



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
Question On Notice



Tuesday, 8 May 2018

1223. Hon Robin Chapple to the Minister for Environment representing the Minister for Planning

I refer to the Kimberley/Pilbara/Gascoyne Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP) Agenda, dated 29 March 2018, and I ask:

- (a) why was the meeting held in Perth;
- (b) why were the Local Government members all absent from this meeting;
- (c) with reference to the JDAP consultation with other agencies or consultants, why was the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation or representative of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation agency not consulted;
- (d) given the interest of both the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation and the Federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation management of the areas surrounding the proposal, why was there no mention of their interests in the decision to be made by the JDAP;
- (e) were either the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation and the Federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation agency advised of this proposal;
- (f) if yes to (e), on what dates;
- (g) if no to (e), why not;
- (h) if no to (e), why with reference to *Local Planning Scheme, Industry - Clause 6.7.2 – General Provisions*, which states that "issues to be considered in c) risks, hazards, health and amenity associated with the proposed use being located in proximity to existing and planned industry, infrastructure or public purpose or any other use", were these bodies not consulted;
- (i) given that there is a Conservation Agreement between Woodside (Pluto) and the Commonwealth Government in respect of the Burrup (Murujuga) and that the whole commercial viability of the proposal is about trucking a volatile product on public roads covered by these agreements, why was no evaluation carried out over these risks to areas covered by these agreements;
- (j) why was there no evaluation of the risks associated with the national heritage values of adjacent lands;
- (k) why was there no evaluation of the impact and suitability of the transport of volatile material on what is the narrow Burrup Road associated with other volatile transport already using this road, and other civilian road users; and
- (l) why was no axle loading and rumble impact carried out associated with increased heavy vehicle usage on the adjacent heritage listed petroglyphs, either within the Pluto site or main roads through the Burrup (Murujuga)?

Answer

- (a) Due to the nature of the application, it was appropriate for the meeting to be considered via teleconference. The meeting was arranged at the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage located at 140 William Street, Perth and via teleconference with the City of Karratha office.

(b) The Kimberley/Pilbara/Gascoyne Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP) Local Government members were not available for the following reasons:

- Cr Peter Long was interstate.
- Cr Grant Cucel declared a direct pecuniary interest, which precluded him from participating.
- Cr Evette Smeathers was on annual leave.
- Cr Margaret Bertling had not previously attended DAP member training, which precluded her from participating.

(c)-(e) The site of the proposal (an LNG truck loading facility) has no direct interface with, and is approximately 1.4 kilometres from, the nearest boundary of the Murujuga National Park and is a relatively minor component of the greater Pluto and Northwest Shelf State-significant LNG processing facilities operated by Woodside and its joint venture partners.

The Application for Planning Approval was publicly advertised on the JDAP website in April 2018, providing opportunity for the public to comment on the application. Woodside has also made public announcements about plans for the Pluto LNG truck loading facility since 2017.

(f) Not applicable

(g) See the answers to parts (c) and (i).

(h)-(k)

Section 6.7.2(c) of the Scheme was addressed in the report to the JDAP as shown in the JDAP agenda published for the meeting. The issues of risk, hazard, health and amenity were considered as required by the Scheme throughout the report.

The application was referred to Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA) and no issues were raised by MRWA in regard to trucking product from the plant on public roads. No change to existing road classification was required to facilitate this proposed development.

The application was also referred to the Department of Mines, Industry, Regulation and Safety. No issues were raised by that Department in regard to the transport of LNG on public roads.

The JDAP report states that the proponent had noted their requirements to develop Environmental Management Plans and confirmed the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation advice that the Pluto LNG truck loading facility could be constructed and operated under existing environmental approvals.

A Cultural Heritage Management Assessment was completed in July 2017 which includes mitigating measures to ensure there will be no impacts to any rock art and Aboriginal heritage sites. The assessment considered existing approval conditions under the Aboriginal Heritage Act, Conservation Agreement, and Burrup and Maitland Industrial Estates Agreement obligations.

(l) The proponent obtained approval under Section 18 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 to enable construction of the Pluto LNG Plant. The site of the proposed truck loading facility is

on land within the greater Pluto LNG facility and will not increase the production rate or emissions from the development or require a change to existing road classifications. Woodside has been working with neighbouring industry, Government and the City of Karratha to determine and implement traffic management measures commensurate with the nature and volume of expected vehicle movements.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a vertical line followed by a stylized, cursive flourish.