Please could ESSO answer the following bullet points.

- Given that Mobil shut 18 months ago and the new pipeline from the Kipper Fields into the Longford pipeline have been in development for longer than that, and these are causing the additional ethane, why didn't ESSO give the community more notice?
- Would more notice have given the council, the people, the councillors more time to consider and raise the need for an Environmental effects statement?
- Does ESSO accept that by limiting the time available to the community and other interested parties, that it increased their chances of avoiding an EES process?
- Can ESSO provide proof that groups were communicated?
- Can ESSO explain who the Registered Aboriginal Party is and whether the custodian of the women's aboriginal stories has been directly contacted?
- How have any questions raised of ESSO regarding this project been made public?
- Now that the Councillors of the Mornington Peninsula shire have asked for an EES would ESSO be prepared to invite an EES?
- Plans for a power station take a while, how long has this plan been in development since first muted?
- How did ESSO choose Hastings over Altona to site the power station?
- What other alternatives for Ethane have been explored?
- There is 10,000T of pressurised Ethane storage at Qenos, has this and the potential for storage been explored?
- ESSO state that there emissions are conveniently below 200,000 T of Carbon dioxide equivalent emissions that would trigger an Automatic EES. How sure can ESSO be, and where is the evidence from independently verified calculations?
- Does ESSO presently buy ACCU's under the Safeguard Mechanism for the emissions from the smoke stacks at Long Island point?
- ESSO does not appear to have tried to co-operated with Qenos or explore the Mobil
  refinery, if they have what evidence for this is there? Qenos seem to be hurting quite
  a bit as a result of the closure of Mobil that has affected their production and led to
  there being wasted ethane that cannot be used because they don't have the
  machinery to do so despite the massive demand for their polyethylene bins and other
  plastic products.
- Does ESSO accept that making highly recyclable polymers like polyethylene from ethane is much less carbon intense and creates more jobs than burning it just for energy?
- Does ESSO agree that the closure of Mobil is a major cause of the problem of excess
   Methane
- If a gas fired power station was really necessary then why could it not be located at Altona to maybe reskill some of the people lost due to the closure of Mobil.
  - https://www.argusmedia.com/en/news/2216354-australias-qenos-to-shut-petchem-units?amp=1
  - https://www.afr.com/companies/energy/refinery-shutdown-triggers-loss-of-150chemical-jobs-20210519-p57t82
- Does ESSO agree that it is their fault and not Qenos's for the increase in ethane that is not being used ?

- Does ESSO agree that there are less carbon emissions in making plastic than burning it? f
- Does ESSO consider that plastics manufacture is a good use for ethane?
- How many carbon emissions would be avoided if the ethane was made into plastic rather than burned in a gas fired power station?
- To maximise the manufacture of plastic and prevention of ethane going into the atmosphere, would the overall carbon emissions profile be reduced if the gas fired PowerStation, if necessary, was sited at Altona?
- Could the ethane be used to make steam for the plastics manufacturing process at Altona?
- What impact will the opening of the West Baracouta pipeline from the Kipper Fields into the Longford pipeline have on Ethane? How will this contribute to the ethane total emissions over the next 10 years?
- Why have the transmission lines been excluded from this assessment. The transmission lines from United Energy require a brand new set according to the permit application. This means that there will be land clearing, potentially close to properties, potentially increasing fire risk as electric cabling is almost always involved in the exacerbation of risk with fire. Why are the two not combined.
- What are the transmission losses anticipated by the power lines and has ESSO worked with United Energy to quantify this. Whilst these are arguably Scope 3 emissions, the Scope 3 Emissions such values were required to be added with the AGL/APA Gas import terminal.
- If these figures were added together, what is the total figure for carbon emissions for the whole project and does this trip the 200,000 T threshold of the EPA Act of 2017?
- What does ESSO presently pay in terms of the purchase of carbon offsets for the emissions from the smoke stacks at Long Island Point. ESSO trips the safeguard mechanism, so these figure should be readily available, if so, what are they ? if not, why not?
- Does ESSO agree that bivalent gases are the source of our future plastics, once reduced to carbon dioxide they will never be available to use in making polymers again?
- What steps have ESSO taken to quantify the collective social, environmental, and fire risk of the combined project of the gas fired power station and the new transmission lines provided by United
- Has Qenos been involved in any negotiations with ESSO regarding how they could use, store
  ethane or use a power station at their site or the old refinery site.
- Is more infrastructure already in place at Altona for a gas fired power station and would there be less risk to people, nature, the traditional owners and the ocean at Altona versus Hastings?
- Has there been any independent review of any of the data that ESSO has presented been third party verified? If so, would an EES not satisfy this request?
- That Ethane is heavier than air, and therefore does not dissipate in the event of a leak, what risks does this present?
- <a href="https://www.offshore-technology.com/marketdata/kipper-conventional-gas-field-australia/">https://www.offshore-technology.com/marketdata/kipper-conventional-gas-field-australia/</a>
- Kipper Field is a joint venture with BHP Exxon Mobil and Mitsui in equal parts. It is
   estimated that only a fifth of that reserve has been tapped and that field was opened
   in1965 <a href="https://www.oilandgastoday.com.au/bhp-backs-west-barracouta-for-2021-start/">https://www.oilandgastoday.com.au/bhp-backs-west-barracouta-for-2021-start/</a>

- Given that this pipeline is ready to go, again, why has ESSO not communicated this part of the project earlier than now?
- ESSO owns the new West Barracouta <a href="https://www.exxonmobil.com.au/Energy-and-environment/Energy-resources/Upstream-operations/West-Barracouta">https://www.exxonmobil.com.au/Energy-and-environment/Energy-resources/Upstream-operations/West-Barracouta</a>
- Is this project much bigger than ESSO are trying to suggest? How does the rate of extraction from the Kipper Field affect the amount of ethane as a fugitive emission of this process?
- Does ESSO agree that 200 petajoules of gas will be extracted per Annum from West Barracouta?
- Are there any other reasons for siting the gas fired power station at Hastings rather than Altona?
- Esso claim that it will produce GHG emissions whist maintaining a "critical gas supply to the state" I would agree that there is no better way of obtaining gas into the Eastern Gas Grid, at the same time, why is this not being used for plastics? If cogeneration is necessary then this surely can be balanced and optimised across a number of industrial processes like storage and plastics manufacture, would ESSO agree?
- Where does the ethane from Kipper Field go at the moment?
- How can ESSO avoid the risk of an out of control bush fire in the case of a leak and would the risk be less at Altona at the old refinery site?
- ESSO talk a lot about "weed removal" at the site, but given that no flora studies have been done, how do they know the difference between weeds and native vegetation?
- What would be the clearing required around the transmission lines and where would they be. The new set of transmission lines, as opposed to upgrading the wires would double the land clearing and any clearances compared to the existing.
- Does ESSO believe this project should be assessed with United Energy as one is completely dependent upon the other as per the precedent set with the AGL/APA project where the FSRU and the pipeline would not exist in the absence of the other. I believe this is the case here, so ESSO do you agree this should be a joint application?
- How many jobs could be saved at Altona at Qenos if all the ethane was used to make
  plastics and how much carbon would be saved, not only by not burning it, but by not
  having to import polyethylene from abroad to make our bins, or even import the bins
  themselves?
- Would there still be flaring at the smoke stack at long island point
- If not, what are the plans to decommission.
- What are the plans to decommission the power station and remediate the land for the transmission lines and then power station?
- Please can the data that ESSO have used in their permit application be third party verified with then original data set or can ESSO disclose to the EPA all of the data upon which they have relied and all the sources of ethane over time.
- Could ESSO produce an alternative plan involving Altona and Qenos to show how the carbon is removed.