

Question On Notice No. 5009 asked in the **Legislative Council** on **14 August 2007** by **Hon Giz Watson**

Question Directed to the: **Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for the Environment**

Minister responding: **Hon D.A. Templeman**

Parliament: **37** Session: **1**

Question

With regard to the assessment carried out by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), 'Pluto LNG Development, Burrup Peninsula, Bulletin 1259', which is currently under appeal, and the Aboriginal Cultural Committee Resolution (ACMC) 2006/150: Consent Declined - Mining in relation to Site B. Given that the ACMC resolved to recommend to the Minister for Indigenous Affairs that consent be declined to Woodside Energy Limited (the Landowner) to use the land described in Schedule 1 of the Notice as Lot 572 on Deposited Plan 28209 (Industrial Site B) (the Land), for the purpose described in schedule 2 of the notice as development and operation of an LNG Plant and all associated infrastructure and facilities (the Purpose) -

(1) How is the EPA able to determine and recommend to the Minister for the Environment that the proposed Pluto Development meets its objectives -

(a) from an Aboriginal cultural perspective; and

(b) from a scientific heritage perspective, given that the Dampier Archipelago is now on the National Heritage Register?

(2) Given that the site data evidence presented to the EPA by Woodside in their PER for the area concerned was quite different from the data supplied by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in answer to question on notice No. 4455, answered 31 May 2007 for the same area. How can the EPA make a satisfactory recommendation to the Minister?

Answered on 19 September 2007

(1) For both the 'Pluto LNG Development, Burrup Peninsula, Bulletin 1259' and the earlier 'Development of Industrial Land on the Burrup Peninsula for Future Gas Development, Bulletin 1228', there were three components to the EPA's objectives:

- That conservation objectives are met in the context of the wider Burrup Peninsula;
- Impacts of the proposal on heritage sites are avoided wherever practicable; and
- Unavoidable impacts are managed appropriately in consultation with the Traditional Custodians.

(a) The EPA considered the proposal in relation to its objectives and concluded that the Pluto LNG Development can be managed to meet those objectives.

(b) The proposed site for the Pluto LNG Development is in an area which is not within the National Heritage listed area.

(2) On the advice of the Department of Indigenous Affairs, the proponent only provided data on 'verified' Aboriginal heritage sites. The EPA was advised immediately prior to completing its Bulletin 1228 that the number of sites stated in the Bulletin was correct. The EPA understands that the data provided in answer to Question on Notice No.4455 included 'unverified' sites.