

## Appendix A: Questions from ERA and DMP responses

1. [ERA] Can DMP comment on the options available to DBP to comply with AS 2885 and/or its pipeline license requirements as a result of the potential rezoning of land adjacent to the DBNGP at Dandalup and North Dandalup.

[DMP] DMP requires the pipeline operators to routinely consider any increase in risk to its operation. In this case a proposed development after the rezoning will trigger this review as part of DBP's safety case. DBP as part of this will technically review their Major Accident/Incident Events (MAE's) in the vicinity of the development and any increased risk. It is our view that the most likely outcome (almost certain) is that DBP will need to increase the wall thickness of the pipe running through the development from the current 5mm to 13mm wall thickness to significantly reduce the existing rupture case as well as likely increase the protection around the pipeline (such as concrete culverts etc). This would be consistent with outcomes in the past and DMP requirements to demonstrate that the risk is "as low as reasonably practical" (ALARP). Given the size and quantity of gas within the DBNGP, we would expect that an engineering determination of the explosion/heat radius under AS 2885 would extend far beyond any practical easement boundary that could protect the public.

2. [ERA] We understand that DBP has a license requirement to inspect the DBNGP every 5 years using in-line investigation (i.e. pigging), are there any circumstances under which DBP would receive a derogation from this license requirement? And can you advise please of the status of any such discussions between DMP and DBP on this requirement.

[DMP] Under the licence for the DBNGP and the licences for the various lateral pipelines off the DBNGP, there exist are a range of conditions on the licence. In some cases, this includes a 5yrly in line inspection (pigging) requirement. If DBP approached the DMP regards changing these requirements, we would assess the proposal based on the supporting justification for this change. In general terms this would be that DBP could demonstrate that the corrosion mechanisms for the pipeline (internal and external) are well understood and well managed and well within the design corrosion allowance. We have yet to be approached for a change in the current status.