

**Report from Brendan Cafferty, Secretary of Pro Gas Mayo group in connection
Onshore upstream gas pipeline relating to the Corrib Gas Field Project, Co. Mayo**

I am secretary of the Pro Gas Mayo group, an unpaid voluntary organization of ordinary citizens acting totally independently of Shell, Government or other statutory body. We support this project for the benefit of the area, the country and country at large. WE feel it is a major infrastructural development. WE made submissions to ABP and were there as a consequence

There was a 19 oral hearing into the onshore pipeline. Of those 19 days 5 days were spent cross-examining on the topic of Design, Safety & Stability. The Board's assistant safety inspector showed a video of a gas explosion early on in his questioning. The video was of an experimental explosion. At no time did the Board refer to the regulations and legislation under which risk and safety would be measured in Ireland.

.

At one point in the proceedings the assistant safety inspector asked one of Shell's consultants to draw contours on a map of the consequences of a full-bore rupture. Under duress Shell agreed but these contours came to be known as the kill-zone. The inspector ignored the risk by ignoring the probability of failure (very small, order of 0.0000000001 chance per year) and focusing on what would happen if it failed. Obviously this was incredibly damaging.

No clear definition of risk or what the board considers to be an appropriate hazard distance was given. In fact this is evident from the recent correspondence between Shell (RPS) and the board and the fact that they ask ABP to clarify the hazard distance as referred to in the November letter.

The difference between hazard and risk was not laid clearly before us. In the nature of things and the fact that there are local protests about this project, much scope was given to local objections and this was understandable, even though many of the contributions were not relevant.

In a letter dated 2nd. November 2009 to all interested parties, ABP inform RPS on behalf of Shell that it considers the onshore pipeline to be unsafe, yet they ask for some questions to be clarified. This seems to be confusing. They also indicated in the same letter that they would be disposed to approve the pipeline going up through Sruwaddacon Bay. This in our view will present many environmental and logistical problems.

Originally there was approval for another onshore pipeline which was about 70 metres from the nearest house. An independent professional group of consultants, Advantica, were appointed by the Minister in 2005 to examine this route. They reported that it was safe. However, in the interests of harmony I think, Shell indicated a new route which was 140 metres distant from nearest house, and it is this which is before ABP under the Planning and Development (Strategic Infrastructure) Act 2006. This all seems very incongruous to us. Already 1.5 billion euros has been built for the Terminal nearby and for which permission was given by ABP , and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Brendan Cafferty