Your ref: ENO 30001

My Ref: PREE 00000

National Infrastructure Consents Team
DECC
2nd Floor Kings Bldgs
3 Whitehall Place
Loudon SW1A 2AW

1st Sept 2014

Dear Sirs,

PREESALL GAS STORAGE – AN UNBIASED VIEW

This independent report does NOT prove HALITE’S case and there also appears to be a distinct lack of information from HALITE and one must question why?

SENERGY TECHNICAL TEAM PAGE 111 FINAL REPORT 3rd Para: “Data received incomplete, or late, and delivered in obscure formats”. Examples are missing........no vertical Seismic Profile.......improper data.......interpretations with mis-ties.......absence of fault interpretations” etc., etc.,

5th Para “Base Salt not adequately imaged.......no borehole data....development is speculative......uncertainty in calculations.....interpretations illustrate uncertainty in the subsurface and fault presence” etc..

Page iv 2nd Para 2 “criteria used.....optimistic”

2.2.51 MISSING DATA.

ON THIS ALONE THE APPLICATION SHOULD BE REFUSED

2.3 DATA COVERAGE Again inadequate information

3.2.3 TOP SALT “A high degree of uncertainty”

3.3.2 SYN-DEPOSITIONAL FAULTS

3.7 SUMMARY Danger of movement to 9 caverns

4.2 ADDITIONAL RISKS “Preesall salt deposits influenced by faults”. “Fracture Systems...to gas at high pressure.
"Senergy considers there are significant uncertainties......not reflected in resulting volumes".

Planning Applications have previously been refused in 2004 and 2009, “due to the unacceptable risk of gas migration”

Ie, instability, osmosis, erosions by wind and storm, close proximity to the sewage tunnel and Fleetwood population ¾ mile away.

REVIEW AND ADVISE REPORT  para 4 ADDENDUM 1

The above dangers re-iterated.


CAN WE AFFORD EXPLOSIONS OR MIGRATIONS WITH 900 mcm OF GAS??

This Application is no different to previous applications – IT IS COMPLETELY UNSAFE.

ABBEYSTEAD WAS ‘GUARANTEED ‘SAFE’ -

THEN 12 PEOPLE DIED

Thank you for reading our comments

Yours faithfully,

Averil and Derek Booth.