken at the location of the complaint.
- f. Since there is no fixed level which constitutes a statutory nuisance; individual circumstances differ and each case has to be judged on its own merits. Particularly when the Control of Obtrusive Effect of Outdoor Lighting Standard could hardly be used to measure the impact of a 15TJ Flare burning and flickering in the rural night sky directly into bedroom windows.
- g. The assertion that the light was not above the "recommended maximum light value of 1 lux" is but one measure prescribed in the standard. The standard takes account of several aspects of potential obtrusiveness, the light falling on surrounding properties, the brightness of the luminaries in the field of view of nearby residents, and glare to users of adjacent transport systems and the effects of astronomical observations. And again relates to outdoor lighting.
- h. The assessment did confirm that the flare was visible from our property, and since no statement was made as to the satisfactory status of such visible light, it therefore indicates that further investigation is warranted into the merits of this complaint.

2. Noise Assessment

- a. This statement has no meaningful content to address the noise levels at my residence.
- b. I reject the "predicted and extrapolated" noise levels provided by those making the noise.

- c. I expect that transparent testing and factual noise levels when the flare is operating and the environmental conditions are suitable to be undertaken at my residence to determine if a breach of the specific noise limits is occurring.
3. Ambient Air Quality
 - a. The first statement is not complete with regard to in addition to VOCs, the inclusion of PAHs, Formaldehyde, BTEX and other pollutants listed by the National Pollution Inventory for Condibri which if extrapolation and predictions are appropriate to be used, therefore indicates that there is additional testing that is required. This is what is expected in terms of air quality testing.
 - b. Details of where the samplers are located would be necessary to understand if this is representative for the prevailing weather conditions.
 - c. Origin stating “results” is not a transparent method of ensuring that complaints have been addressed. A rigorous analysis of sampling, testing and reporting would be appropriate.
 - d. The statement by EHP that fumes or smoke is uncharacteristic of gas combustion is unhelpful in this circumstance, and irrelevant in addressing a complaint where there is video evidence of the flare producing vast amounts of fume or smoke at times where there is no cloud or rain.
 - e. Using such a statement to establish that “there is therefore no relevant grounds to conduct or require an investigation” is flawed and indicates that EHP has failed to take into consideration data from those complaining.
4. As per the APLNG EIS it would be reasonable for a response to a complaint to address directly the established guidelines for the operation. Since the guidelines identifies us as High/Moderate Visual Sensitivity, and only mentions the Flare, (there is more discussion on pipeline markers) it would be natural to expect a review of the document to address the experience of those complaining. This also indicates a failure in the EIS to consider and address the impact of the flare on residents. This must indicate a need to review the EIS.
5. As “all the monitoring results” have not been provided to analyse, and what has been provided in this letter has been refuted, and only ‘statements’ made by the company, I do not accept that the complaint is closed.
6. Origin has failed to consult with me as a sensitive receptor for the lighting, and has therefore failed in its EIS and EA.
7. I look forward to the opportunity to review all the data that has been supplied to you in relation to my complaint, such as:
 - a. SLR Consulting's report, and all the raw data that was used to inform it,
 - b. the actual report and raw data from the noise monitoring on the adjoining property, (continuous monitoring during October) and
 - c. all the raw data from the VOC passive sampling during September and October (from the two NAMED locations).

Sincerely

Shay Dougall

Property Owner.