

PORTS — KIMBERLEY MARINE SUPPORT BASE

1603. Hon Dr Brad Pettitt to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Ports:

I refer to the proposed privately-funded Kimberley Marine Support Base (KMSB) at Broome Port, previously named the ‘Kimberley Marine Offloading Facility’, the proponent of which is Kimberley Marine Support Base Pty Ltd, and I ask:

- (a) what was the Port of Broome revenue for the last financial year;
- (b) is the Minister aware that according to an article in the *Australian Financial Review* on June 8, 2023 the KMSB has reportedly stated forecast revenue of – \$41.5 million for 2026, \$55.4 million for 2027, \$62.4 million for 2029 and \$65.2 million for 2030;
- (c) has the Minister or Department reviewed these forecasts and determined if they are realistic;
- (d) if yes to (c), what new import and export projects will generate this level of revenue;
- (e) how will the Minister ensure the Port of Broome will continue to receive revenue sufficient to continue operations if the private wharf takes business away from the Port of Broome;
- (f) has the proposed KMSB floating wharf been assessed by a state engineer or engineers;
- (g) if no to (f), why not;
- (h) if yes to (f), will the Minister table the report;
- (i) if no to (h), why not;
- (j) if the proposal has been assessed by a state or independent engineer, did they identify any concerns given the tides can exceed 10 metres;
- (k) if the proposal has been assessed by a state or independent engineer, did that assessment include the potential compounding impacts on the proposed wharf of a combination of high tides, high waves or swells and cyclonic weather conditions;
- (l) if no to (k), why not;
- (m) what is the maximum wave height or swell measured at the port;
- (n) does the Minister or department consider the proposed floating wharf can tolerate the high tides, maximum wave heights and cyclone conditions at the port;
- (o) if yes to (n), on what basis has the Minister made a determination on this;
- (p) according to the Kimberley Ports Authority (KPA) website, KPA and KMSB negotiated a range of leases which are conditional on KMSB finalising the necessary environmental and cultural heritage approvals; attracting finance and appointing a facility operator. Has KMSB finalised the design and engineering elements of the new multiuser facility;
- (q) have each of those lease conditions in (p) been met; and
- (r) if no to (p), which ones remain outstanding and why?

**Hon Sue Ellery replied:**

- (a) For 2022–23 the gross revenue was \$24,091 million.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) No.
- (d) Not applicable.
- (e) Kimberley Ports Authority will receive land lease rent, variable rent and will provide stevedoring for the first five years to KMSB operators, in addition to receiving revenue from marine based fees and charges and operations on the existing facility.
- (f) The final design requires a works approval by Kimberley Ports Authority and KMSB will obtain an independent design verification report.
- (g) Not applicable.
- (h) Not applicable.
- (i) Not applicable.
- (j) Not applicable.
- (k) Not applicable.

- (l) Not applicable.
- (m) The design is based on a wave height of 4.9 m which is based on measured data obtained at the Port.
- (n) I understand KMSB has engaged experts in Copenhagen, Denmark who constructed a scale model of the facility in a dedicated wave pool. The scale model was exposed to the environmental conditions experienced at the Port including tidal, wind, wave and current conditions. The testing was based on both normal operational and cyclonic conditions.
- (o) Ministerial determination not required.
- (p) Yes.
- (q) Yes.
- (r) Not applicable.