

**RESERVES (MARMION MARINE PARK) BILL 2019**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from 18 September.

**HON STEPHEN DAWSON (Mining and Pastoral — Minister for Environment)** [12.30 pm] — in reply: Before we finished yesterday afternoon, I was providing an answer to the question asked by Hon Dr Steve Thomas about whether we could flip the location of the marina to the south of the current proposal area. I had begun to provide some of the key environmental issues that had been identified if the Ocean Reef marina was located at an alternative site to the south. I will not make the points that I made yesterday, but continue on in that regard.

I am advised that a reduction in flushing characteristics and overall water quality could be expected if the proposal was moved to the sandy coastline, which is evident south of the Ocean Reef Boat Harbour where the rate of groundwater inflow will be reduced. Seagrass communities would be more significantly impacted if the marina was constructed south of the existing boat harbour. It is also likely that more earthworks would be required to create land for the proposal. Another impact would be that broader visual impact on the existing residents of Mullaloo and the green-link opportunity would likely be lost or compromised given the available land. The Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development has conducted a detailed assessment of the impact the Ocean Reef marina will have on aquatic resources. No such assessment has been made on a proposal to the south as no such proposal has been put forward for assessment. The Environmental Protection Authority has also conducted a detail assessment of the impact of the Ocean Reef marina based on the current design and location. Whilst the EPA is required to consider and assess proposals that are referred to it, through the EPA's assessment and the appeals investigation, LandCorp has advised that locating the marina further south would prevent additional environmental issues.

Before we concluded yesterday, Hon Dr Steve Thomas had an outstanding query about the annual review of abalone fishery impacts. Our interpretation of Hon Dr Steve Thomas's question was: could the annual results from the monitoring undertaken at the Ocean Reef marina development site, in accordance with the abalone habitat biomass monitoring plan that is required for at least five years, be used in commercial quota setting? Each year the department analyses data from the surveys it undertakes at the 17 sites across area 7 as well as information from commercial and recreational fishing. All this information is used to determine annual stock status and to set commercial and recreational catches for abalone in area 7. This process is set out in the department's abalone harvest strategy publication and was taken into account in attaining Marine Stewardship Council certification for the fishery. Importantly, the annual catch-setting processes are undertaken in close consultation with commercial abalone fishers and Recfishwest.

I will move on to some further queries raised by Hon Alison Xamon. Although the excision is necessary to deliver this election commitment that has been long anticipated by the community, the McGowan government is committed to protecting the Western Australian conservation reserve system. The Plan for Our Parks policy that the Premier and I announced earlier in the year, which aims to create an extra five million hectares of national marine park and conservation estate over the next five years, includes some proposals to expand the marine conservation estate, particularly the marine conservation reserve system. We have flagged that there could be opportunities for the expansion of the marine conservation reserve system in the metropolitan area, and those opportunities are being explored at the moment. Targeted consultation will begin soon with not only other government departments, but also local government authorities and peak bodies to refine a metropolitan marine parks proposal for the Plan for Our Parks initiative. The Marmion Marine Park management plan will also be reviewed to reflect the excised section of the marine park to accommodate the expansion of the Ocean Reef Boat Harbour as well as any extension of the marine park. The management plan is outdated—it is from 1992—so the development of the Ocean Reef marina will result in an increase in the use of this area. This is an opportunity to review the management arrangements for the marine park, including enhancing conservation outcomes while providing for ongoing sustainable use.

The honourable member also touched on the issue of climate change. The Environmental Protection Authority considered the implications of sea level rise when assessing the impacts of the proposal. I am advised that the proponent undertook an assessment of the impacts based on an increase in sea level by 0.9 metres within the next 100 years. This assessment was carried out consistently with "State Planning Policy 2.6: State Coastal Planning Policy", which sets out specific considerations relevant to sea level rise for coastal developments in Western Australia.

In relation to the points made about sustainable design, LandCorp has a proven track record in achieving sustainable and innovative development throughout its projects. Ocean Reef marina will follow this mandate. LandCorp is pursuing an Infrastructure Sustainability Council of Australia accreditation that will ensure that class-leading sustainability outcomes are realised over the infrastructure components of the project covering themes such as the environment, economy and governance. Ocean Reef marina is also recognised as an innovation-through-demonstration project that champions change, new technologies and sustainable living. The Ocean Reef marina project webpage

at LandCorp.com.au/Ocean-Reef-Marina, and LandCorp's "Have your say" online engagement portal provide opportunities for interested community members to stay informed of project updates and any future opportunities for comments and feedback. Earlier this year, local residents were also invited to join a community reference group representing the views of different segments of the community. Twenty representatives were selected to join the community reference group to help guide the design and features of the Ocean Reef marina public realm. A landscape master plan is now being developed that incorporates the reference groups' recommendations.

With regard to Bush Forever, while the land-based impacts are beyond the scope of this bill, as acknowledged by Hon Alison Xamon, an approved Bush Forever—negotiated planning outcome is required and sets out strategies to ensure the long-term protection of the environment, including the rehabilitation of adjoining degraded bushland and the recent government acquisition of offset conservation land with similar environmental values. An amendment to the metropolitan region scheme is required to facilitate construction of the development. That will be progressed as a separate submission to Parliament in line with legislative requirements. I would certainly be happy to raise the member's concerns about Bush Forever impacts with the Minister for Planning for consideration at the appropriate time.

Finally I want to touch on the queries raised by Hon Rick Mazza. I have referred to some already but the outstanding query is: what is the cost and who pays? The project will receive about \$120 million in state government funding and about \$132 million in LandCorp equity. But by far the biggest funding contribution will be from the private sector through its delivery of the built form—essentially building the marina. Additional funding for the artificial reef and stock enhancement projects is being pursued through the recreational fishing initiatives fund. LandCorp is also participating in a smart farming partnership grant consortium application to the federal government. The consortium comprises a partnership between LandCorp, the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development, Recfishwest, recreational and commercial fishers, aquaculturalists, Murdoch University and natural resource managers to protect habitat and support the resource management of fisheries. As the member alluded to in his comments, this issue has been treated with the utmost importance by a number of state government agencies. I think the member said after he had been provided with his briefing that he was left with a degree of confidence—if I can paraphrase what he said—about how seriously people are treating this and how all the potential impacts have been looked at and will be mitigated as a result of the work undertaken on this project.

I commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Committee*

The Deputy Chair of Committees (Hon Robin Chapple) in the chair; Hon Stephen Dawson (Minister for Environment) in charge of the bill.

#### **Clause 1: Short title —**

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** This will hopefully be a fairly short debate, but it may be a slightly tricky one, because I suspect that a lot of the questions that we are interested in fall outside of the environment portfolio and into some others. I will do my very best. If it gets to the point where we just do not have the answers, then we will not have the answers.

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** By way of interjection, I will do my very best to provide the answer if I possibly can.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** We will try to get the right things on record. We may not be able to—we may just have to accept that—but let us give it a go.

Can the minister give us a description of the abalone fishery in area 7? Looking at the proportion of reef and fisheries that will be impacted, is area 7 the entire metropolitan region or a proportion of the metropolitan region? I just want an idea of what the numbers actually look like.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Area 7 goes from approximately Moore River in the north, down to about Cape Bouvard in the south. It is north of Perth and south of Perth, between Moore River and Cape Bouvard.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** I thank the minister for that clarification. Effectively, that is the fisheries off the metropolitan region. Obviously, therefore, with the impact percentages that we have been talking about, it will have a significant impact on the total catch. I was wondering whether this was a smaller region and the numbers represented a big fish in a small pond, but it is not. It is a relatively sized fish in a relatively sized pond. I guess that takes me back to the issue of compensation for what is then a reasonably significant proportion of the metropolitan catch of abalone. Is the minister in a position to give us any figures or an undertaking that the compensation package does not have a price tag restricting how much might be available in the process? Acknowledging that the compensation package would normally come through the Department of Fisheries and would be negotiated as

a natural part of this process, are we able to get some level of comfort for the affected community that there is not a cap restricting how much that will be? Is there a limited fund that restricts how much would be available? I guess I am looking for some support that the government would be looking to provide fair and just compensation based on market forces.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** There is certainly no cap on amounts that may be provided. Obviously, negotiation will happen between the state and the affected licence holder. I will just put one point on the record. Initial estimates predict a potential loss of 9.35 per cent of abalone habitat within Marmion Marine Park. This is estimated to reduce the available catch by approximately nine tonnes of abalone—approximately 4.5 tonnes of commercial catch and 4.5 tonnes of recreational catch. The current annual recreational catch is set at 18 to 22 tonnes.

**Hon Dr Steve Thomas:** For area 7 or for the marine park area?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** This is for area 7. The annual figure is set at 18 to 22 tonnes of recreational catch and 24 tonnes of commercial catch; therefore, the commercial catch will be reduced by approximately 20 per cent for area 7, from Cape Bouvard to Moore River.

In the compensation process, we have approved the establishment of a voluntary fisheries adjustment scheme—a VFAS—to assess appropriate compensation entitlements for the commercial abalone licence holders who will be impacted by the marina development. The VFAS will look to purchase entitlement or licences within area 7 of the commercial abalone fishery. This will be assessed by an independent committee providing advice to the Minister for Fisheries on all matters, including the value of the abalone licences and entitlement quotas. It is important to note that the scheme is voluntary.

Earlier in the week, while I was away from this place on urgent parliamentary business, I am aware that Hon Jim Chown asked a question about the VFAS and the committee, so the membership of that committee is now on the public record. It is an independent process. Hon Dr Steve Thomas said today that he had previously been an adviser to ministers. I have been an adviser to a fisheries minister. This VFAS process has been used over time in relation to various fisheries as there has been a need to buy up or close fisheries. I think that this process is respected and well regarded by the participants, and it is certainly well understood by the fishing industry in Western Australia. That process will be used for this VFAS.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** Just on that, I understand that this will be a voluntary scheme. Has the government received any expressions of interest from current licence holders to have their licences bought out?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** No, we have not. We have not called for applications yet. Upon passage of this bill—hopefully today in this place—would be the appropriate time for us to go out and call for applications. We have not done that yet. It would have been a bit presumptuous of us to call for something before the Legislative Council had considered the legislation.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** I do not have the notes in front of me, but there are 13 commercial licences in area 7. How many of those 13 licences are held by abalone fishermen?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Although that is outside the scope of the bill before us, I will give the member as much of an answer as I can on that. I am advised that all are owned by abalone divers, but not all are fished at the same time—some transfer quota rights at various times. All are owned by abalone divers, but they are not all fished.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** Just to continue that, I know I am trying to pin the minister down a bit, but that is my job.

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** Go for your life! If I can provide an answer, of course I will.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** Is the minister aware of any restriction that would prevent, for example, a compensation package that is less than \$20 million coming out to those commercial abalone fishers?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I cannot comment on the likely quantum of any buyout. I am not at liberty to comment. Any discussions will obviously be commercial-in-confidence for a time. It is not best for the government to come out with a figure because that ties our hands in negotiations. I am not aware of any upper figure. I do not believe there is one. We will go into this negotiation appropriately and properly and we will have those conversations with the fishers who may be affected.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** We have had briefings on the use of silt blankets to try to minimise the silt moving around. Is silt from the development likely to have an impact beyond the immediate area of where dredging et cetera will occur? Will the government make sure that whatever mechanism is put into place will accommodate both the environmental and harvest impact of the silt damage?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I will answer this way: we have a level of confidence and the Environmental Protection Authority has assessed this proposal and suggested that it can be implemented subject to a range of conditions. The Appeals Convenor and I, as the Minister for Environment, undertook some work in relation to the appeals and we tightened up the approvals that were given, so we have a level of confidence that what we are saying is correct.

If, for some reason, the impact is greater than we anticipate, at the end of five years, an exercise will be undertaken and, potentially, there will be a need to lessen —

**Hon Dr Steve Thomas:** Perhaps less than five years if the impact is significant early.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** As I said in my comments today, that will be monitored in the meantime. Obviously, it is open to the CEO of the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation to seek to change conditions based on the advice that will be coming back annually from the monitoring and reporting that needs to take place. That is the potential, but, certainly, at the end of five years, as part of the review process, if, as a result of the review, we see the need to change the conditions, lessen the impact or lower the quota, that could happen at that stage.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** The abalone fishery has been quite contentious. My understanding is that about 100 000 abalone will be relocated—some of that work will be done by divers—to a section of the reef affected by hot-water events in 2010–11. Another 200 000 juvenile abalone—I think the terminology is “spat”—will be put onto the artificial reef. What is the difference in cost between relocating 100 000 abalone to another area of the reef and seeding 200 000 abalone onto the artificial reef? Would it be cheaper to seed the section of the reef where the translocation is to take place rather than dive for mature abalone and translocate them?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am told that both are part of the plan to replace what is being lost as a result of the creation of the park. The cost of the creation of the artificial reef and the stocking of the 200 000 juveniles will be about \$600 000. The abalone divers and Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development scientists will make sure that the translocation of the 100 000 abalone is done properly. The cost of that will be approximately \$200 000. We want to make sure that we are giving it our best shot to ensure that the impact on abalone is limited, so we are trialling both.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** I am a little curious about the translocation to the area that was affected by the hot-water event eight or nine years ago and why the abalone have not re-established on that affected section of reef. Will the translocation of the abalone to that area have a degree of success, considering that abalone have not re-established there. I would have thought that spawning abalone over nine years would have re-established that area as a viable abalone fishery. I am a little curious about the science around why the hot-water event that occurred has not allowed for the natural re-establishment of abalone over this period. What science is there around the translocation of abalone being successful?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am told that the 2010–11 heatwave impacted an area further north, around Kalbarri, which is outside area 7. We are not translocating abalone there because if that area had been heat-affected before, it may well be heat-affected again. The work that we intend to do is inside area 7. I am told that DPIRD has successfully demonstrated the translocation technique. The development has strict environmental conditions and will have a five-year monitoring program. The artificial habitat, using proven techniques with concrete blocks, will be created in proximity to the marina and supplemented with hatchery-reared abalone. Essentially, the historic occurrence in 2010–11 happened in a very different area and we will not be doing this work there; we will be doing it very close to the park, where we understand we will have much better success.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** I am a little confused about that because my understanding from the briefing was that the abalone would be relocated to an area that was affected by the heatwave event in 2010–11. If it is not, I understand that the minister is talking about further north in Kalbarri —

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** By way of interjection?

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** Yes.

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** The whole of the west coast, I am advised, had an impact, but the area that was most affected was the area near Kalbarri, which was kind of disastrous. Therefore, we will not be going back near that. We will be doing stuff lower down, close to —

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** Right—so will that be at the northern end of area 7?

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** No, inside area 7. The area of mass mortalities was outside area 7; it was area 8.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** I am clear on that now. From the briefing I had, the translocation of the abalone would be to an area in which abalone stocks are not currently present and part of the reason was that hot-water event.

Getting back to my question: Why has the abalone not naturally re-established in this area? If we translocate mature abalone into that area, what is the science around it being successful?

**The DEPUTY CHAIR (Hon Robin Chapple):** I think it might be worthwhile and for the benefit of Hansard to refer to the map that is in the schedule at the back of the bill. There has been a lot of discussion, with hand movements, about where things might be and all the rest of it, so I think if we refer to something that Hansard can reference, that would be good.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Sure. My apologies if my gesticulating is causing concern for Hansard or indeed any other member of this place. I draw members' attention to schedule 1 in the Reserves (Marmion Marine Park) Bill 2019, which has a map solely of an area that is Marmion Marine Park. However, the map that I am using, which shows area 6, area 7 and area 8, is not actually associated with the bill.

To answer the member's question, the translocation will occur in areas in which there is some abalone already or in areas where we know, with some confidence, that abalone will be able to grow. It is within area 7. It is likely to be north and south of the marine park, but it will be in area 7. The significant hot-water event that happened in 2010–11 happened further north. Although there was some effect across the west coast of Western Australia, the significant impact was further north. We are not going there. The area that we will use is where abalone exists already. We will translocate into that area, and we have some confidence that it will take and be successful.

*Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm*

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** Before the break we were talking about the hot-water event that occurred in 2010–11. The minister's advice was that it occurred outside zone 7, predominantly around Kalbarri. I understand that since 2012, the recreational catch has reduced by about 50 per cent as a result of some of the effects of that hot-water event. Given that the marina project will affect some of the reef and there will be a relocation, will the quota for the recreational sector reduce in the short term when the project commences?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am told that the quota may not need to be reduced. However, the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development will hold discussions with Recfishwest, as it does annually and as the marina is rolled out, and based on the surveys undertaken in area 7, a decision will be made based on what that catch will be. I cannot say definitively, but potentially the quota will not be reduced.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** At the moment the recreational quota is 18 to 22 tonnes and the commercial quota is 24 tonnes. It is estimated that the development will result in a reduction in the quota by about nine tonnes—4.5 tonnes for recreational fishing and 4.5 tonnes for commercial fishing. The department will discuss sustainability with Recfishwest and an adjustment of its total catch, but will the commercial sector's quota of 24 tonnes be reduced once the marina project starts? If that is the case and no-one takes up the voluntary scheme, how will that be managed?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am told that the commercial catch will be reduced by approximately 4.5 tonnes. I am also told that at the same time as the marina is being built, a significant amount of work will be done to rebuild the abalone stock across the coast of Western Australia. That work has been happening, I think, since at least 2010–11 when the heatwave took place. I have heard positive things about how the stock is retaking. The catch moves up and down over time and changes can be made annually. There is no intention to provide more catch to the recreational sector. If the catch is not used, the department will have its annual conversations with Recfishwest, on behalf of the recreational sector, and with the commercial sector about what the catch should be moving forward.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** It is estimated that 100 000 abalone will be relocated from this reef to another area in zone 7 and that 200 000 juvenile abalone will be put onto the artificial reef. It is estimated that nine tonnes of abalone will be lost while the project is undertaken. Has the department estimated how long it will take to recover those nine tonnes and will abalone quotas be lifted to take into account those nine tonnes?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The department has not done any modelling and cannot state definitively when or if the figures will rise again. However, I can say that we undertake monitoring in 17 areas. As I previously alluded to, the stock is rebuilding nicely and has been doing so since that heatwave in 2010–11. We will continue to monitor it and see. If these encouraging signs blossom and there is potential to take further catch in the future, those decisions will be made. The member would be aware that fishers are generally used to the catch rising and falling based on climatic or environmental factors. That happens in the rock lobster fishery at the moment; if the puerulus are not there, the take drops. That can happen in the abalone sector, too. At this stage the catch will drop, but it could lift again in the future based on the success of the breeding program, the benefits of that and the rebuild that has been happening since the heatwave in 2010–11.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** Just to finish on this line of questioning, I take it from that answer that there is a chance that the nine tonnes estimated to be lost by this development, notwithstanding the reseeded and translocation of abalone, may never be recovered.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am not in a position today to say definitively that the sector that would lose out as a result of the decisions about the marina would be able to recoup the catch in the future. But I can say that because we continue to monitor sites around the metropolitan area and we continue to see the positives happening as a result of the rebuild, there is a potential in the future for further catch to be allocated at this stage. I am not in a position to say that definitively, but certainly because the catch can fluctuate on a year-by-year basis, there is every likelihood that at some stage in the future, if things go right, the catch could increase.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** I thank the minister for all the advice he has given on the fisheries component. As I come to the end of my contribution, I go back to the excision and the loss of habitat. I want the minister to confirm something. I think these are the figures the minister gave in his reply to the second reading debate: of the 143 hectares to be excised, there appears to be 19 hectares of reef and 17 hectares of seagrass material, which to me makes a total of 36 hectares of 143 hectares, leaving approximately 107 hectares of what I think the minister effectively described as sand or a sand–mud base. Can the minister confirm that that is what we are dealing with?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** That is correct.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** That, of course, does not include some of the terrestrial environment loss, as indicated by Hon Alison Xamon. Does the minister have a total figure of what that terrestrial loss might be?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** No, I do not. It is not included in this bill before us today, so I do not have that figure at hand. In my second reading reply, I alluded to the fact that there will need to be a further bill before this house with amendments to the metropolitan region scheme, and that will look at potential loss of terrestrial space.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** As I said during my contribution to the second reading debate, the environment gives up some of its assets to allow development to occur, and we in the opposition accept that is part of the process. Does the government have a measure, though, of how much is enough? I know the minister does this on an issue-by-issue, project-by-project basis, but how is the government measuring how much environmental degradation or sacrifice by area is reasonable? Is there a mechanism by which the government and the environment department says that a project requires this much environmental impact on a geographical area and this is how they assess it. Is there a limit?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The short answer is no, there is not. The Environmental Protection Authority assesses each project on a case-by-case basis, and it goes through the merits of each project. Frequently, we have projects before us in which people want to take declared flora and it is controversial. We have alarmist stories in the media about two rare plants stopping projects.

**Hon Dr Steve Thomas:** Do not get me started on stygofauna.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** No, but the EPA makes a decision based on each project. I have placed on the record already that we are talking about 143.0667 hectares out of about 9 500 hectares in the marine park, so it is a very small area. Notwithstanding that, bear in mind that the Conservation and Parks Commission has to sign off on approvals for the reduction of conservation estate in national and marine parks, and the EPA has also assessed it. As Minister for Environment, I do not want us to go backwards with the areas we are protecting in this state, so it is certainly my intention—I alluded to this in my response to Hon Alison Xamon’s question—as part of the plan for our parks, to look at further areas that we may put into the conservation estate and in this case put into the marine park system. I am hopeful that over time we will at least cover this 143.0667 hectares and put more into the conservation estate to protect it for future generations.

**Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS:** I made the reference about how we assess various projects, because, as I said in my contribution to the second reading debate, I think the total clearing for Roe 8 was 97.8 hectares of significantly degraded bushland, and I thought that perhaps a comparison might be made with 35 hectares of marine environment and the terrestrial environment, which suggests that we are going to sacrifice a not dissimilar area of environment at the Ocean Reef marina and the Marmion Marine Park excision as we would have done with Roe 8. One project is supported by both sides of Parliament and progressing as a reasonable, acceptable loss of environment for outcome, and the other one has had a far more political outcome. I remain interested in the process of deciding how much is enough, but I think I have made my point, and I will allow us to proceed.

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** I think you have made your point.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** I want to ask some questions about the development. Can the minister advise whether all approvals required for the commencement of this project have now been cleared?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Although the environmental approvals have been received, the metropolitan region scheme needs to be amended. That has not yet been undertaken. That will be a future step, and a future change to regulation and legislation will need to come before this house. Not every approval has been received, but the environmental approvals from the EPA have certainly been received.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** What is the estimated commencement date of this project? Earlier the minister said in his second reading reply that the project was going to partly be funded by the state government at \$100-odd million. I think he mentioned something about some federal and private sector funding that would be contributed. Can the minister give us a bit more clarification about the commencement date and how the private sector funding will operate?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** We are beginning to stray outside of the realms of the legislation before us; however, the member has asked some questions and I have some answers that I am very happy to provide. The cost figures are about \$120 million in state government funding and about \$132 million in LandCorp equity. LandCorp already

has its equity, so it is not cash going across, but LandCorp equity in the project. I made the point previously that by far the biggest funding contribution will be by the private sector, and that is through delivering the buildings and the 750 pens. The state will not be building those; the private sector will. I am advised that the breakwater construction will commence in about November 2020, so we are about a year away from that, providing the bill passes this place today.

I should also point out, in relation to the member's previous question, that even though approval has been given by the Environmental Protection Authority and the Minister for the Environment, the proponent will need to prepare and submit to the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation a range of plans for the project. These include a marina construction monitoring and management plan, a coastal processes and wrack management plan, an abalone habitat and biomass baseline survey, an abalone habitat and biomass monitoring plan, and an offset strategy.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** It is quite a sizeable project. I imagine it will take some time to construct. I imagine also that the construction will be staged; the breakwater will be put in, and the boat ramp facilities and boat-stacking infrastructure, and then some residential and commercial components. What modelling has LandCorp done on how long this project may take from start to finish?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I appreciate your indulgence, Mr Chair, and honourable member. A number of agencies are involved, and I have advisers all over the place today because I want to make sure that I can answer as many questions as are asked of me. As I have said, construction of the marina is scheduled to commence late next year. Works will take place across multiple stages, in response to market demand and community expectations. Stage 1 is likely to include the marine infrastructure and preparation of sites for sale to developers. Some early community activation is also planned to be included in stage 1. I am told that full build-out of the marina is expected to take approximately 10 to 15 years. The initial work will be done now, and depending on market forces and market demand, I guess, further stages will take place over that 10 to 15-year period.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** We are looking at a decade from start to finish for this entire project. For how long is the project estimated to disrupt the marine environment? I imagine that construction will commence with the breakwater, so the turbidity of the water will be affected and different things will go on there, and then other construction will take place. For how long will there be an environmental impact on the marine environment before they get onto the terrestrial component?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The likelihood is that the majority of the impact—to use the member's word—will be in the early phases, particularly the construction of the breakwater. That 10 to 15-year period includes the pens and the buildings on the land. We do not have the details of stage 1 in front of us, but the main terrestrial impacts will occur in the early years, and they will then lessen.

**Hon RICK MAZZA:** I am talking about the marine environment.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Sorry—yes, the marine environment. I thank the member for clarifying that. The main impacts will be in those early years. That is not to suggest that there could not be potential impacts down the track in 10 to 15 years, depending on what is built. However, the likelihood is that the main impacts will be in those early years, once the project receives approval.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 2 to 6 put and passed.**

**Schedule 1 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

*Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by **Hon Stephen Dawson (Minister for Environment)**, and transmitted to the Assembly.