



Australian Government
Department of Industry,
Innovation and Science

National
Radioactive Waste
Management Facility

Kimba Consultative Committee

Meeting Notes

Wednesday 20th March 2019

Agenda

Kimba Consultative Committee Agenda

Wednesday 20th March, 2019
Location: 49 High St, Kimba SA

| Time | Item | Lead |
|-------------|---|--|
| 13:00-13:30 | KCC contract review & signing Lunch on arrival | |
| 13:30-13:40 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housekeeping - Apologies - Acknowledgement of country - Overview of the meeting agenda - Meeting Notes Process - Note: the matter of Barngarla Determination Aboriginal Corporation v District Council of Kimba is awaiting a decision by the court and no comments or discussion will be made at this time. | Allan Suter, Independent Convener |
| 13:40-14:10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Update - Site selection - Committee tenures & the Regional Consultative Committee - Departmental staffing arrangements - Questions from the committee | Jenni Philippa, DIIS |
| 14:10-14:30 | Site security arrangements | Jenni Philippa, DIIS & James Hardiman & Shane Harrison, ANSTO (Via mobile) |
| 14:30-15:00 | AECOM Flora & Fauna Surveys | AECOM |
| 15:00-15:30 | Community Benefit Programme update – project progress to date | Adam Comley, AusIndustry |
| 15:30-16:00 | Kimba Economic Working Group, Community Skills and Development Program Workshop | Jenni Philippa & Dean Johnson |
| 16:00-16:30 | Facility needs - what we have learned | Jenni Philippa, DIIS |
| 16:30-17:00 | UQ Socio-Economic Study | Peta Ashworth, UQ |
| 17:00-17:30 | Question time | Jenni Philippa, DIIS |

Attendees:

| | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Allan Suter (Convener) | Symon Allen | Amy Wright |
| Dean Johnson (Deputy Convener) | Randall Cliff | Peta Willmott |
| Jeff Baldock | Meagan Lienert | Peter Woolford |
| Heather Baldock | Jeff Koch | Toni Scott |
| Pat Beinke | Kerri Rayson | |

Apologies:

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| Kellie Hunt | Sally Inglis | Sam Chard |
|-------------|--------------|-----------|

Other Attendees:

| Name | Organisation |
|-------------------------|--|
| Jenni Philippa | DIIS: NRWFM Community Engagement Team - Manager |
| Ian Carter | DIIS: NRWFM Community Engagement Team – Assistant Manager |
| Megan Gietzel | DIIS: NRWFM Community Engagement Team – Community Engagement Team |
| Margaret-Rose McKenzie | DIIS: NRWFM Community Engagement Team – Hawker Community Liaison Officer |
| Adam Comley | AusIndustry - State Manager SA/NT |
| James Hardiman | ANSTO - Teleconference |
| Shane Harrison | ANSTO - Teleconference |
| Professor Peta Ashworth | University of Queensland |
| Matt McDonnell | AECOM – Flora and Fauna |
| Madeleine Wheeler | AECOM – Flora and Fauna |

Action Items:

| Item | Status |
|--|---|
| 1. The Department will inform the committee of the RCC establishment methodology, the process for selection of members, guidelines and governance procedures once determined. | To be advised once procedures and guidelines are finalized. Link to the National Radioactive Waste Management Act 2012 |
| 2. To look into funding for the community, either for a second round of the CBP due to delays OR Department to investigate next steps if there are further delays, and provide clarification to the committee. | Complete - There are no plans for additional CBP rounds at this stage. However, any request by the communities for further funding will be considered after the outcome of the current court process is known, and the extent of any delay can be assessed. |
| 3. Update committee about peer review tender process at next meeting. | To be addressed at the next committee meeting. Link to the peer review tender work on Austender |
| 4. To look into follow up socio-economic report. | In progress |
| 5. Provide copy of UQ report. | Complete Link to the UQ Baseline Report: Kimba |
| 6. Attach copy of Prof Ashworth's presentation with meeting notes. | Complete |
| 7. Attach copy of AECOM presentation with meeting notes. | Complete |

Committee members arrived 1.00pm to sign contracts

Meeting opened 1:45pm

Housekeeping

The Convener opened the meeting and gave an overview of the agenda, with a slight change to match the availability of Mr Comley.

The convener noted the BDAC v. District Council of Kimba case is still before the court and that it would not be discussed at the meeting.

Ms Philippa spoke about the meeting notes not being verbatim, but reflecting key points, answers and action items.

Ms Philippa recommended that the committee meet next post a court decision.

Project Update

Ms Philippa passed on apologies from Ms Chard who was unable to attend due to urgent family matters. Ms Philippa gave an update on the team and certain aspects of the project, including:

- Staffing Arrangements
 - Ms Philippa informed the committee post the November 2018 meeting there had been a number of staffing changes. The Department has appointed a new Hawker Community Liaison Officer, Ms Margaret-Rose McKenzie.
- Indigenous Engagement Manager
 - The Department has advertised a position to employ an Indigenous Engagement Manager. Interviews are taking place next week from a good field of candidates. The Department hopes they will be in place in April, and potentially based out of the Adelaide office.
- Site Selection Update
 - Ms Philippa informed the committee the department cannot discuss the court case but are mindful of the need to reach a decision on the current proposed site nominations as soon as possible.
 - Ms Philippa also informed the committee on what will happen after a site is selected and steps required by legislation before a site for the facility is declared and acquired by the Commonwealth:
 - first the Minister will announce an 'intention to declare a site'.
 - then at least 60 days for persons who have a legal right or interest in the site, to comment on the announcement.
 - after considering these comments, the Minister is able to declare a site.
 - When a site is declared it is acquired.
- Reappointments/Contracts
 - Ms Philippa informed the committee the Barndioota Consultative Committee and the Kimba Consultative Committee have been re-appointed until 31 December 2019. The Wallerberdina Economic Working Group have also been re-appointed until 31 December 2019. The Kimba Economic Working Group

tenures cease end of April 2019 and will also be extended to 31 December 2019.

- Post the vote and once a site is selected a Regional Consultative Committee (RCC) will be established once the Minister for Resources and Northern Australia declares the selection of a site in line with Section 22 of the National Radioactive Waste Management Act 2012. For further information please find [Link to the National Radioactive Waste Management Act 2012](#)
- Website changes
 - NRWMF website has been consolidated along with other Department websites into the Industry.gov.au site, as it is better supported technically.
 - The department is currently working through the process of migrating material from the old site to the new one, however, there is currently a link to redirect people to the old site if needed.
 - If the committee is aware or faces any issues with finding material on the website, please feel free to contact the department directly to provide any materials/resolve issues.

Discussion

- A member asked what the RCC will consist of.
 - The department noted this question will be taken on notice.
- A member raised that there needs to be more discussion of the different roles once the project moves to phase 3, how and when the packages of dollars will be rolled out, and what other decisions needed to be made.
 - The department noted that the legislation answers these questions.
- A member asked if interested people can nominate for the RCC.
 - The department noted the process for transitioning to the RCC is still being worked out, and the committee will be informed once there has been some decisions.

Action: The Department will inform the committee of the RCC establishment methodology, the process for selection of members, guidelines and governance procedures once determined.

Site Security Arrangements

James Hardiman (Head of Waste Operations ANSTO) and Shane Harrison (Head of Security ANSTO) were dialled in via teleconference at 2.30pm. Introducing themselves, James advised his expertise around ANSTO's waste holdings and managing a team of around 30 who look after the management and transport of waste holdings at Lucas Heights. Shane advised he has 15 years of experience at ANSTO and across design and technical aspects of the project for the last 12 months – this includes working on the site design, construction, cyclotrons, reactor, waste stores and security design. Their presentation included:

- Waste packaging and acceptance criteria (James)
 - There will be a strict waste acceptance criteria around the waste packages that will be disposed or temporarily stored.

- This criteria will be monitored by ARPANSA, the independent regulator that will oversee all waste arriving at the Facility.
- All LLW waste that arrives for permanent disposal at the facility will be packaged in drums encapsulated in cement. There will be no free powders, no corrosives, no explosives, no gases accepted that the Facility is not designed to manage.
- Any ILW waste that arrives for temporary storage will be physically encapsulated in glass, from which the waste is not readily extractable, nor will it possess any free powers/corrosives/explosives/gases as with LLW.
- Facility security (Shane)
 - Noting that the facility design is still only conceptual, and is not specific to a site, Shane discussed that one of the next steps is to undertake a risk assessment from a number of agencies, including the Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office (ASNO) and Australian security agencies.
 - This information would go into forming a security risk assessment, which will assist with the design and development of the facility.
 - The facility will rely on a number of security measures, including but not limited to: multiple barriers (including a visible fence), the Defence in Depth philosophy, threat assessments, underlying security barriers and controls. These controls are necessary for licensing purposes with ASNO and ARPANSA.
- Invitation to ANSTO
 - James and Shane concluded their presentation reiterating the standing invitation to visit ANSTO.

Discussion

- A member asked if the waste held by the Department of Defence and CSIRO at Woomera would remain at Woomera if it did not meet the acceptance criteria.
 - James advised that if waste does not meet the acceptance criteria, it will not be sent to the Facility. He mentioned that it will be the responsibility of the waste holder to ensure their waste meets the Facility's acceptance criteria. In the case that the waste does not meet the criteria, it will be up to the holders to eliminate the hazards themselves, or develop a strategy to send it somewhere else.
- A member raised that whilst the Facility will be built to a standard, who is going to be the security on the ground, and whether it would be contractors or if it might be the AFP.
 - The department noted that these considerations are dependent on where the Facility is sited. However, jobs have been set aside for security, but those decisions will be made once the site is known.
 - James noted that the AFP do look after security at the Lucas Heights site, which includes an armed first response.
 - Shane added that the most important factor will be approval by the independent regulator, which includes personnel and operating licences.
- A member raised a question regarding the level of terrorism risk.
 - The department informed the committee, security measures around any radioactive waste management facility will be designed to mitigate a range of threats based on advice from relevant government security agencies, and the

facility will be supervised by multiple regulators including the ARPANSA and ASNO.

- The department noted, while the terrorist threat in Australia persists, terrorists globally have shown no propensity for an attack on a facility of this nature.

Community Benefit Programme Update

Adam Comley from AusIndustry provided an update on the Community Benefits Programme (CBP). He noted there have been 14 finalised projects with a further 19 still ongoing, which he hoped members had seen some benefit from already within the community. Adam mentioned that there are no concerns about the projects from the AusIndustry team, rather they anticipate that all the projects will hopefully finish in May and be paid out by June, or accrued at the end of the financial year.

Discussion

- A member raised a question about Feasibility Studies and the timeframe in which the committee would find out what the results were.
 - Adam noted that AusIndustry have the responsibility of funding the project rather than ownership of the project. Any decision to share the results or information from the studies rests with the individual contractors.
- A member asked whether AusIndustry would see the reports if they had been completed.
 - Adam noted that AusIndustry would see the reports, but only so far as to confirm whether or not they had been complete rather than looking at the content of the reports themselves.
- A member noted that the community needs to know the outcomes of the reports, and the impacts on the community.
 - Adam reiterated that it is up to the applicant as to how much information they provide to the community.
- Members raised that an update had been issued regarding the project at the pub, and whether there would be updates regarding other projects. A member noted that they would like to share some facts with the community regarding the benefits of these projects.
 - Adam noted that the department has at times requested photos, which AusIndustry has disclosed where the grantee has allowed it.
- A member noted that there are rumours going around the town about the progress of projects.
 - Adam noted AusIndustry was aware of the rumours. He noted that the department has a complaints register, which is taken seriously and followed up by the AusIndustry team. He also noted he received regular reports from the department.
- A member asked if AusIndustry had received any feedback about the process.
 - Adam mentioned that applicants had been very happy. He noted that AusIndustry had tried to streamline the process as much as possible, and remove many of the challenges, however, as projects get more complex,

- there are more checks and balances which have to be considered in the project design phase.
 - A member noted that the experience working with AusIndustry on a project had been very good.
 - A member noted that much of the extra bureaucracy comes from the accountability of the projects, but agreed that the process was great.
- The committee raised the issue of a second round of CBP funding, the committee informed the department, their understanding was CBP funding was to continue for each financial year the community remained in Phase 2 of the project. The committee felt the CBP funding rounds are not being honoured. The committee questioned the department, if the current timing around the court decision continues will the department resolve the CBP funding situation. Mr Johnson also noted Kimba had only participated in one round of funding compared to Hawker receiving 2 rounds.
 - The department informed the committee the CBP funding profile is fully committed.
 - The department informed the committee they would seek advice on the matter of CBP funding while the court proceedings continue (please see department response in Action Items No. 2).

Kimba Economic Working Group (KEWG), Community Skills and Development Package (CSDP) Workshop

Ms Philippa and Mr Johnson provided an update to the committee on the CSDP workshop with the KEWG 21st February 2019.

- The CSDP will provide \$8 million in grants funding over four years to the host community of the proposed National Radioactive Waste Management Facility (NRWMF) as part of the \$31 million Community Development Package (CDP) for the community that will host the proposed NRWMF.
- The CSDP aims to ensure that the community is able to maximise the economic benefits of the construction and long term operation of the facility, through the provision of grants for projects that will support economic resilience, capacity and skills. To ensure that the CSDP is fit-for-purpose, the department held workshops with the WEWG to discuss community views of the CSDP and to inform the development of guidelines for the program.
- The department also discussed the \$3 million in grant funding from the Indigenous Advancement Strategy, which was to be delivered through the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.
- Ms Philippa informed the committee that the IAS funding would likely fund the outcomes/recommendations of an Aboriginal Economic and Heritage Participation Plan. Funding of the actual plan development was being determined by the department.
- Mr Johnson informed the committee he raised at the KEWG meeting the urgency for Kimba to have a doctor. Mr Johnson noted the department informed the group that project suggestions can be put forward and could be considered. Mr Johnson put the suggestion forward to the department the CSDP be used to fund a doctor.

Discussion

- A number of members raised queries regarding the community development program, and whether there would be a second round of funding.
 - The chair requested the department to investigate and advise the community about funding if there are significant delays.
- A member asked what is happening with the CBP, and if there will be an additional round.
 - The department informed the committee the CBP is fully expended, future funding may be considered post the outcome of the court decision.
- A member asked what the department's stance is if the court case is prolonged, and what support will be provided to the community during this period.
 - While the grant guidelines indicated that the program may be extended until a site was selected, the guidelines clearly indicated that any extension would be subject to Government consideration.
- A member asked what kind of confidence we can give the community if there are further delays around future funding.

Action: To look into funding for the community, either for a second round of the CBP due to delays OR department to investigate next steps if there are further delays, and provide clarification to the committee.

Response: There are no plans for additional CBP rounds at this stage. However, any request by the communities for further funding will be considered after the outcome of the current court process is known, and the extent of any delay can be assessed.

AECOM Flora and Fauna

Mr Matt McDonnell and Ms Madeline Wheeler from AECOM presented on the environmental work done as part of the site characterisation in the impact assessment team. They noted they work with Mr James Rusk and have been involved with the initial desktop assessment. Their work looked at the potential impacts the project could have on the environment at the two Kimba sites, specifically checking for Commonwealth and State listed species (of flora and fauna) within a 10km area.

Discussion

- A member noted they were surprised by the lack of reptile species in the assessment.
 - Mr McDonnell noted the assessment included species listed by the Commonwealth and State.
- A member asked if the assessment compared fenced off areas and roadsides.
 - Ms Wheeler noted that to her knowledge there weren't any fenced off areas which were found to be in a better condition based on their survey, however, AECOM would be happy to advise on a specific location if the committee/member advised of a location.
 - Mr McDonnell noted that a pre-fauna check will be conducted prior to construction starting, should one of the Kimba sites be selected, which would

allow any animals (if found) to be relocated prior, as well as recommending dust mitigation strategies, slower speed limits, etc.

- A member enquired if an allowance was made in the assessment given the community is going through a period that has been drier than usual.
 - Ms Wheeler noted that although it had been quite dry, they did find a considerable number of flowering species during their assessment in spring.
 - Mr McDonnell noted that once a site has been selected, a further survey will potentially be undertaken. But felt that at this stage the work completed to date was adequate.

Facility needs - what we have learned

The department advised that in phase 1, the department provided an initial concept design used to assist land owners for them to consider.

AECOM presentations and our site characterisation fact sheets show each of the sites are a bit different. Some aspects of the sites are similar but have different service requirements such as power and water access and telecommunication requirements.

The design also needs to respond to recommendations from the senate enquiry and requirements by the regulator.

As the department develops its understanding of the sites, we will provide updates back to the community with our concepts once they are developed.

Ms Philippa informed the committee they are conducting a tender process to undertake a peer review of the facility design work in relation to conceptual, design development and detailed design of the NRWFMF. The department is also working with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to undertake an Integrated Review Service for Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuel Management, Decommissioning and Remediation (ARTEMIS) review, as well as review of and contribution to the Common National Inventory of Radioactive Waste (CNIRW), safety documentation and WAC.

Discussion

- A member asked what the peer review process would entail.
 - The department noted that the tender is to peer review the conceptual design development, the safety documentation, waste criteria, technical advice and policy.
- A member noted that if this was a substantive body of work, and if the process was about the three sites under consideration.
 - The department noted that the peer review was on the generic design. However, that phase two of the project is concentrated on the three shortlisted sites.
- A member noted these assessment assumed the site will fit on one of these three sites, and whether there is a cause for concern given that none of the sites may be suitable.
 - The department noted that there has been no technical indication that the facility could not be located at any of the currently shortlisted sites based on the reports from the surveys conducted thus far. There is an ongoing element

of community support that is being assessed which will contribute to the selection of a site.

- A member noted that while money could be found for the peer review tenders, it couldn't be located for community funding.
 - The chair noted this matter had been covered previously in the meeting.

Action: Update committee about peer review tender process at next meeting.

University of Queensland (UQ) Socio-Economic Study

At 4.15pm members of the KEWG were invited to join. Professor Peta Ashworth presented the UQ socio-economic baseline report on the township of Kimba. The report relied on desktop working which leveraged data from the ATO and ABS, followed by subsequent interviews and community advice. Peta noted the strong community spirit to engage with the study, with over 80 people interviewed.

The report made a number of findings around local agricultural trends, population trends and the flow on effects of business on the town and local industry. The report made recommendations around improvements to local education if the Facility was located in Kimba. It also captured concerns around property values and local accommodation during the construction phase. It noted the lack of doctor is a key concern for the community.

Discussion

- A member raised a question about mental health and well-being as captured by the report.
 - Prof Ashworth noted that it was mentioned in the interviews, and was tied back to the community and the mention of a mental health support group. She also noted that some people in the community did not feel comfortable accessing this group.
- A member asked if the report had been with the minister's office for some time now, mentioning that they had heard it would have been with the minister since September.
 - The department acknowledged there has been some liaison between the Department and UQ and the report is now at the minister's office for consideration.
 - Prof Ashworth noted the report had taken a bit longer than expected to complete.
- A member asked if there would be any follow up of a similar type once a site has been selected.
 - The department noted the Policy team would look into that option, but this report sought to capture a baseline.
- A member enquired if there was any significant differences between the Kimba and Hawker reports.
 - Prof Ashworth noted that the indigenous engagement had been different, and the different demographics of Hawker and Quorn. She also noted that the trends around education and ageing populations were quite similar.

- Prof Ashworth noted that for Hawker it was a lot smaller, and was different due to the two communities, Hawker and Quorn. She also noted there were a lot of similarity, especially around the community spirit and volunteering.
- A member noted that if the study was to be conducted again, to review the timing as the visit for this report was during the school holidays when people were not around.
 - Prof Ashworth noted that there were some restrictions last time due to the Senate enquiry and the potential vote, but the timing would definitely be considered if there were to be a future study.
- A member asked if there were any discussions with the community about the outcome of the vote, either way, and the potential impact on the community.
- A member asked if the report included strategies.
 - Prof Ashworth noted they had tried to share insights in the report where possible. The presentation today shared insights with the committee.
 - The department noted that the report aimed to provide baseline results which would inform the CSDP and determine what would be of the most benefit to the community.
- A member asked if there were any other aspects of the report that stood out about Kimba.
 - Prof Ashworth noted that the sporting nature and the role of the school in Kimba stood out.
- A member asked if there was any consideration given to talking to younger children about the school system.
 - Prof Ashworth noted that other surveys have included this consideration, although it does require parental support. She noted that often youth have really good ideas.
- The department informed the committee the report will be published on the department's website as soon as possible.

Action items:

1. Policy team to look into follow up socio-economic report.
2. Provide copy of UQ report to committee members with minutes.

Questions

- A member asked about the timing of future meetings, specifically which day they would be held on given concerns about attendance for some members.
 - The department noted that Thursday seems to be the best meeting day, and the department will try to work with that day in mind going forward. The department noted if there is an outcome from the court there will be a meeting, and if there is not an outcome for a significant period there will be a meeting. Although the department won't hold a meeting if there is nothing to provide an update on.

Action items:

1. Attach copy of Prof Ashworth's presentation with minutes.
2. Attach copy of Mr McDonnell's presentation with minutes.