

PERDAMAN UREA PLANT PROPOSAL — ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVAL

4157. Mr M.P. Murray to the Minister representing the Minister for Environment

With reference to the recent Western Australia Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) approval for the proposed Perdaman Urea Plant near Collie, EPA Report 1358 states that the EPA does not assess public risk and that the offsite risk from the plant is not a relevant environmental factor. This appears to be contrary to EPA Guidance Document No. 2: 'Guidance for Risk Assessment and Management: Offsite Individual Risk from Hazardous Industrial Plant'. Therefore, I ask:

- (a) could the Minister please explain why the offsite risk was not considered a relevant part of the EPA process and provide copies of the documentation showing justification for this decision;
- (b) which agency or department will be responsible for ensuring all the potential risks to employees, the public and the environment, including offsite individual fatality risk, meet the EPA and Environmental Health acceptance criteria; and
- (c) at what state of the approval process for the proposed urea plant will a full environmental and health risk assessment be carried out?

Dr G.G. JACOBS replied:

- (a) Industrial risk is regulated under the Dangerous Goods Safety Act 2004 and regulations. Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) Guidance Document No. 2, released July 2000, predates this Act and is now used for guidance only.
- (b) WorkSafe is responsible for occupational health and safety and the Department of Mines and Petroleum is responsible for major hazard facilities.
- (c) The environmental assessment has been undertaken (EPA Report 1358). Plant emissions that could contribute to health risk were assessed under the factor "Air Quality" in EPA Report 1358.