

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
Question on notice

Thursday, 30 June 2011

4355. Hon Robin Chapple to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for State Development.

With reference to funding for Browse basin and other gas projects, and supplementary information provided during the Estimates hearings in the Legislative Assembly, specifically Division 7: State Development, Supplementary Information No. A12, I ask -

(1) Will the Minister provide a breakdown of the categories of public expenditure for the Browse project for the following years, and while providing details of all expenditure, in particular, identify any funding for public relations, security, legal advice, and assistance to the proponents to respond to Native Title and Aboriginal Heritage matters -

(a) 2008-09;

(b) 2009-10;

(c) 2010-11 estimated actual;

(d) 2011-12 budget;

(e) 2012-13 forward estimate;

(f) 2013-14 forward estimate; and

(g) 2014-15 forward estimate?

(2) If no to (1), or any part of (1), why not?

(3) The figures in the supplementary information show that Browse funding is 14 times greater than the funding for Ashburton North over the period 2008-15. Why is the State Government funding for the Browse basin project so much more than the Ashburton North gas hub?

Answer

Department of State Development advises:

(1a-g) [see tabled paper no]

(2) Not applicable

(3) The Browse LNG Precinct is a strategic priority for the Western Australian Government as it will deliver significant benefits to the local community. The Government has therefore taken direct responsibility for the strategic approval, land access and land tenure requirements for the establishment of the Precinct. The budget for this period also includes an allocation for the State's monetary benefits under the native title consent agreements.

Note that a significant portion of those funds expended were subsequently recouped from Woodside Energy Limited as the potential foundation proponent for the Precinct.

A handwritten mark or signature, possibly the letter 'B', located in the lower right quadrant of the page.

Attachment to LC4355 parts (1a-g).Barnett

See the table below for a breakdown of costs in relation to the Browse LNG Precinct project, detailing the particular details requested. No funds were provided for any security purpose and no funds were provided to proponents to assist in their response to native title or Aboriginal heritage matters.

Accounts	2008/09 Actual \$'000	2009/10 Actual \$'000	2010/11 Est. Actual \$'000	2011/12 Forward Est. \$'000	2012/13 Forward Est. \$'000	2013/14 Forward Est. \$'000	2014/15 Forward Est. \$'000
KLC Funding		13,495	4,462				
Native Title Agreement				62,804	10,980	11,337	
Salaries and Operating Costs	710	720	828	960	994	1,029	
Public Relations		16	105				
Consultants	2,875	4,348	1,278	1,103	81	84	
Legal Fees	80	685	1,744				
Total Expenditure	3,665	19,264	8,417	64,867	12,055	12,450	

Note that parts of this expenditure was offset by revenue from Woodside Energy Limited

	2009/10 Est. Actual \$'000	2010/11 \$Est. Actual '000
KLC Funding	9,226	2,900
Consultants	2,917	610