

PERDAMAN UREA PROJECT — ROCK ART

789. Hon Dr Brad Pettitt to the minister representing the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade:

I refer to the Perdaman Urea project. The proposed Urea plant would be built immediately adjacent to the current Burrup Peninsula National heritage listed area and Murujuga National Park and would involve the physical removal of Aboriginal rock art including at least one highly culturally sensitive image. Although Aboriginal Affairs Minister Hon Dr Tony Buti on 27, January 2022 gave section 18 approval under the *WA Aboriginal Heritage Act* for Perdaman to remove this rock art, this proposal is currently the subject of an emergency section 9 application by Murujuga Aboriginal custodians under the *Commonwealth Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Heritage Protection Act*. Given the fact that the purpose-designated Maitland Heavy Industrial Estate is situated only approximately 15 km south of the current site location and would seem to be an ideal location for the plant, because of the absence of globally significant rock art at Maitland, I ask:

- (a) will the Minister provide an explanation as to why the State Government is proceeding to locate a major industrial project within a potential world heritage site and immediately adjacent to the Burrup National heritage listed area, when the purpose-designated Maitland industrial estate, which does not contain globally significant Aboriginal cultural heritage, is available instead;
- (b) if no to (a), why not;
- (c) did the State Government obtain costings for situating the Perdaman plant at Maitland rather than the current planned location;
- (d) if no to , why not;
- (e) if the Government did obtain such costings, will the Government now release them and clarify the cost differential for locating the Perdaman plant at Maitland instead of the current proposed location which will involve the removal of rock art to make way for the plant;
- (f) if no to (e), why not;
- (g) if the State Government obtained such costings, will the Minister state which agency and consultancy provided it with these costings;
- (h) if no to (g), why not;
- (i) if the State Government did not obtain such costings, will the Minister provide an estimate of the cost differential; and
- (j) if no to (f), why not?

**Hon Alannah MacTiernan replied:**

The Department of Jobs, Tourism, Science and Innovation advises:

- (a) The Environmental Protection Authority required Perdaman to consider alternative sites including Maitland SIA, in its Public Environmental Review.  
  
Perdaman cited the significant clearing of Murujuga land including National Heritage Listing areas to construct a conveyor as well as the significantly greater cost among the reasons why Maitland was not a feasible location for its Urea project.  
  
These considerations, combined with the robust environmental management outcomes that can be achieved by the conditions placed on the project by the Minister for the Environment, give the State Government full confidence that the Burrup Strategic Industrial Area is an appropriate location for the Perdaman project.
- (b) N/A
- (c) In its Public Environmental Review Document, Perdaman estimates that the cost of locating at Maitland, in comparison to the Burrup, is approximately \$700 million to \$1billion.
- (d) N/A
- (e) This cost estimate was disclosed to the Environmental Protection Authority and publically released as part of Perdaman's Public Environmental Review.
- (f) N/A
- (g) N/A
- (h) N/A
- (i) N/A
- (j) N/A

