

House: Legislative Council- QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Date: Tuesday, 14 March 2006
Member: Llewellyn, Hon Paul; Chance, Hon Kim
Subject: PLUTO GAS FIELD LNG PROJECT - MAINLAND FACILITY, WEST INTERCOURSE ISLAND
Page: 352c - 353a / 1

PLUTO GAS FIELD LNG PROJECT - MAINLAND FACILITY, WEST INTERCOURSE ISLAND

2760. Hon Paul Llewellyn to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for State Development

With regard to development of the Woodside-owned LNG project based on the Pluto gas field, and answers to questions -

- (a) No. 265, Wednesday, December 11 2002, Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development;
- (b) No. 701, Tuesday, May 13 2003, Hon Jon Ford to the Hon Robin Chapple;
- (c) No. 772, Tuesday, April 1 2003, Hon Jon Ford to Hon Robin Chapple;
- (d) No. 832, Tuesday, April 8 2003, Hon Louise Pratt to Hon Robin Chapple;
- (e) No. 983, Wednesday, September 10 2003, Hon Robin Chapple to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for State Development;
- (f) Legislative Council Estimates Committee, Tuesday, June 11 2002, Division 55: Mineral and Petroleum Resources; and
- (g) No. 1, Tuesday, May 3 2005, Hon Robin Chapple to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for State Development.

- (1) Have there been any discussions with Woodside in relation to the establishment of this development on West Intercourse Island?
- (2) When were such discussions first initiated and by whom?
- (3) Which officer of the Department has been conducting these discussions?
- (4) Which senior Departmental Officers were aware of such discussions and when?
- (5) On what date was the Minister or former Minister apprised of these discussions?
- (6) Are the current discussions related in anyway to those identified in answer to question on notice No. 265 above?
- (7) Does the Minister still consider West Intercourse Island a suitable place for the development of this mainland facility?
- (8) If so, why?
- (9) Have there been any discussions with Woodside in relation to the establishment of this development on the Burrup?

- (10) On what date was the Minister or former Minister apprised of these discussions?
- (11) Does the Minister still consider the Burrup a suitable place for the development of this mainland facility?
- (12) If so, why?
- (13) What are the predicted levels or emissions of benzene at this proposed mainland facility?
- (14) What is the total of volatile organic compounds at this mainland facility?
- (15) What will be the predicted emissions of Nitrogen oxides from this mainland facility?
- (16) What will be the predicted emissions of Sulphur dioxide from this mainland facility?
- (17) What will be the predicted emissions of Benzene Toluene Xylene from this mainland facility?
- (18) If the development proceeds at either West Intercourse Island or the Burrup, by how much will this increase the explosive potential of material being stored at Dampier, currently at 760 000 tonnes of TNT equivalent?

Hon KIM CHANCE replied:

- (1) Yes
- (2) The discussions were first initiated by Woodside Energy Limited in June 2005.
- (3) Officers of the Office of Major Projects and the Infrastructure Coordination Division have been conducting these discussions.
- (4) Senior Departmental Officers in the areas outlined in (3) above were aware of the discussions in June 2005.
- (5) The Minister was apprised of these discussions on 28 September 2005.
- (6) Yes.
- (7) Yes. I am not clear why the term "mainland" is used in this and subsequent questions.
- (8) Because West Intercourse Island is planned and zoned for industry.
- (9) Yes.
- (10) The Minister was apprised of these discussions on 28 September 2005.
- (11) Yes
- (12) Because the land on the Burrup Peninsula under investigation by Woodside for the Pluto project is planned and zoned for industry.
- (13) This will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement prepared by Woodside.
- (14-17) See response to (13)
- (18) With respect to any addition to explosive-equivalent potential for materials currently stored on the Burrup Peninsula, I am assured by safety specialists that this is a meaningless figure. It is well known that

estimating hazard based on energy content is meaningless and very misleading. LNG does not explode; it burns relatively slowly when mixed with air, without forming an explosive shock wave. Even then, too much or too little gas will not support combustion.