

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act Co-design
submissions
Department of Planning, Lands & Heritage
Locked Bag 2506
PERTH WA 6001

Our Ref: DWERT 4935
Enquiries: Wendy Thompson
Email: wendy.thompson@dwer.wa.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

**ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ACT 2021 – PHASE THREE CO-DESIGN
SUBMISSION**

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the Department of Planning Lands and Heritage (DPLH) *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2021* (ACH Act) phase three co-design process.

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) considers that the ACH Act co-design instruments should be designed to include clear and consistent consideration of cultural heritage that may be harmed by proponent activities, including from impacts to the physical and biological environment. An approach based on considering the range of potential types of harm to cultural heritage from proponent activities would be consistent with the ACH Act objects and principles. This approach would enhance the overall effectiveness and thoroughness of the tools being delivered through the ACH co-design process. It would also enable an integrated and comprehensive cultural heritage assessment process that is likely to improve the outcomes for cultural considerations in decision-making and provide for a more efficient process for Traditional Owners, government and proponents.

The EPA remains very concerned about risks and limitations in the ACH Act instruments, as outlined in the enclosed co-design submissions, provided during phases one and two. The EPA emphasises the following key points of concern:

- The ACH documents remain focussed on managing specific areas of physical ground disturbance rather than avoiding and minimising harm to cultural heritage in the area impacted by a proponent activity.
- Consultation guidelines remain primarily focused on the process of consultation rather than emphasising outcomes. The EPA stresses the importance of documenting and understanding the outcomes of the consultation, particularly the proponent responses to Traditional owners concerns and why any issues cannot be resolved.

- The EPA's ability to take account of other statutory decision-making authority processes (detailed in phase two submission) remain unclear and uncertain based on the current ACH instruments. The EPA emphasises the benefits of the ACH Act processes requiring consideration of cultural heritage harm, including from physical and biological environment effects, as early as possible and on a case-by-case basis. The current ACH instruments, in particular the ACH Management Code, Activity Tiers and ACH Management Plan template, may limit the EPA's ability to have confidence in the ACH process to deal with cultural heritage impacts to meet the EPA's objective for social surroundings.
- Substantial commencement requirements remain concerning. There is potential for perverse outcomes to both cultural heritage and the environment by focusing on ground disturbance (which tends to incentivise clearing of native vegetation) rather than other indicators of commencement. The inclusion of supporting project elements (such as fencing or roads) is not consistent with genuine substantial commencement of key project infrastructure.

The EPA welcomes Traditional Owner engagement in all EPA processes where they have concerns or knowledge about the environment, regardless of the ACH Act processes and instruments. Traditional owners will continue to be able to engage with EPA processes as they choose on these matters. The EPA emphasises our responsibilities to protecting the environment and protecting it from harm and we note that the ACH Act and its instruments are intended to protect cultural heritage from harm.

The EPA appreciates the engagement with DPLH on the development of the ACH instruments. The EPA welcomes further discussions, including joint guidance to Traditional Owners and proponents with DPLH to ensure cultural heritage is considered early and comprehensively.

Yours sincerely



Lee McIntosh
Deputy Chair

06 January 2023

Encl. EPA Submissions *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2021* – Co-design phase 1 and 2

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act
co-design submissions
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
Locked Bag 2506
PERTH WA 6001

Our Ref: DWERT4935
Enquiries: Michael Christensen
Email: Michael.christensen@dwer.wa.gov.au

ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ACT 2021: CO-DESIGN SUBMISSION

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the co-design elements of the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2021* (ACH Act).

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) considers that there is a close and inherent connection between cultural heritage and the environment. This is reflected in the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) definition of social surroundings as “aesthetic, cultural, economic and other social surroundings to the extent to which they directly affect or are affected by physical or biological surroundings”. The environmental and heritage characteristics of an area or landscape are also intrinsically linked through the concept of place.

As such, ACH Act instruments being co-designed should consider, recognise and reflect the intrinsic connection between cultural heritage and the environment. Consideration of the environment as part of cultural heritage assessment and management would have additional benefits including:

- Increasing the thoroughness of the ACH Act tools being developed. In considering potential impacts to heritage and place from an environmental effects perspective a more holistic view of overall impacts can be understood. This approach has the potential to capture indirect environmental effects which have heritage implications, for example downstream impacts on water sources of importance to Aboriginal people.
- Providing a more integrated approach, through a combined cultural heritage assessment and protection process. This will result in greater confidence that cultural heritage can be adequately protected and enable efforts and resources to protect heritage through one comprehensive process.
- Facilitate the building of better relationships between proponents and traditional owners. Proponents often engage in environmental consideration processes earlier than they do heritage processes. There may also be difficulties in revisiting environmental matters in a later stage heritage processes - even if

environmental effects are at the heart of traditional owners' concern. Considering the two together would allow more efficient and effective process.

- Providing better information about environmental effects, as it would utilise and value information about the environment from traditional owners which isn't otherwise available in current processes.

Consideration of environmental effects in ACH Act tools

The EPA recommends that incorporation of environmental effects considerations in ACH Act tools (the activity categories, ACH management plans, State significance and protected areas and the ACH management code in particular) should be based on the system which the EPA has in place for consideration of environmental effects. This would ensure consistency of environmental effects across the two processes, utilise the EPA established environmental assessment framework and be familiar to many proponents.

The EPA's framework includes:

- Specific consideration of relevant environmental factors. The EPA has established 14 environmental factors used as an organising principle for EIA and comprised of a number of values. Factors are in place for land, sea, water, air and people, and include for example: flora and vegetation, terrestrial environmental quality, inland waters, human health and marine environmental quality.
- Objectives are in place for each environmental factor. The EPA assesses the consistency of projects against these objectives, for example: the objective for flora and vegetation is to protect flora and vegetation so that biological diversity and ecological integrity are maintained.
- Consideration of cumulative impacts are the successive, incremental and interactive impacts on the environment of a proposal with one or more past, present and reasonably foreseeable future activities. Cumulative effects can also arise from pressures in the environment such as climate change and bushfires etc. The EPA recommends heritage impact or management aspects considers the cumulative pressures as well as individual activities.
- Consideration of holistic effects which is the connections and interactions between impacts, and the overall impact of the proposal on the environment as a whole. The EPA recommends a holistic view of impacts on heritage, rather than impacts from single issues or activities.
- Indirect, downstream and upstream impacts, such as downstream impacts on water sources of importance to Aboriginal people.
- Looking at all stages of projects, including proposed end land uses, particularly if land will be returned for some traditional use.

When prescribing the content of cultural heritage tools, the EPA also recommends including explicit reference to the key principles or objectives which the tools must be consistent with in. This will ensure any unintended gaps in specific prescriptions are still required to be dealt with. It also tends to encourage a focus on using the tools to achieve real and lasting outcomes which are consistent with the object of the ACH Act.

Consultation Guidelines

In respect of the Consultation Guidelines, the EPA recommends that these should include a requirement for proponents to show the outcome of the consultation, as well as the process which was undertaken. For example, the proponent should show what issues the traditional owners raised, and how the project responded to these, and for any issues which are not resolved – why these cannot be resolved.

Substantially commenced definition

In relation to section 18 consents granted under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* and the definition of substantially commenced, the EPA recommends that consideration be given to potential unintended consequences. For example, if land clearing alone constitutes substantial commencement, it has the potential to drive significant impacts on flora and vegetation, fauna habitat and inland water quality for the purpose of ensuring the section 18 consent remains, rather than for actual commencement of the project. The EPA recommends that substantial commencement should:

- be attached to construction of key infrastructure for the project, rather than just minor or preliminary physical disturbance or infrastructure; and
- also include that the proponent has complied with its obligations under the consent, in particular any requirements to consult, survey and protect.

EPA can consider whether ACH Act can mitigate the potential impacts of proposals on the social surroundings


The EPA is required give consideration to Aboriginal heritage matters to the extent that they may be directly affected by the impacts of the proposal on the physical or biological surroundings. This means the EPA assesses whether changes to the biological and physical environment resulting from proposed developments may significantly adversely affect matters of heritage significance to Aboriginal people.

The EPA advises that, due to recent amendments to the EP Act, when undertaking assessments, it can now take into account other statutory decision-making processes which can mitigate the potential impacts of proposals on the environment. The matters the EPA considers when deciding what other statutory decision-making processes are appropriate to consider for a proposal are set out in the EPA's [Interim Guidance Taking decision making processes into account in EIA.pdf](#) (epa.wa.gov.au)

To assist the EPA's ability to take the ACH Act into account when assessing Aboriginal heritage matters, the EPA encourages the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage to incorporate consideration of environmental effects associated with heritage impacts and management in the ACH Act tools, as set out above.

The EPA looks forward to the continued engagement on this important matter through the next phases of the co-design process.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Matt Tonts', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Prof. Matthew Tonts
CHAIR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

26 May 2022

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act co-design
submissions
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
Locked Bag 2506
Perth WA 6001

Our Ref: DWERT4935
Email: robert.hughes@dwer.wa.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2021: co-design submission

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to phase 2 of co-design for the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2021* (ACH Act).

As part of its assessment of social surroundings, the EPA is required to consider cultural heritage where it is directly affected by physical and biological surroundings. If the ACH Act instruments were also designed to clearly require consideration of physical and biological disturbance which affect cultural heritage, the EPA believes it could reasonably consider the ACH Act adequately deals with these impacts instead. This would mean the EPA does not then need to separately assess cultural heritage matters.

Benefits to cultural heritage protection of the EPA being able to consider the ACH Act

Consistent with its submission to phase 1, the EPA believes that if the ACH Act instruments explicitly and consistently consider cultural heritage which is affected by physical and biological disturbance, this would have the following benefits:

- Increase the thoroughness of the ACH Act tools being developed, by considering potential impacts to heritage from the holistic traditional owner view of country. This is more consistent with cultural heritage protection than a view which separates heritage and environment into separate processes and disciplines;
- Facilitate a single, integrated and comprehensive cultural heritage assessment and protection process, rather than having cultural heritage considered under both heritage and environmental processes. This single comprehensive process is likely to be more efficient for both traditional owners, proponents and government;
- Facilitate relationship building between proponents and traditional owners, especially in cases where cultural heritage affected by environmental effects are at the heart of traditional owners' concerns;
- Allow more efficient and effective project design, for example because areas to avoid both heritage and environmental impacts of significance could be identified and avoided early; and
- Address some potential concerns with assessment under the EPA's social surroundings factor, including that it involves the EPA (rather than traditional owners) determining heritage significance, and that the EPA process is not able to result in binding agreements with traditional owners, and in particular can't deal with issues of compensation or funding.

EPA decision whether it can take the ACH Act processes into account

Due to recent amendments to the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (WA), when deciding whether or not to assess a proposal, and if so whether social surrounds is a relevant factor in assessment or condition setting, the EPA can take into account other statutory decision making processes that can mitigate the potential impacts of the proposal on the environment.

The matters which the EPA takes into account when deciding whether other statutory decision-making processes (such as the ACH Act processes) are appropriate for the EPA to consider are set out in the EPA's

[Interim Guidance Taking decision making processes into account in EIA.pdf](#)

(epa.wa.gov.au). In relation to the ACH Act processes, the EPA would need to be able to have reasonable confidence in the following:

1. Can the ACH Act processes consider cultural heritage which is directly affected by physical and biological surroundings?
2. What is the process, including the consultation, decision making, and role of supporting instruments and policy, for decision-making for the ACH Act?
3. Does the decision-making process adequately require consideration cultural heritage which is directly affected by physical and biological surroundings, including consideration of whether the EPA's social surrounds objective is likely to be met?
4. What is the outcome of the decision-making process? Are arrangements likely to be in place to protect cultural heritage which is directly affected by physical and biological surroundings?

Re question 2, the EPA believes the modern consultation and decision making processes under the ACH Act, in particular the central role of traditional owners and knowledge holders in many processes, is likely to satisfy the EPA that it is an appropriate decision-making process for it take into account.

Re questions 1, 3 and 4, the EPA considers the co-design instruments should be designed to include clear and consistent consideration of cultural heritage which is affected by harm to the physical and biological environment.

EPA submits there should be early and consistent consideration of cultural heritage which is affected by physical and biological disturbance in ACH Act instruments

The EPA advises that in its experience, many cultural heritage concerns are specifically connected to environmental effects. This includes: drawdown of culturally significant waterholes, change to culturally significant watercourse flow (increase or decrease) or water quality, dust affecting the amenity of a culturally significant place, visual impacts of or from a culturally significant landscape, disturbance of culturally significant vegetation, and disturbance of culturally significant fauna. Culturally significant areas which have already been harmed by one activity may also be subject to additional harm from another activity, for example by additional water drawdown, or disturbance of rehabilitated areas.

The EPA outlined the tools which it considers the ACH Act processes could usefully adopt (in the activity categories, ACH management plans, and the ACH management code in particular) in its submission to phase 1 submission.

The EPA further advises that in its experience, the best way to consider whether cultural heritage could be affected by disturbance to the physical and biological environment or not is 1) as early as possible, and 2) on a case by case basis.

The decision points where the EPA could consider the ACH Act in its own processes is attached for your information. The main benefits of the EPA being able to take the ACH Act processes into account are likely to come if the ACH Act processes are clearly in place as early as possible, and in particular before the EPA makes a decision whether to assess a proposal or not (stage 1 in the attachment). If the EPA has confidence that the ACH Act processes will mitigate potential impacts on social surrounds because those processes consider cultural heritage impacts from physical and biological disturbance, the EPA can decide at this early point that social surroundings aren't relevant for its assessment.

If amendments are not made to the ACH Act instruments to deal with cultural heritage impacts from physical and biological disturbance, or the EPA can only consider the ACH Act in its later assessment stages, the EPA will still be able to take the final outcomes of the ACH Act processes (such as an actual agreed ACH management plan) into account. However, agreement on an ACH management plan would usually only come *after* the EPA process is largely complete, and so too late to provide any of the above benefits for traditional owners, proponents and government.

One way to implement the above “1) as early as possible, and 2) on a case by case basis” approach in the ACH Act instruments would be to 1) require broad consideration of cultural heritage impacts from physical and biological disturbance in the instruments; 2) include examples of common types of impacts (see above examples for reference); 3) explain the benefits of early consideration (such as the ability to avoid an impact altogether, if the potential impact is identified in project scoping and before referral of proposals to the EPA); and 4) recommend use of the EPA tools (described in the EPA co design phase 1 submission) to identify impacts on a case by case basis.

If there are constraints on the ACH Act to consider cultural heritage which is affected by physical and biological disturbance- these should be made clear

The EPA understands that one of the primary reforms the ACH Act introduced was requiring the consideration of harm to cultural heritage of based on considering the impacts of an activity, instead of confining impacts to land tenure considerations.. This means there is no pre-determined limit or boundary of ACH Act considerations – the boundary is dependent on the harm caused by the individual activity.

If the EPA's understanding is incorrect however, and there are legal or practical boundaries or limits of the ACH Act, this should be made clear in the co-design instruments, so that the coverage of the ACH Act instruments is clear for traditional owners, proponents and other government agencies. If this is not done up front, there risks being significant confusion, gaps and overlaps between the ACH Act and the EPA's processes. For example, if the ACH Act processes are not likely to be able to consider harm outside of a certain footprint, even if the cultural heritage harmed by the activity is outside this footprint, this should be made clear.

If the ACH Act provides this clarity, the EPA will then be able to provide certainty to traditional owners and proponents about what the EPA will, and will not, assess, in its own procedure documents. In the meantime, the EPA advises that it would be incorrect to assume that the EPA can assess what the ACH Act doesn't. The EPA is only able to consider impacts to

cultural heritage where they are *directly* affected by physical or biological surroundings, which in many cases could be a more confined set of impacts that the broader ACH Act.

One area where the EPA considers it may continue to have a role is where cumulative impacts and multiple pressures are involved and the ACH Act is unlikely to be able to mitigate impacts of these, for example the effects of industrial emissions on rock art.

For completeness - the EPA commented in its submission in October 2020 that it considered it may still have a role for some impacts, for example groundwater drawdown impacts on significant waterholes outside of a development footprint area. This comment was before the ACH Act was finalised in 2021, and before the EP Act amendments in October 2021 were in force. The EPA now considers that if the ACH Act requires consideration of cultural heritage impact from groundwater drawdown impacts caused by an activity on significant waterholes, the EPA would not need to also assess this under social surroundings.

Way forward

The EPA is happy to consult further on the specific content of the activity categories, ACH management plans and the ACH management code to implement the substance of this submission. The EPA is also happy to consider providing joint guidance to traditional owners and proponents with the Department to ensure that the cultural heritage which is affected by physical and biological disturbance is considered early, and comprehensively, in project scoping and development, in as efficient and integrated way as possible.

Finally, the EPA notes that despite anything in the ACH Act processes which deal with cultural heritage impacts, the EPA welcomes traditional owner engagement in EIA processes dealing with other environmental factors where they have concerns or knowledge. For example, traditional owners may have concerns about security of drinking water, health impacts from dust, or valuable knowledge about ecosystem impacts and management. Traditional owners will continue to be able to engage with EPA processes as they choose on these matters.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Matthew Tonts', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Prof. Matthew Tonts
CHAIR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

23 August 2022

Attachment

EPA decision points where cultural heritage is considered

For your information, the EPA considers its social surroundings factor at the following decision points. It would need to be satisfied that the ACH Act processes considered cultural heritage which is affected by harm to the physical and biological environment at each of these points, to be able to take the ACH Act processes into account.

1. Whether to assess a proposal. Considerations include whether social surroundings effects are likely to be significant, and whether they can be mitigated by the ACH Act decision making processes. This is usually one of the first regulatory steps in proposal development. It would include considering whether the ACH Act processes considered cultural heritage which is affected by harm to the physical and biological environment
2. Level of assessment. Considerations include whether there should be a formal environmental review, and any additional consultation required. This could include additional consultation with traditional owners, if the ACH Act processes did not adequately consider cultural heritage which is affected by harm to the physical and biological environment.
3. Whether social surroundings is a key factor for assessment. This could be a key factor if the ACH Act processes did not adequately consider cultural heritage which is affected by harm to the physical and biological environment
4. Whether to recommend a proposal be implemented or not.
5. What conditions to recommend be attached to a proposal if it is implemented (for example, a heritage management plan if there is not one agreed under the ACH Act, or requirements for proponents to consult with traditional owners on other plans)