

## Parliamentary Question

<b>Minister Representing:</b>	Minister for Local Government representing the Minister for	<b>Question No:</b>	4455
<b>Portfolio:</b>	Indigenous Affairs	<b>Question Date:</b>	20/03/2007
<b>Year:</b>	2007	<b>Answer Date:</b>	31/05/2007
<b>Parliament:</b>	37	<b>Question Type:</b>	Question On Notice
<b>Session Number:</b>	1	<b>Asked By:</b>	Hon Giz Watson
<b>Chamber:</b>	Council	<b>Tabled Paper No:</b>	

### Question & Answer:

With regard to the Pluto LNG proposal, site A and B, I ask -

- (1) How many section 18 applications were originally made for Pluto site (A)?
- (2) How many sites, panels, individual petroglyphs, tool scatters, hunting hides or other cultural materials were covered by these applications?
- (3) How many sites, panels, individual petroglyphs, tool scatters, hunting hides or other cultural materials were identified in Woodside's survey work and were these accurate?
- (4) Did the survey work carried out by the indigenous custodians identify a differing amount of sites, panels, individual petroglyphs, tool scatters, hunting hides or other cultural materials, and if so, how many extra sites were found by these parties and were any found to be incorrect in Woodside's survey work?
- (5) How many sites, panels, individual petroglyphs, tool scatters, hunting hides or other cultural materials are being allowed to be disturbed by Woodside as a result of the Ministers decision to allow the section 18 applications?
- (6) If any of the items identified in answer to (5) cannot be safely moved or are damaged, what action is to be carried out by Woodside in respect of these items?
- (7) Is Woodside permitted to use methodologies to remove petroglyphs from panels that are too large to move, and if so, what are those methodologies?
- (8) In relation to cultural material that is to be moved, into what location is this being placed and is the scientific and cultural appropriateness of this location being considered?
- (9) If yes to (8), by whom?
- (10) Is the current material in the proposed relocation site being compromised or scientifically altered by the location of this new material?
- (11) How many section 18 applications were originally made for Pluto site (B)?

(12) How many sites, panels, individual petroglyphs, tool scatters, hunting hides or other cultural materials were covered by these applications?

(13) How many sites, panels, individual petroglyphs, tool scatters, hunting hides or other cultural materials were identified in Woodside's survey work and were these accurate?

(14) Did the survey work carried out by the indigenous custodians identify a differing amount of sites, panels, individual petroglyphs, tool scatters, hunting hides or other cultural materials, and if so, how many extra sites were found by these parties and were any found to be incorrect in Woodside's survey work?

(15) How many sites, panels, individual petroglyphs, tool scatters, hunting hides or other cultural materials are being allowed to be disturbed by Woodside as a result of the Ministers decision to allow the section 18 applications?

(16) If any of the items identified in answer to (15) cannot be safely moved or are damaged, what action is to be carried out by Woodside in respect of these items?

(17) Is Woodside permitted to use methodologies to remove petroglyphs from panels that are too large to move, and if so, what are those methodologies?

(18) In relation to cultural material that is to be moved, into what location is this proposed to be placed, and is the scientific and cultural appropriateness of this location being considered?

(19) If yes to (18), by whom?

(20) Will the current material in the proposed relocation site be compromised or scientifically altered by the location of this new material?

**The Department of Indigenous Affairs advise:**

**(1)**

One.

**(2)**

In relation to Pluto Area A:

Sites: 147 registered sites

Panels: Not available

Individual petroglyphs: Approximately 441 (across 62 engraving sites)

Artefact/midden scatters: 3

Stone features: 51

Multiple site types/other: 31

**(3)**

Refer to question 2.

**(4)**

Different survey groups identified different sites depending on site identification methods and the conditions during the surveys. All the sites identified were incorporated into the heritage survey reports prepared for Woodside.

**(5)**

Consent was granted with the knowledge that the project would impact upon 87 Aboriginal heritage sites within the meaning of section 5 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972*.

**(6)**

All sites that could not be left *in situ* were successfully salvaged and relocated with the exception of a small number of stone pits and one standing stone, which were destroyed *in situ* in consultation with the Aboriginal representatives.

**(7)**

Yes, in accordance with the conditions of consent. Relocation however, was the only method employed during the salvage work on Pluto site A.

**(8)**

All relocation of cultural material on Pluto Area A has been done in consultation with the relevant Aboriginal groups and heritage professionals.

**(9)**

Discussions regarding relocation took place between Woodside officers, Aboriginal custodians, heritage professionals, the Department of Indigenous Affairs and technical experts associated with the relocation of the material.

**(10)**

Relocation to any site may compromise and scientifically alter the cultural material in question. Locations are carefully considered to minimise this.

**(11)**

One.

**(12)**

In relation to Pluto Area B:

Sites: 268 registered sites

Panels: Not available

Individual petroglyphs: Approximately 500 (across 173 engraving sites)

Artefact/midden scatters: 10

Stone features: 52

Multiple site types/other: 33

**(13)**

Refer to question 12.

**(14)**

Different survey groups identified different sites depending on site identification methods and the conditions during the surveys. All the sites identified were incorporated into the heritage survey reports prepared for Woodside.

**(15)**

Consent was granted with the knowledge that the project would impact upon 193 Aboriginal heritage sites within the meaning of section 5 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972*.

**(16)**

Best efforts will be made to avoid items that cannot be relocated; where this is not possible they will be destroyed *in situ*. Woodside is committed to relocating cultural material in consultation with the relevant Aboriginal groups if the cultural material cannot be avoided.

**(17)**

Yes, in accordance with the conditions of consent.

**(18)**

All cultural material to be moved will be done in consultation with the relevant Aboriginal groups and heritage professionals. It will be moved to an agreed location taking into account both cultural and scientific appropriateness.

**(19)**

Discussions regarding relocation are taking place between Woodside officers, Aboriginal custodians, heritage professionals, the Department of Indigenous Affairs and technical experts associated with the relocation of the material.

**(20)**

Relocation to any site may compromise and scientifically alter the cultural material in question. Locations are carefully considered to minimise this.