

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 1

The Bonney Upwelling is vital to the survival of local marine species. This project will contribute significantly to the climate crisis. There is no denying it.

Comment Response

This project is in the early stages of exploration and the purpose of the survey is to determine if commercially viable deposits of petroleum are even present. It is too early in the development process to speculate about the significance of any climate impact arising from what we discover. We will fully assess the known impacts of the activity on the Bonney Upwelling.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Sort: Recent Popular

You seem to be implying that the seismic surveys i.e "exploration part" are not the thing people are concerned about.. is that right? To be clear, no one wants you exploring these waters because it's the exploration that does the most damage. (Assuming there are no gas spills ever and the gas stops being extracted within a year or two so as not to contribute too severely to climate change.. and if all the all the guaranteed leaks didn't happen.) Nothing is right about this!!

Comment Response

We have received many concerns about different parts of the activity and the underlying merits of proceeding. We are openly consulting to learn about the environment from the local community and protect their values and sensitivities. We will register each objection to gas developments, respond with our perspective on the ongoing need for gas, and pass both views to our regulator to decide.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Are you still allowing comments on this map?

Comment Response

Yes, we continue to welcome peoples views and invite the sharing of local environmental values and sensitivities to make sure we're taking everything into consideration in our assessments.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

The exploration part is the part people are most worried about. Can you address that in your answer please.

Comment Response

Apologies if we haven't answered your question to your satisfaction. Our team will be in touch to clarify what your concerns are.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 2

I am concerned about the blue whales in the region and have concern that you will be interfering with their migrations and movements, habitat and behaviours. The consultant noted at the port fairy mtg this week that priority first is for the SRight whale in waters May to Sept. Blue whales are here Nov to May. What are you doing to protect earth's largest mammal as an endangered species?

Comment Response

We will have a comprehensive management plan for all whales including BW. Their Conservation Management Plan mandates that blue whales must be able to continue to utilise their biologically important area without injury, and must not be displaced from that foraging area. We have many measures to protect BW, including stopping if we see a BW within or approaching the threshold distance for injury.

1 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like  Dislike 

Discussion 3

I have concerns regarding the blue whales. I fear you will be interfering with their migrations and movements, habitat and behaviours. What are you doing to protect earth's largest mammal? At the meeting in Port Fairy this week, the consultant notes that the SRight Whales will be their priority and that blasting will not take place in the months they are in our region - May to Sept, however blue whales visit at the opposite time of year Nov to May. blue whales are listed as endangered

Comment Response

We will have a comprehensive management plan for all whales with a particular focus on blue whales. SRW are our priority to protect due to our proximity to their critical life stage habitat. This doesn't mean our protection of blue whales is compromised, it means we have to protect them in a different way. We have been gathering data on BW so that we can work around there foraging behaviours.

1 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like  Dislike 

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 4

You didn't address the question of how seismic blasting will impact the bonnie upwelling. Seeing as it always occurs in a random spot how will you ensure there is no blasting anywhere near it? And considering the impact zone is thousands of kms for whales and larger creatures how can you guarantee it will not effect them?

Comment Response

We're still working through our impact assessments and we'll publish our predictions of impact on the Bonney upwelling as soon as we can. Our preliminary results for the impact zone for marine mammals is actually 10.3 kilometers (single pulse) and 13.2 km (over time). There will be effects to whales and it is only acceptable if those effects are behavioural i.e. not injurious.

🔔 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍

Dislike 👎 -1

Who decides what is an acceptable risk to whales? Distressed whales not being able to communicate with each other/hunt properly for an extended time in one of their most important feeding zones/travelling routes is not acceptable to anyone but gas companies.

Comment Response

The Federal Department of Environment, through the EBPC Act, protect matters of national environmental significance. Whale species have specific levels of protection enacted through legal instruments such as Conservation Management Plans. These plans often contain information about the levels of impact that is unacceptable and we must adopt them to comply with the law.

🔔 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍

Dislike 👎

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 5

What about the Abalone industry? Will there be compensation if they are killed off like the scallops were near King Island recently? Was that your company responsible for that and the millions of dollars of damage to their industry? And if not what are you doing differently to ensure that kind of disaster doesn't happen again?

Comment Response

It would be unacceptable to have mortal effects on any marine species from our or any marine seismic survey. We do not predict mortal effects to molluscs (including scallops, abalone, oysters, clams, mussels, limpets, squids, octopus and cuttlefish etc.). Our full assessment of predict impacts on molluscs will be made publicly available as soon as it's completed.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +4 Dislike

Why do you say, with confidence, that your seismic blasting won't harm shellfish such as Scallops (or abalone etc) when studies have been done by Ryan Day et. al. (2017) to prove that "Exposure to seismic air gun signals causes physiological harm (including significant mortality) and alters behaviour in the scallop Pecten fumatus"?

Comment Response

We understand that there are impacts of seismic surveys. The findings of the paper have been used to define the distance at which some effects may occur. Our current understanding is that the effects are initially sub-lethal, that increased mortality was observed post exposure, and that increased mortality was within natural variation. Our draft assessments will be published soon.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

You may not feel the impact on abalone populations for years. It may depend on juvenile stages at the time of blasting. Who knows? We don't know, but either do these people.

Comment Response

We have recently installed an exclusion zone down to the 40m bathymetry contour primarily as a result of discussions with abalone fishers who dive down to 30m. This will help protect early life-cycle stages of abalone. Further, seismic surveys have occurred in this region for many years and the two industries (fishing and petroleum) have successfully coexisted over time.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 6

My understanding is that the allocated zone has now been extended to allow the vessel to turn due to the exclusion around Deen Maar. Can the map be updated to reflect this change? Why couldn't the vessel turn within the initially proposed zone? Is this to ensure that you can cover maximum ground with your surveying? Also, can you confirm that this extension remains within the licensed zone? Is this proposed zone of operation not "locked in" until the EP is submitted?

Comment | 2 years ago

Like 👍+5 Dislike 🗑

That's atrocious. Are wildlife unimportant as well as humans. Once extinct always extinct. That's the beauty of this area and surrounds and why people love to come and visit. Keep it that way! What about the whales who come to calf in our waters. Are profits the only thing this company thinks of. Perhaps shift the focus on areas that are not populated and would not affect wildlife.

Comment Response

We will not survey while SRW mothers and calves are in the area. Oil and gas has successfully co-existed with wildlife in this area for >25 years and we are doing everything we can to protect the wildlife and natural beauty of the area.

Comment | 2 years ago

Like 👍+3 Dislike 🗑

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 7

I am cray fisherman how close to port fairy a what time off year you be there

Comment Response

Hi there, we're still working through this detail. A member of the team will be in touch with you to discuss the timing and location of your activities.

 Comment | 2 years ago

Like  Dislike 

Hello Ken, We have sent you an email so we can discuss your operations and any potential interaction in further detail. Thank you! The Regia MSS Team

 Comment | 2 years ago

Like  Dislike 

Discussion 8

What about Deen Maar (Lady Julia Percy Island). It holds the largest fur seal colony in the Southern Hemisphere! The seismic blasts will directly impact them and an 'Exclusion zone' can't stop the blasts travelling through the ocean. Also Deen Maar is the 'equivalent' to Uluru, but in the southern ocean for the local indigenous community, holding very sacred importance. You wouldn't explore for gas next to Uluru would you? Not to mention it's Aus's only offshore Volcano!

Comment Response

We are aware of the environmental, cultural, and spiritual importance of Deen Maar and will talk with local traditional owners to learn more about Deen Maar and understand how we protect and preserve the values of this site.

 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +1 Dislike 

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 9

You say you'll exclude depths less than 40m since abalone divers don't diver deeper than 30m. This sounds fine on the surface, however, what you should be doing is keeping 10.3km AWAY from the 30m contour that abalone are not exposed to damaging sound levels, as you have with Dean Maar. Please adjust your 40m water depth protection line.

Comment Response

The 40m exclusion was put in place for abalone and other shallow water molluscs/invertebrates, rather than only for commercial divers. Abalone belong to the phylum Mollusca and are considered a benthic invertebrate in the sound modelling study. The 10.3km buffer is the behavioural response distance for marine mammals. The appropriate distance for abalone is 52m at 40m water depth.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +1 Dislike

Sort Recent Popular

Also, can you please supply a link to the reference document you are using for determining the safe distances to conduct seismic blasting allowed for different life forms.

Comment Response

The Sound Modelling report can be found on the Regia website. We can't link directly to it through this portal unfortunately.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Does that mean a 52m depth exclusion is appropriate in areas that fall inside your REGIA MSS area where abalone may be present?

Comment Response

The sound propagation is considered in both the vertical and horizontal directions. The 52m referenced here is the horizontal distance. Even with the 40m depth exclusion zone there may be abalone exposed above threshold levels, and we will contend that the residual impacts will be of an acceptable level at a population/ecosystem level.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike -1

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 10

Seismic testing has been proved to be detrimental to OUR oceans and marine life. Why should corporate greed (under the pretense of human need) be allowed to to destroy beyond repair the marine ecosystems of our oceans?? There are other ways beyond gas and we need to spend money to find them. Not put more money into gas!!

Comment Response

We acknowledge that the Regia MSS will have some short-term, localised, and recoverable effects on some parts of the environment. We will try demonstrate to our independent regulator that these impacts are of an acceptable level and not as detrimental as you claim. We welcome any evidence you can share so that we can consider it fully prior to our submission.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍 Dislike 👎

Discussion 11

Have you considered the potential effects on the endangered hooded plovers that nest and live on the beaches in various parts of the coastline, e.g Killarney Beach? Also, shearwaters that migrate and nest on Griffith Island, Port Fairy?

Comment Response

Yes, these species will be considered in the impact and risk assessments. The most likely effect to birds is from artificial light from our survey during night time. We will commit to using the minimum lighting needed for navigation and safe operations. We will have porthole shrouds to minimise light impacts to all birds.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+1 Dislike 👎

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 12

The IPCC report released in March 2023 was unequivocal: there must be no new fossil fuel exploration if we are to limit warming to 1.5 or 2 degrees C. This explicitly includes "Ceasing all licensing or funding of new oil and gas", "Stopping any expansion of existing oil and gas reserves", and "Ensuring net zero electricity generation by 2035 for all developed countries and 2040 for the rest of the world". To ignore this warning is grossly irresponsible and threatens the wellbeing of us all.

Comment Response

In most world energy outlooks gas still has a role to play in a net-zero world, particularly in hard to abate sectors. The most recent IRENA report suggested that even if we can scale up renewables three times faster than current projections, renewables will only meet 90% of the world's energy demand. Gas, particularly with carbon capture technologies, is necessary for a net-zero emissions world.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +12 Dislike -1

The transition to net zero does not require any new infrastructure or investment. We already have more than enough gas. The problem is not a lack of supply, it is that Australia's gas is overwhelmingly exported. The latest AEMO report suggests that by 2030 the amount of gas needed for electricity generation in Australia will have dropped by a third, yet AEMO forecasts that in the same year gas companies will still be exporting the same amount they are now. Be honest — this is about profit.

Comment Response

Electricity generation is only one source of gas usage. The latest AEMO Victorian Gas Planning Report stated "Unless new Victorian supply is developed, Victoria is forecast to become a net importer of gas from winter 2027, as Victorian annual consumption exceeds Victorian production."

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +3 Dislike

The transition to net zero does not require any new fossil fuel infrastructure or investment. We already have more than enough gas. The problem is not a lack of supply, it is that Australia's gas is overwhelmingly exported. The most recent AEMO report suggests that by 2030 the amount of gas needed for electricity generation in Australia will have dropped by a third, yet AEMO forecasts that in the same year gas companies will still be exporting the same amount they are now. This is about profit.

Comment Response

Electricity generation is only one source of gas usage. The latest AEMO Victorian Gas Planning Report stated "Unless new Victorian supply is developed, Victoria is forecast to become a net importer of gas from winter 2027, as Victorian annual consumption exceeds Victorian production."

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 13

The speed at which we must exit fossil fuels to save the planet means that any gas found being profitable before being banned or replaced very small indeed. The risk to marine life however is great. We have finally allowed whale populations to build to sustainable numbers and you want to create explosions in their travel paths. You are also competing with wind farm companies who wish to construct many huge pylons in the same area. Human destruction of wildlife habitat for profit must stop.

Comment Response

We are working hard to design our survey so that we limit our impacts to acceptable levels. Our activity is no more than 90 days so we'll find an appropriate window to operate in. We will not destroy any wildlife habitat as a result of our activity.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +3 Dislike

Discussion 14

Seismic testing is proven to be very deadly to marine life. It is a completely unacceptable practice in our oceans and needs to be banned outright. The sheer numbers of marine life destroyed and very adversely impacted are scary. You do not have the right to destroy the health of our ocean ecosystems, or fishing industries! Go Away!!!!!!

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +16 Dislike -1

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 15

The IPCC clearly mandates no new oil or gas! greenhouse gas emissions from existing fossil fuel infrastructure is more than enough to push the world beyond 1.5C of global heating compared with pre-industrial times. Obviously enough, it tells us that no more fossil fuel sources can be opened if the world is serious about living up to its commitments and avoiding a significantly worsening climate crisis.

1 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like  Dislike 

Discussion 16

Gas is not a sustainable fuel. Seismic exploration is dangerous to all marine life. You cannot ensure zero risk and zero risk is all that is acceptable. Stop profiteering from our planet and marine life. Do something else with your money and your time. Like investing in sustainable energy sources. Go away. You know the damage you will be doing. Do the right thing for the future generations. Be part of the solution not a part of the problem. Use your power to create a better world for all life.

1 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like  +17 Dislike  -1

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 17

Have you considered the Fairy Penguin colony here? Have you checked how far they travel to forage, including how deep they dive? Or what time of the year the breeding colony is active? They forage after dusk, so won't be visible at night. Will your seismic blasting be happening at the time of year when they are present? Will the sound level be harmful or uncomfortable for them when foraging? A lot of time, energy and money has gone into caring for the penguins. They are special to this community

Comment Response

We are currently assessing impacts to fairy penguins in the region and will release our full assessment soon. Our sound modelling report indicated injury would only occur at 60m from the sound source. There would be a behavioural response before those distances are reached and we're working hard to assess the effects of that response so that we can protect them properly.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like  +1 Dislike 

How do you know that seismic blasting is definitely safe for the penguins, as long as it is at least 60m away. That seems close! How close do you intend to seismic blast to Middle Island and the surrounding coastline? Please take into account how far these underwater foraging birds will be swimming out at night to find food for themselves and their young. Have you considered the impact seismic will have on their food supply? How will they feed if the fish are gone and the zooplankton is killed?

Comment Response

We are still studying the little penguins and will put in place protections for them. The detail of our impact assessment of the effects of elevated levels of sound will be published shortly. We will consider all life-cycle stages of the penguin and the ecosystem effects, including those pressures on the food chain.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like  Dislike 

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 18

I oppose your proposal for seismic testing in this location very very strongly. Far too close to our local fishing industries to say the least. The area is also in a major birthing and migration site for the endangered southern right whales that visit here every year.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+13 Dislike 👎-1

Thank you for your comment. We are about to start our environmental assessments and will include details about how we plan to protect southern right whales and minimise our interference with local fishers. Keep informed of updates by registering for our newsletter and our webinars.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍 Dislike 👎

Discussion 19

I oppose any seismic blasting disrupting these Sacred Birthing Grounds for the Southern Right Whales and stand in solidarity with Gunditjmarra Traditional Owners of this precious Sea Country. I also stand in solidarity with our precious Cetacean Families whom I consider Kin. The destruction of their homes, migrations and songlines for corporate greed must cease. Educate yourselves deeply. Listen, Listen, Listen to the Elders and Traditional Owners. Look into the whale's eye. Open your hearts.

Comment Response

Thank you for your comment. We will not carry out our survey whilst Southern Right Whales are present in their reproductive biologically important area. We have meetings with the local traditional owners soon and look forward to hearing their stories, learning about their culture, and protecting sea country.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+5 Dislike 👎-1

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 20

Logans Beach is south-east Australia's only established southern right whale nursery. Scientific evidence on the effects of seismic blasting on whales has shown that air gun use has chronic effects "such as: excluding marine mammals from important areas at significant times, interfering with their migrations and movements, overall habitat degradation, disruption of biologically significant behaviours, and increased levels of stress" (Gordon et al, 2003/04). This is unacceptable.

Comment Response

We agree, it would be unacceptable to acquire seismic in a known southern right whale calving area while they are present. So, CGG commits to not undertaking seismic activities while Southern Right Whales are in the critical habitat defined in their conservation management plan. That plan identifies that the SRW are likely to be present between May and November.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +11 Dislike

I agree with the others. Go away

Comment Response

We respect your views and encourage you to consult with us through the relevant persons process so that your views can be documented and shared with the independent regulatory decision makers at NOPSEMA.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

The incredibly loud sounds generated by seismic blasting are detectable 4,000km away (Evans Ogden 2014); for reference, the distance between Warrnambool and the Antarctic continent is only 3,000km. And it's not just the whales — blasting has a devastating and unavoidable effect on other marine life including fish, crustaceans and zooplankton, all of which are crucial to the marine ecosystem.

Comment Response

We will publish our prediction of sound propagation from our survey as soon as it's ready. We are less concerned with the overall distance the sound will travel, rather we're concerned about the sound level a receptor receives. We agree, it would be unacceptable to have a devastating effect on marine life and no survey would be allowed if this was the level of impact predicted.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +2 Dislike

The incredibly loud sounds generated by seismic blasting are detectable 4,000km away (Evans Ogden 2014); for reference, the distance between Warrnambool and the Antarctic continent is only 3,000km. And it's not just the whales — blasting has a devastating and unavoidable effect on other marine life including fish, crustaceans and zooplankton, all of which are crucial to the marine ecosystem.

Comment Response

We will publish our prediction of sound propagation from our survey as soon as it's ready. We are less concerned with the overall distance the sound will travel, rather we're concerned about the sound level a receptor receives. We agree, it would be unacceptable to have a devastating effect on marine life and no survey would be allowed if this was the level of impact predicted.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 21

Why did you remove my comment? I thought you were looking for honest feedback?? I strongly oppose any seismic testing in the ocean as the effects on wildlife and fishing industries have proven to be devastating. Not only this but your proposal lies within the known impact zone of 10km. This means you will be directly adversely affecting and the local crayfish and other fishing industries to the point they may not recover for many years if not longer 🙄🙄🙄

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+15 Dislike 👎

Hi there, our automated filters blocked your comment and we have reinstated it. Our apologies if this hasn't met your expectations. We will assess the impact of our activity on all local fisheries and publish those assessments in full when they are available.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍 Dislike 👎-1

Discussion 22

I'm pretty sure seismic testing is been proven to damage/kill marine life

Comment Response

Hi there, we would not propose this activity if it would lead to unacceptable impacts on marine life. We are completing environmental impact assessments for each part of our activity that has potential impacts to marine life. These are based on scientific literature and we will publish them in full as soon as they are ready for review.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+4 Dislike 👎

Could you please advise on what you consider unacceptable impacts on marine life. I understand that NOPSEMA makes the final call on this, however I would like to know what your stand as a company is.

Comment Response

We believe it would be unacceptable to have long-term, regional scale, or irreversible effects on the marine environment. This would also be inconsistent with the principles of ecologically sustainable development that the Regia MSS must be consistent with. You can comment on our Decision-Making Criteria recently published on the Regia website.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍 Dislike 👎

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 23

Seismic surveys will destroy and/or dangerously impact every sea creature within AT LEAST 10km of your survey site- except for whales and other sonar using creatures who will be negatively impacted up to THOUSANDS of kilometers away. You know this, you just don't care. Seismic surveys will be catastrophic for our oceans and MUST be stopped. SPEND YOUR BILLIONS ON ACTUAL RENEWABLE RESOURCE CREATION AND LEAVE THE OCEANS ALONE!

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +15 Dislike

As a Scuba Diving Instructor, I have witnessed plenty of change in our local oceans over the last 40 years. Seismic surveys will devastate our local area and could have severe impact on divers while in the water during the seismic testing. We are diving along the coastline from Port Campbell to Portland all year. Fish populations are already impacted by these testing over the last few years, the population is in decline and may reduce other marine species as well as effect the whales.

Comment Response

We understand that divers may be affected by the activity which is why we'd like to know where and when you're diving so that we can implement a SIMOPS plan in accordance with DMAC guidelines. One of the team will be in touch with you soon to discuss your activities. As for your other concerns our fish assessment report will be released soon along with our assessment of impacts to whales.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

There are already plenty of scientific studies that have been done on the impacts of seismic surveys. And plenty in this area from Tasmania and King Island. It doesn't even matter where in the world they are conducted, the impacts will always be catastrophic. Blasting sound at such crazy decibels will destroy a huge percentage of marine life, from phytoplankton to crayfish. Whales often beach themselves from the pain they experience. Not worth the risk in a whale sanctuary area!!!

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +3 Dislike

Thank you for your comment. We will publish our detailed assessments of environmental impact as soon as they are available.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike -2

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 24

I would like my grandchildren and their grandchildren to grow up and enjoy this area as their father was able to.

Comment Response

It would be unacceptable to have long-term or permanent/unrecoverable impacts that threaten the environmental enjoyment future generations. Fortunately, impacts from marine seismic surveys are short-term, temporary, and recoverable.

 Information | 2 years ago

You cannot prove they are short term at all... in fact anecdotal evidence shows it is often not, and not remotely enough testing has been done to claim anything positive about long term impacts. You are gambling with the foundation of our environment and all the lives of future generations by putting the ocean at such risk 🙄🙄🙄🙄🙄

Comment Response

We understand your frustration and encourage you to engage with us in the consultation process, and/or comment directly to NOPSEMA in the public comment period. We are working hard on our predictions of impact, some of which we've already published, which provide the evidence for our claims. We believe that seismic testing can occur within the legislated limits for acceptable impacts.

 Information | 2 years ago

Discussion 25

I would like you to leave this area untouched.

Comment Response

We acknowledge your opinion and encourage you to engage in the prescribed regulatory process so that NOPSEMA can take this into account. There is evidence that the Otway area is a highly productive industrialised waterway with defence, shipping, fishing, and petroleum activities coexisting within the environment in the region for many years.

 Comment | 2 years ago

Like  +1 Dislike 

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 26

I think you should leave this area untouched and natural.

Comment Response

We understand your opinion and encourage you to consult with us through the prescribed regulatory process. However, our there is overwhelming evidence that the area is not untouched and is impacted daily by transient shipping, defence activities, port activities, commercial and recreational fishing and the natural fluctuations of a functioning ecosystem.

🚫 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍 Dislike 👎

Discussion 27

How many times does this need to happen ? After this seismic blast when do we expect the next one to do the SAME area???? Over and over again! Its a disgrace... environmental impacts are huge. NOPSEMA needs to stop these seismic BLASTS or be held accountable.

Comment Response

The Regia MSS is targeting areas that have not been surveyed before though we acknowledge there may be some overlap with previous surveys. We have to show that the environmental impacts are short-term, localised, or recoverable and that they are controllable with appropriate measures in place.

🚫 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+3 Dislike 👎

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 28

I agree, gas is not a sustainable fuel. Seismic exploration is dangerous to all marine life. You cannot ensure zero risk and zero risk is all that is acceptable. Stop profiteering from our planet and marine life. Do something else with your money and your time. Like investing in sustainable energy sources. You know the damage you will be doing. Do the right thing for the future generations. Be part of the solution not a part of the problem. Use your power to create a better world for everyone.

Comment Response

The legislative framework in Australia permits some impact from offshore petroleum if it is managed and of an acceptable level. We believe that responsible development of gas is essential for maintaining the current quality of life we all enjoy and ensuring we pass that quality of life on to future generations. Gas is part of the Labour governments energy transition plan.

🔔 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍 +1

Dislike 👎 -1

Discussion 29

No social license for offshore gas exploration and expansion in the Otway Basin. While you can try to capture the tangible impacts to commercial fish stock, the fact we are still investing in fossil fuels will exacerbate climate change and the heating of our oceans and cause immeasurable devastation for communities.

Comment Response

We understand your concern. There may not be commercially viable gas deposits in this area so we cannot assess the contribution of future developments to human made climate impacts. Further investment in gas development is needed in Australia to meet local gas demand and is a key part of the Labour governments energy transition plan.

🔔 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍

Dislike 👎

Discussion 30

Seismic activity is widely known to be incredibly detrimental to marine life. This project will contribute to the degradation of this coastal area and should be abandoned. To inevitably harm an environment upon which we rely not only socially and culturally but also economically would be blatantly irresponsible. No new gas.

Comment Response

Oil and gas activities have occurred in this region for 25 years and provide energy directly to Victorian and South Australian homes. The industry has a strong environmental track record and it's one we will maintain by applying the highest environmental standards for seismic surveying in Australia. With these standards in place our impacts will be short-term, localised, or recoverable.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+3

Dislike 👎-1

Not according to the Port Fairy and King Island fishing industries you don't. Why do you say they are not mortal in your circumstance? What exactly are you doing differently to the other seismic surveys that had massive mortal consequence for molluscs?

Comment Response

Through our extensive research we have not found any evidence of causation between seismic survey and mortal effects on molluscs. In fact, the evidence we have found (which we will publish in full) suggests seismic and fishing can happily co-exist. Please provide references, evidence, or testimonials for your claims so that we can take them into consideration in the proper process.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍

Dislike 👎-2

Does a strong environmental track record include wiping out entire fishing industries worth millions with no financial compensation? Such as the scallop and industries off King Island??

Comment Response

Seismic survey effects on molluscs, including scallops are well understood and not mortal in our circumstance. There are many environmental pressures that cause fluctuations in fish populations, not just sound. We have a track record of successful co-existence with the fishing industry and of paying reasonable evidence-based claims for compensation - which we will do for the Regia survey.

🚩 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍

Dislike 👎-2

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 31

Is this seismic blasting project a Special Prospectors Authority? Why is this project not listed with NOPTA on the application tracking system? You need to be honest when consulting and inform communities that the area you wish to seismic blast is not a designated title released by the Australian Government. It is frontier exploration and you are prospectors. Are you telling them this area has been blasted before multiple times and may be blasted again by other companies? To sell the data?

Comment Response

The title/titles we end up applying for has no bearing on how we protect the beautiful and important creatures in your photo. The title you reference expires after 183 days so it is quite normal to apply for these when we submit our Environment Plan and not before. Questions about the purpose and use of titles are best answered by the National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator (NOPTA).



Concerns | 2 years ago

Like +1 Dislike -1

CORRECTION! You have 183 days once the project is approved not from when you register the project with NOPTA.

Comment Response

It appears you may be conflating the roles of our two petroleum regulators, NOPTA and NOPSEMA. Once again, the title instruments required have no bearing on how we manage environmental impacts and risks. Therefore, questions about titles are best directed to NOPTA.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Your company has 180 days AFTER the SPA is approved, there is no time limit that I know of between registering the project with NOPTA and final approval. You did not address my comment about being transparent regarding the type of seismic blasting licence your are seeking. An SPA should be clearly explained to the community so they are informed. The whale photo? I wish I had posted the forgotten species like zooplankton, flathead, shell fish etc what protection is there for these species?

Comment Response

The protection in place for the species you refer to will be included in our environmental assessments, which we will publish as soon as they are ready. We are still designing the activity so we don't know the details necessary to apply for an SPA and/or an AA. We understand your call for transparency about the titles we use. When we know the details of our application we'll publish them.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 32

The proposed drilling is incredibly close to this marine park. The impact would affect this protected area. If and when an oil spill occurs this area will be irreparably damaged like much of the coast. I am highly concerned and oppose it all and do not have any belief in your environmental impact risk assessments. if you where doing your risk assessments properly the project would be stopped.

Comment Response

The Regia activity is a marine seismic survey. There has never been an oil spill from a seismic survey in Australia and we take every precaution to ensure this will remain the case. Even in the unlikely event of a spill the consequences would be undetectable 7 days after the event. This risk is lower than the 1000's of vessels that transit through the marine park every year without accident.

🗨️ Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+1 Dislike 👎-2

I also agree with the previous comment. This place is beautiful as is all of the Australian coastlines. It's also home to colonies of seals and whales. Apollo bay is known for good and fresh seafood. All of life in Apollo Bay and surrounds will be negatively, heavily impacted by the proposed drilling, let alone the environmental cost of during and after possible chance of fossil fuel. We are all moving away from fossil fuels so what's the point of destroying our home -a point that stands on own.

Comment Response

Gas has successfully been developed in the Otway for 25 years, including the successful co-existence of seismic surveying with the fishing, shipping, port infrastructure, and other marine users. If you have particular places you'd like to see protected please let us know on this map so that we can acknowledge them and consider how best to protect them.

🗨️ Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍 Dislike 👎

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 33

The impacts of the noise on marine ecosystems, can kill zooplankton and immediately affect larger marine animals' hearing and physiology and might also disrupt behaviours such as feeding, breeding or escape responses.

Comment Response

We acknowledge that there may be mortal effects on zooplankton within a few meters of the sound source. However, given natural mortality rates of 20-50% along with their abundance the population effects to zooplankton are considered negligible. There are significant protections in place for effects on large marine animals which we will detail in our full impact assessments.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

So is it a couple of meters or 220 meters? Studies off the NW coast of WA had zooplankton mortality's for 1.2km radius. This study was later questioned by 'modelling' studies. I.e: not real life studies. There needs to be real life studies done in the Southern Ocean before you can speak to this. Until then we should adopt the precautionary principle. Because you just don't know!

Comment Response

We have received our preliminary modelling results from independent experts which predict our sound effect distances. For zooplankton this is 220m. Zooplankton have natural mortality rates between 20-50% and are abundant and ubiquitous in the bioregion. These are scientifically robust reports routinely critiqued and ultimately accepted by the qualified experts at NOPSEMA.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

That's interesting, in another comment on here you said there would be NO mortal impacts on plankton. Considering planktons are one of the most studied creature groups in relation to seismic testing, it's interesting you are so careless with your comments.

Comment Response

We said there would be no mortal effects to marine species in response to a comment about lobsters and scallops. We encourage people to read our full assessments so statements aren't taken out of context.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

That's interesting, in another comment on here you said there would be NO mortal effects at all ...

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

By metres they mean (at least) 1.2km, and by the sound source they mean several million sound sources spread over the study area. At a rate of every 10 seconds for 3 months, most likely more than millions - you do the maths. Oh and by sound they mean shockwaves :)

Comment Response

Our preliminary modelling indicates no effect to plankton at 220m from the sound source. The effects within this range are not uniform. The number of times the sound source will be activated will be determined soon but is likely to be in the range of 5000, not millions. There will be no more than 60 days of acquisition.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

By a few metres.. they mean (at least) 1.2kms, and by the sound source, they mean several million sound sources spread over the study area. Considering the sounds are made every 10 seconds for a period of 3 months, likely more than millions - you do the maths. Oh and by sound, they mean shockwaves :)

Comment Response

Our preliminary modelling indicates no effect to plankton at 220m from the sound source. The effects within this range are not uniform. The number of times the sound source will be activated will be determined soon but is likely to be in the range of 5000, not millions. There will be no more than 60 days of acquisition.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 34

Greatly concerned about the environmental risk spills will pose

Comment Response

We understand this is a risk people are concerned about. Seismic surveying has occurred in Australia extensively for 60 years and there has never been an oil spill from a seismic activity, this is due to the prevention measures we implement to protect the environment. Further, in case the worst happens, we have plans in place to response quickly and effectively. These will be published shortly.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

While there are attempts made to mitigate risk this is not an isolated event. As you have said thousands of diesel ships pass through every day. The ramifications of oil on our reefs is happening slowly over time by an amalgamation of industries. Diesel is the reason I don't drive a car and is not a material to be taken lightly. This issue goes beyond one oil rig, the issue is Australian Industries culture of more oil and gas. We need to retrain and introduce renewables now.

Comment Response

We understand your concern which is why we'll publish our risk prevention measures as well as our emergency plans for you to comment on.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

C15CAD Our ecosystems are collapsing and we need to completely move away from oil altogether. Spills are inevitable and these waterways are worth more than profit

Comment Response

Our oil spill risk is far less than the thousands of ships that pass through these waterways every year, without incident, delivering essential goods and services to local communities. The fuel we use is similar to diesel you'd put in your car. Our vessels are designed to the highest standard and have redundancies in place if unforeseen circumstances arise.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like Dislike

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 35

as someone who lives in your 'conservative' area for potential oil spill, I am greatly concerned and whole hearty oppose your plans. I am beyond concerned of the deep and long-lasting affects of this activity not only on the marine life but also the coastlines both ecologically and culturally. You do not have the capacity to properly undertake a environmental impacts survey as we as humans know very little about our oceans. who cannot have any way to know the damage you will undoubtedly course.

Comment Response

We appreciate your concern and thank you for raising it. We have set decision making criteria that align with your comment in that we must not have long-lasting effects on ecological or cultural sensitivities. Our impact assessments will be thoroughly scrutinised by an independent regulator with the necessary expertise to hold us accountable if our work is not accurate.

1 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+2 Dislike 👎

*That has not been funded by the fossil fuels industry.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍 Dislike 👎

Its not independant though. Conducting any activity that can have such devaststing impacts needs to be backed by actual proven peer reviewed scientific evidence.

Comment Response

We look forward to providing you our environmental assessments that are thoroughly referenced with peer reviewed literature and scientific evidence.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+1 Dislike 👎

Who is the independant regulator? Do you mean NOPSENA who is funded only by the petroleum industry? You cannot say they are independant.

Comment Response

A Productivity Commission study into Resources Sector Regulation (Nov 2020) stated that other regulators should "investigate opportunities for enhancing regulators' cost recovery processes (like those adopted by NOPSEMA)". Our claim of NOPSEMA's independence is repeating the claim they themselves make. It is regulatory best practice to cost recover from proponents and typical in many sectors.

Concerns | 2 years ago

Like 👍+1 Dislike 👎-2

Archive Interactive Map Comments

Discussion 36

How will you protect whales at night?

Comment Response

We are currently assessing a range of measures to detect whales at night, or during poor visibility. These include the measures outlined in Policy Statement 2.1 (Part B), which is the standard set by the Federal Government for management of interactions between whales and seismic surveys. We will publish our marine mammal adaptive management plan as soon as it is complete.

 Concerns | 2 years ago

Like  Dislike 