



September 2020

**KIMBA CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
KIMBA ECONOMIC WORKING GROUP**

General Meeting Minutes

# KIMBA CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

## KIMBA ECONOMIC WORKING GROUP

**Date:** Thursday 17 September 2020

**Time:** 12:30pm – 4.30pm local time

Kimba Gateway Hotel for members

ARWA attend via videoconference

### AGENDA

**Convenor:** Allan Suter – Kimba Consultative Committee

ITEM	Lead	Key Points
1. Welcome	Convenor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgement of Country</li> </ul>
2. ARWA Update	SamC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff updates</li> <li>BDAC</li> <li>Mentally Fit Program</li> </ul>
3. Senate Committee Report	SamC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Findings and Recommendations</li> <li>Agency response</li> <li>Impact on legislation timing</li> </ul>
4. Regional Consultative Committee	SamC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results of the online consultation</li> <li>Next steps</li> </ul>
5. Community Benefit Program	SamC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program update</li> <li>Managing conflicts-of-interest</li> <li>Process and timelines for input to AusIndustry</li> </ul>
6. Future initiatives	SamC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visitor Information Centre – RDA-EP work</li> <li>Transport</li> <li>Agriculture</li> </ul>
7. Other business	Convenor	

**Meeting close**

Committee Member	Attendance
Allan Suter (Convenor)	Accepted
Dean Johnson (Deputy Convenor)	Accepted
Symon Allen	Accepted
Jeff Baldock	Accepted
Heather Baldock	Accepted
Pat Beinke	Accepted

Committee Member	Attendance
Randall Cliff	Accepted
Kellie Hunt	Accepted
Sally Inglis	Accepted
Jeff Koch	Accepted
Meagan Lienert	Accepted
Kerri Rayson	Accepted
Toni Scott	Accepted
Peta Willmott	Accepted
Peter Woolford	Apology
Amy Wright	Accepted
David Schmidt	Accepted
Laura Fitzgerald	Accepted
Debra Larwood	Accepted
Christine Lehmann	Accepted
Charlie Milton	Accepted

**DISER:**

- ARWA General Manager, Sam Chard
- Community Liaison Officer Maree Barford
- Stakeholder Engagement Nicolas Crowther
- ARWA Georgina Neuhaus
- ARWA Jane Bailey
- ARWA Nikola Kanard

**Outstanding Action Items**

Item Number	Detail	Status
<b>KCC20200806/A04</b>	The department to organise for a range of presenters to attend a future KCC/KEWG meeting in order to discuss the options for the entity to control the community fund.	<b>PENDING</b>
<b>KCC20200806/A05</b>	ARWA to report back to the committee on the results of the RCC online consultation.	<b>PENDING</b>
<b>KCC20200806/A07</b>	KCC/KEWG to discuss Economic Development Officer in a meeting after this round of CBP has been finalised.	<b>PENDING</b>

**New Action Items**

<b>KCC20200917/A01</b>	ARWA to redistribute information on CBP Conflict of Interest management
------------------------	---

<b>KCC20200917/A02</b>	ARWA to consult with AusIndustry on projects alternative funding for projects unsuccessful in this round of CBP
<b>KCC20200917/A03</b>	ARWA to circulate an outline of the preferred option for siting the visitor's centre.

## 1 Welcome & Acknowledgement of Country

The Chair opened the meeting at 1:05pm AEST / 12:35pm ACT. The Chair provided an Acknowledgement of Country, before outlining housekeeping arrangements, given this meeting was both virtual and face-to-face.

Attendees in Kimba were located at the Kimba Gateway Hotel, with Canberra-based members of ARWA attending via videoconference.

## 2 ARWA Update

The Chair invited Ms Chard to provide an update on ARWA.

Ms Chard thanked those participating in the meeting, as well as those who had assisted with the virtual set up. Ms Chard noted the positive development with the borders opening up, hopefully allowing ARWA to attend the next meetings in person.

### **Barnjarla Determination Aboriginal Corporation**

Ms Chard provided an update on ARWA's interactions with the Barnjarla Determination Aboriginal Corporation (BDAC).

ARWA and the Minister were continuing to seek to meet with BDAC.

Members heard that previous attempts to meet had been made, which had been hampered by the various travel restrictions required as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Now some of these restrictions are being lifted, ARWA is hopeful that an in-person meeting will be able to occur.

AEWA's Indigenous Engagement (IE) team has been increased, with new team members based in the Adelaide office. They are planning to visit the community soon.

### **Mentally Fit EP Program**

Ms Chard thanked those members who had already provided feedback on the MentallyFitEP program; this has been provided to the consultants.

An outline of activities was provided including:

The delivery of individual sessions across a range of age groups are conducted by the project's clinicians; also positive psychology and therapy sessions for the school population.

Ms Chard encouraged members to engage with the programs on offer, and to promote them around the community.

### **Report of the Senate Economics Committee**

The report was published on 14 September 2020

Two recommendations: that the legislation be passed in its current form before the Senate; and that fresh dialogue commence between ARWA and the Traditional Owners, utilising the services of an independent mediator, if necessary.

The report has been provided to members for their information

Ms Chard noted that notwithstanding the dissenting reports, the bipartisan endorsement of the Committee's report could be a positive sign for the prospects of the legislation which is scheduled to be debated in the Senate on 7-8 October 2020.

**Note: the legislation is now scheduled for debate for the week of 9 November 2020.**

### **Australian Radioactive Waste Agency - Update**

Ms Chard advised that new staff, including new members of the IE team, have commenced in Adelaide.

These positions are part of the 35 jobs in Adelaide already announced and are in addition to the 45 jobs for the facility.

Advertising for a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for ARWA is likely to occur in late October. This position will be Adelaide-based, and, in APS terms, will be of a rank senior to Ms Chard's.

In addition a Senior Executive - Technical Specialist will be recruited shortly. This role will work in conjunction with the current General Manager overseeing the two parallel but integrated streams of work, including; policy, governance, and community engagement; and the technical program of work to develop the actual facility, engage appropriate contractors, and licencing. These roles will be advertised domestically and internationally.

The CEO role will ultimately be a Ministerial appointment once the Agency is established as a statutory agency with its own legislation.

*A member asked: Could you please clarify the acronym, 'ARWA'?*

'ARWA' is the Australian Radioactive Waste Agency; it has subsumed the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility Taskforce (the Taskforce). At this time, it is effectively the same team you have dealt with in the Taskforce. Whilst still predominantly based in Canberra, the vast majority of any new recruitment will be Adelaide-based.

### **Community Skills & Development Program**

Ms Chard outlined some details of the Community Skills & Development Program (CSDP).

An \$8million grants program which will come into effect once the site is acquired.

The site is acquired after the legislation becomes law. (It becomes law on 'Royal Assent' – when the actual 'bill' is signed by the Governor-General, on behalf of the Queen as Australia's Head of State.)

The CSDP is designed to support skills and training and economic development to ensure the Kimba community can maximise the economic opportunities from the development, construction, and operation of the facility.

Options could include skills acquisition or upskilling for locals to take advantage of new employment opportunities; opportunities for business development to support the project, and the protection & promotion of local indigenous heritage.

Consistent with approach taken with developing the Community Benefits Program (CBP), there will be a role for the committee to contribute to development of the guidelines and assessment criteria.

Ms Chard encouraged the members to give consideration to the full range of options that could be incorporated into the program design to deliver the best outcomes for the future.

There was discussion of a number of possibilities for consideration including funding scholarships and traineeships, either directly or through a third party community entity.

For example, you could invest around \$900,000 of the \$8million which would support over 22 residents to acquire relevant degrees or qualifications.

*A member asked: Acquisition of the site, and therefore the access to this funding, is predicated on the legislation passing the Parliament. What happens to this funding if the legislation does not pass?*

If the legislation did not pass, it would be for the government to decide how the project would progress. In the Senate inquiry process, the question was raised as to whether the government would revert to the current (2012) legislation. Theoretically, the government could proceed under the current legislation and make a declaration, however, that would be a decision for government. The government's strong view is that this legislation should pass.

*A member asked: Do the traineeships you refer to just relate to the functioning of the facility, or would you see an opportunity for businesses to take advantage of such training in order to enable them to develop further, so the wider town can progress?*

This is an excellent question and highlights the issues for discussion to develop the program. ARWA is seeking to ensure there is plenty of opportunity for a variety of people, businesses and organisations to take advantage of the economic opportunities the facility will provide for the Kimba and the region. Members were reminded of the Cadence Economics report that highlighted the importance of such opportunities to the town long-term viability.

*A member asked: Further to this discussion regarding business development and capability growing, in the recently-closed round of the Community Benefits Program, there may be businesses that have applied for funding for projects that might fit better under this CSDP funding. Especially given the CBP is over-subscribed, should we have a more in-depth discussion about this and consider postponing some of those applications for this program?*

Ms Chard noted that, given the diversity of projects put forward under the CBP, it is likely some applications could be relevant under the CSDP but the final guidelines and regulations for the CSDP will not be settled until later this year or early next year.

Ms Chard also cautioned members regarding the CSDP being used for investing in specific businesses; the CSDP is meant to be about the whole community gaining the skills and capabilities to take advantage of the economic opportunities, rather than investing in specific businesses.

**Note: Since the meeting a member sought further information on CSDP and business support. Ms Chard provided the attached clarification (Attachment A) on 7 October 2020.**

*A member asked: Further to the previous question regarding site acquisition, an organisation has submitted an application for CBP funding to develop workforce strategy and planning; where would this discussion leave such an applicant?*

The commitment to progressing the site and the project is a matter for government. As outlined above, CSDP funding is contingent on site acquisition and it will be rolled out after that and more than likely in the first half of next year. In contrast, the CBP funding is certain, secured, and has a definite timeframe. Ms Chard encouraged members that, when contributing to the assessment of applications, if they felt a project was a priority for the community it should be considered in the context of the CBP funding that is available now.

*A member noted: This is an \$8million fund, and is meant to develop long-term strategies for the community. Whilst we are discussing immediate projects, we also need to be thinking about the*

*longevity of projects and their effects, such as building training infrastructure, and engaging businesses to conduct training for the long-term.*

Ms Chard concurred.

*A member asked: In this discussion of the CSDP, the agency is being quite firm that it should not focus on individual businesses, and that its purpose is to develop opportunities. However, how is that possible if you can't focus on individual businesses? In previous discussions, we had looked at this being an opportunity to develop business plans, but these are business-specific.*

Ms Chard explained that the best outcome will be to take the time to sit down and talk through the options for these grant guidelines to ensure they provide the most effective program for Kimba. In relation to support for 'upgrading premises' Ms Chard offered a personal perspective on the questions: her view was that capability development was a long-term business development strategy, which would be relevant to CSDP funding. Where concerns might arise would be considering the eligibility of projects seeking funding for 'upgrades of premises' for example, could be challenged. Noting there has been some past criticism of funding that provided a competitive advantage for one business, by improving specific amenities at that businesses, which ARWA would want to avoid in the future.

The concept of capability planning and mapping - how a business could plan, shift, or adapt to take advantage of the economic opportunities arising from the facility could be supported.

The crucial point is that there is a need to be guided by the community in the development of the guidelines and program; it needs to meet the needs and expectations of the community, and deliver maximum benefits to the whole community.

*A member commented: They were in agreement with sitting down, discussing, and developing the guidelines. Regarding the skills and development discussion, if the legislation passes, do we know when the build of the facility will commence, so we can work backwards from that in terms of a timeline?*

Ms Chard explained: In a previous meeting, we did discuss a high-level timeline and we will update this at a future meeting; to recap

We will need at least two years, and quite possibly longer, for the regulatory approvals process. Once these applications are submitted, the relevant agencies will need to conduct their assessments. They have so far advised that they will be able to complete these processes concurrently, but, this has not been done before, so will be a new process to work through.

Then we can apply for a construction licence.

In summary, it could be three or more years before any construction work begins on the site.

## **4 Regional Consultative Committee**

Ms Chard was invited to provide an update on the Regional Consultative Committee.

Ms Chard thanked those members who had participated in the online consultation process. There was a pleasing response rate and that feedback is important to ARWA to shape the final membership and term of reference options.

### **Regional definition.**

The discussion of what would constitute 'regional' was extensive, a common theme was that the Eyre Peninsula could be a practical geographic boundary for the RCC representation. In addition the concept of having both voting and non-voting members was discussed, to allow maximum geographic reach but maintaining a workable committee size.

## **Community Fund**

Some responses sought to clarify the relationship between the role of the RCC and the management of the \$20m Community Fund and how the funds would be disbursed.

### **To clarify**

The \$20m is to support the Kimba community; while the RCC may draw representation from a broader area it does not mean the funding will be applied across the broader regional area.

A separate entity will be established to manage the community fund, the RCC will not administer the fund.

The option of supporting RCC representation on the community fund managing entity was discussed by respondents, noting this could ensure clear communication of community views and expectations.

### **RCC Charter**

Ideas for establishing the role and functions of the RCC included the idea of a Charter for the RCC

By law, the RCC will require Terms of Reference to be set out in regulations under the Act, these will effectively operate as a charter. ARWA will be seeking feedback on the Terms of Reference later this year when as we prepare the regulations for tabling in parliament.

### **Gender balance in RCC membership**

A number of respondents highlighted the need for diversity and gender balance in the membership

The Commonwealth has established guidelines and standards to meet gender and diversity requirements. As a ministerial-appointed committee, the RCC will be subject to these standards.

### **Useability of the system?**

A member explained that the rating system was a little confusing, as it was asking you to rate what you said, rather than marking other good ideas; is this an adaptation that could be included in subsequent iterations of the platform?

A member found the forum useful, but was disappointed more members did not contribute; they felt there could have been more engagement. As to the roles & responsibilities that were subject of the RCC, the member felt another forum would be good to get down to the nuts and bolts of this, if other members were willing to participate.

*A member asked whether communications with the agency were strictly official and for publication, or could communications happen and opinions be placed with ARWA in confidence?*

Ms Chard explained that she – and the agency – were always happy to receive feedback in confidence, either through the ARWA or personal email addresses; it is beneficial to have the writer's intentions for their correspondence to be included (eg 'in confidence' or 'not for further distribution'). ARWA can consider further how confidential feedback could be appropriately included in deliberations on these kinds of platforms, without identifying participants.

*A member asked: You have explained that the agency has received a lot of feedback on the Mentally Fit EP program, but as members of this committee, we are not all aware of this feedback; has it been displayed publically or privately? Is this something we can discuss?*

Ms Chard explained that as this particular issue (the MentallyFit program) was not a topic for discussion or information on the consultation platform, the feedback was via the program consultants and emails to the agency.

Mr Crowther explained that some feedback had been provided in previous meetings of this group, and was passed on in writing to the MentallyFit team. However, members should feel



free to contact the ARWA at any time seeking information or providing feedback, via the ARWA inbox: [arwa@industry.gov.au](mailto:arwa@industry.gov.au). While we have not been publishing any feedback received in this way for privacy reasons, the agency will further consider how it could be incorporated and/or communicated to the members.

Ms Chard went on to explain that ARWA was keen to open some of the upcoming consultation topics to the broader community, but are interested to hear members' views before proceeding further with that. We have previously discussed that there may well be concerns about managing and moderating behaviour in public forums, but the agency believes this could be managed and mitigated against. Views of the committee were sought.

Members discussed that there would need to be careful consideration given to having an open platform for comments to be made, and it would need to be very tightly moderated.

A member did note that the feedback being asked for in this forum was relatively in-depth, so might need to be simplified in some way if it was going to the broader community.

Members were concerned that defamatory, inappropriate, or dangerous/violent commentary may ensue on such a forum, based on past experience; safety did seem to be a concern to the membership.

There was a suggestion that if broader community feedback was going to be sought, it might be better to think about feedback via email, in a closed and private manner, rather than in a public forum.

ARWA agreed to continue to consider these issues and options.

## 5 Community Benefits Program

Ms Chard noted that this round of CBP funding was over-subscribed; AusIndustry have informed us that there are 39 eligible applications, seeking a total of just under \$6million in funds. Given the difference between what is available (\$2 million) and the amount sought in this round of funding difficult decisions will have to be made.

Thursday 15 October was identified as a possible date for the KCC meeting to consider CBP applications, noting that other priorities for the agency including the debate on the bill and senate estimates were all occurring close to that date ARWA will confirm this date as soon as possible. [Note the meeting has now been rescheduled to 4 & 5 November].

### Time to review CBP applications

Members sort an assurance that they would have adequate time to review applications. The agency in consultation with AusIndustry will ensure sufficient time (at least a week) is provided for consideration of the applications prior to the planned meeting.

### Conflict of Interest

In discussion members raised the need for clarity on the process to ensure appropriate measures are in place. The agency noted it had provided some information on Conflict of Interest after the previous KCC meeting.

The Chair noted that members in the room were indicating they had not received the information; ARWA committed to resending it to members, and asked they check their junk mailboxes to ensure the email hadn't been mislaid, as it was now coming from a new email address.

**KCC20200917/A01**

ARWA to redistribute information on CBP Conflict of Interest management to members

**Note: This information has been attached to these Minutes as a follow up. (Attachment B)**

Ms Bailey outlined the arrangements for the CBP process;

If the committee member is an applicant, they will be asked to identify that on a memo, and state their interest.

AusIndustry will then assess the materiality of that conflict.

If the member stands to make a personal gain from the proposal seeking funding, they will not to participate in that application assessment. All conflicts of interest will be recorded as part of the master scoresheet.

*A member asked: Given we will receive the information on the applications a week in advance, what will the confidentiality level of that be? The purpose of having the information ahead of time is so committee members can assess the community need and benefit in forming their advice, so surely will need to be able to discuss these details?*

The intention in providing this information to the committee members, in confidence, ahead of the meeting information is to enable discussions and/or further considerations to make the most thorough community benefit assessments. When the package of information is sent out, ARWA will include guidance on how the information should be used or discussed; it might be that certain questions would be more appropriately referred back to the agency or AusIndustry for clarification or response and if appropriate that could be shared with all members, for example. ARWA notes that the role of the committee is to provide that local view – how the project will help the community- acknowledging that committee members will assess this to the best of their ability.

*A member raised: In previous rounds, all committee members declared their conflicts, and consensus was reached in the room that none were sufficiently material; the concern this time around is that this is a much more competitive round of funding, and therefore conflicts of interest may pose greater sway or issue.*

Ms Chard explained it would be important for all members to fully disclose any associations or interests to allow AusIndustry to assess the materiality of any notified conflicts. AusIndustry have well-developed processes for independently assessing and determining whether these are material conflicts. Ms Chard further noted that the KCC/KEWG are not the decision-makers in this process; their purpose is to provide advice on the community benefits of the applications. AusIndustry is the ultimate decision-maker.

*A member sought two points of clarification: regarding the involvement of the KEWG in prioritising applications, especially given the over-subscription of applications; and, is AusIndustry having a final say in the approval of projects, as an objective decision-maker?*

It was ARWA's understanding that members of the KCC and the KEWG had resolved at a previous meeting that they would convene as one group for all meetings for the remainder of their tenure, until the establishment of the RCC. [*Secretariat note: this was resolved at the meeting in February 2020*].

Ms Chard confirmed that AusIndustry is the decision-maker for the program, reiterating that whilst the committee would be providing advice on the community benefit of the various projects, it is ultimately AusIndustry's decision on which applications receive funding.

The chair confirmed he was in favour of both groups being involved in this process, and continuing to meet together. The chair noted that he felt the conflict of interest issues would also be further diluted by the involvement of the larger group, and that the assessment of these applications was indeed core work for the Economic Working Group, so they must be involved.

*A member asked: Is a week long enough for committee members to liaise with the community in order to assess the benefits of projects proposed?*

Ms Chard noted that ARWA was hoping to be able to provide the committees with more time, but that it would be a week at a minimum. The agency committed to confirming this and making contact with the members on Monday 21 September to confirm the timeframes for this assessment process.

**Note: The next meeting of the KCC has been postponed to 4-5 November**

*A member noted: Their concerns regarding the process, and the high level of competition for this round of funding. The member noted that though the committees would like to be objective, this might not always be easy. As such, the member was keen to emphasise that though the committees would be providing advice, they hoped the decision would predominantly rest with AusIndustry.*

Ms Chard noted this comment, and emphasised that AusIndustry is the decision-maker. There are several criteria that AusIndustry uses when assessing applications; the committees' advice is in relation to one of these criteria: the community benefit of the project. This is a comparative merit process, applications are assessed against all criteria and the ones evaluated as best meeting all criteria are recommended for funding.

*A member supported the previous member's comments that AusIndustry be the ultimate decision-maker and noted it was good that AusIndustry were so involved, providing that strong objectivity.*

*A member noted that in earlier discussions, it was raised that some projects might sit better in other funding rounds. They asked if AusIndustry would be able to provide any advice on which projects could be deferred, based on other grants schemes that might be coming online in the future.*

Ms Chard committed to sit down with AusIndustry to seek some advice on which applications might suit alternative funding programs. However, Ms Chard once again emphasised that this CBP grants package is absolute and guaranteed, while others were dependent on site acquisition or licensing, which might not happen for a long length of time. As such, members should be careful of deferring projects, especially as expectations and guidelines for other funding rounds had not yet been developed.

**KCC20200917/A02**

ARWA to consult with AusIndustry on projects best suited to alternative funding programs

A member concurred that if guidelines and assessment criteria have not yet been developed for other grant sources, it would not be prudent to put off important projects.

*A member asked: When assessing the applications for the CBP, will there be written reporting, and will members be privy to their colleagues' assessments of applications.*

This assessment process would be the same as USED in previous rounds. This involved an overall ranking system that was shared amongst the group, compiled from the ranking assessments provided by individual members to AusIndustry, de-identified. The final ranking would be shared, but individual rankings were kept confidential.

ARWA committed to providing clear advice on the specifics of the process in plenty of time for members' consideration. The agency requested members contact either Ms Barford or the ARWA mailbox with any further questions they would like clarified regarding this process, so advice could be appropriately provided to all members.

*A member noted: last time, this process took more than a day; how long will be allocated for this assessment, given there are many more applications?*

Ms Bailey explained that in discussions, AusIndustry had queried whether two days would be needed in both communities; Ms Bailey was still waiting on formal advice of this. ARWA

acknowledges that this is a large number of applications to process in one day, and it may be necessary to have up to two days. Ms Bailey explained this would be dependent on the complexity of the applications, hence the need to wait for formal advice.

**Note: The meeting is now for 4-5 November**

*A member asked: Could we please clarify the meeting date as soon as possible, as it is difficult to make personal arrangements at such short notice, as is consistently occurring at the moment.*

(The date has now been confirmed as 4 &5 November)

Ms Bailey confirmed that early indications from AusIndustry were that they would be ready to commence this part of the assessment process by 15 October. However, the agency noted that they also needed to attend meetings in Hawker. A discussion ensued which established:

- There is a Kimba Council meeting on 14 October, which would conflict with timings
- ARWA confirmed that members should make plans for 15 October, with possible spill over into the morning of 16 October
- That the meeting should start earlier in the day than previous assessment days (ie earlier than 10:00am local time)
- That there should be an expectation that the day last to at least 5:30pm; therefore, a full day of work (with an adequate break for lunch to allow members to refresh)

It was noted that though the process was oversubscribed, there would be preparation time for this round, which was absent in previous assessment processes. This therefore may speed up the assessment process.

*A member noted that advice from AusIndustry had circulated in the community that projects would be assessed and notified within the next three weeks.*

Ms Chard noted this was not correct. Due process has to occur including the committee input at the upcoming meeting.

It is understood that the earliest possible date for assessments to be completed and applicants notified would be late November.

## **6 Future initiatives: Visitors Centre, Agriculture, Tourism**

Ms Chard was invited to update the committee on anticipated future initiatives and discussions.

### **Visitor Centre: Proposals for siting**

There is an opportunity to engage with both the Committee and the broader community on the optimum location of the planned Visitor Centre. Currently it has been designed as part of the facility, however, there may be enhanced economic outcomes for Kimba and the region by locating it in town.

Discussions have been initiated with Regional Development Australia – Eyre Peninsula and Tourism SA to draw on their resources to look at some aspects of the alternative Visitor Centre proposal including:

1. The general economic impact of hosting the centre in Kimba or out on-site, and
2. A market analysis of the tourism sector in the region to 2030 and opportunities for expanding tourism and related businesses in the Kimba region including (but not limited to):
  - Ecotourism
  - Educational tourism
  - Cultural/Indigenous tourism

- Adventure tourism

From this work, ARWA would seek to develop an understanding of the comparative economic benefits of tourism to the Kimba and the region based on the two siting options.

ARWA will bring an outline of the option back to the committee and seek ideas in how to engage the wider community.

**KCC20200917/A03**

ARWA to circulate an outline of the preferred option for siting the visitor's centre.

### **Agriculture**

ARWA acknowledges the concerns expressed by some in the local agricultural industry about the impact on the sector from hosting the facility, notwithstanding the evidence from France and Spain that it can comfortably coexist with a thriving agricultural industry.

ARWA is committed to promoting research and development benefits for the agricultural sector in Kimba.

We have specifically dedicated part of the site for agricultural research and development and we will continue to consult with the community, industry and experts to design an appropriate R&D program.

Support for R&D projects is one of the uses envisaged for the \$20 million NRWMF Community Fund.

### **Transport**

ARWA has commenced preliminary investigations into the future transport options from Lucas Heights and Woomera to the NRWMF.

This work includes analysis of possible transport modes (e.g. by road (truck only) and through a combination of road and rail) and possible routes from ANSTO Lucas Heights (Sydney) and Woomera (SA) to the NRWMF, and is being assisted by transport logistics experts from the CSIRO.

This is a long-term project but it will be important to begin the process now to ensure all the information is available for the regulators.

### **Comments**

The Chair noted that he and another member are members of the RDA board; the Chair was not expressing a conflict, just making members aware.

The Chair offered some initial views regarding the visitor's centre, explaining the very successful tourism operation at the Maralinga site, where visitors were taken to relevant sites in that area. As to the location of a centre for Kimba, the Chair noted that it was likely there would be some things at the Kimba site, which might be of primary interest to tourists and visitors, as against the convenience of having something in town.

Ms Chard noted that this was a good example of the issues to be considered. Whilst having the centre at the facility might increase its 'drawcard' nature, it may be that there would be more flow-on economic benefits to the community if it was located in Kimba. Weighing up the benefits will be important.

A discussion ensued in which multiple members supported the notion of a main visitors centre in town, but with some visitor access and space at the facility. The economic benefits of having the centre in town were noted and considered more likely to generate economic returns. If the centre was only at the facility, then visitors would be more likely to bypass the town.

Regarding community consultation, a member noted that whilst the current trend is for more and more online engagement, they saw this issue as one that would be useful to hold some more in-person broader community consultations on, especially given the impact these sorts of considerations have on the broader community.

Given some of the constraints of online consultation, including the kinds of language and opinions used, in-person consultation could facilitate a more productive and active conversation, rather than a one-way dialogue. It was also noted that in a forum situation, answers and responses could be more immediate, so the conversation could flow more productively, rather than stall while waiting for responses or advice.

The member also noted it would be important to reach out and go to groups, rather than expect them to come to 'us' as either the committee or ARWA.

*A member asked: Is it possible to consider transport options prior to consulting on and developing the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC)?*

Ms Chard agreed that the two were interconnected: transport modes and routes would not be able to be settled without the WAC criteria, but that the WAC criteria was also dependent on the transport options. Whilst the WAC will determine the kinds of packaging, and therefore volumes and sizes of packages, which will then be used to assess how they integrate with transport modes, you also need to have a sense of those transport modes to ensure the packaging will suit them.

This will be an incremental process of designing preliminary WAC, then applying it to potential routes, then continuing refinement of both of these things.

We are conscious that consultation on transport routes will not be resolved quickly, it could take a few years.

For Kimba, the impacts will be significant including decisions about upgrading or developing roads to access the facility. Given this it will be important to commence to gather local views noting it will need to be an incremental process.

*A member asked to return to some earlier issues raised regarding community representation and consultation. The member sought to clarify, did the agency not feel they were receiving a 'true' representation of community views via this forum? Do members need to go into the community and conduct more active, individual consultation? Does the committee need to look at holding a forum to help gather more community views?*

Ms Chard clarified that this was not the view of ARWA. Acknowledging that it is a big ask to expect that the committee can harness all the views of the community. For example, whilst it is one thing to expect the Mayor, as a member of this committee, to represent Council's views, as it is his role in the community, it is less fair to assume that other committee members represent other, broader groups in the same way

Establishing if the committee is of the view that it adequately represents the views of the broad community is important as is determining if more support from ARWA is required. The agency was seeking to demonstrate that they are conscious that it might be unfair to expect or assume that the committee was comfortable that they captured all community views.

A member noted that it might be useful to consider having committee members more actively attending all community events, and making themselves more known in the community as committee members, so that community members felt able to discuss their issues, concerns, ideas, and views with members. These could be compiled and reported to the committee as a whole. The member noted that it might not be possible to establish this prior to the establishment of the RCC.

Ms Chard noted ARWA was seeking to step up the RCC fairly quickly, but this was a good idea to note for discussions regarding the drafting of the Terms of Reference for the RCC.

## 7 General business

The Chair invited members to raise any items of general business.

*A member asked: Regarding the next meeting, will it be entirely focussed on the CBP and AusIndustry, or will another committee meeting also occur at this time?*

Ms Chard confirmed there would not be another general committee meeting prior to the CBP assessment meeting.

Ms Chard took this opportunity to reiterate that if the committee felt it required more support from the agency in order to fulfil its community consultative role, or had any ideas for how ARWA could provide support, members were encouraged to be in touch with the agency. At the very least, such ideas might be useful in the development of the Terms of Reference for the RCC.

A conversation ensued regarding the fact that committee members tended to gravitate to their own social groups and likeminded opinion groups, and so it might be valuable to host some broader forums, challenge our own ideas, and therefore possible balance some perspectives.

A member noted that a great number of topics had been covered in recent meetings, and would a newsletter be a good way to communicate some of these to the community. Such an action might prompt conversations in the community, which would feed back to the committee.

Ms Bailey confirmed that the agency was working on a newsletter, due for distribution in the coming week(s). Ms Chard agreed that the newsletters could be used more frequently and could form more of the consultation strategy.

Members were asked to consider if they would consent to having their names listed on the newsletter, so community members would know who to reach out to.

Members generally concurred, noting that it is easy to assume that everyone in the community knows who to talk to, where to find services, but this might not be fair on them. Members were asked to be in touch with the agency directly if they had any concerns regarding their name being published in upcoming newsletters.

Members further agreed that it might be useful for the newsletter to be written and distributed as 'from' the committee, rather than ARWA, as this would show greater community involvement. It was noted that the committee would need to approve the content.

A member further noted that the Facebook page could be used more extensively.

### **Meeting close**

There being no further business, the Chair thanked members for their attendance, participation, and input. The Chair further thanked those involved in organising the video link and related technology, in order to facilitate the meeting.

The Chair noted that the committee would reconvene in order to assess the Community Benefit Program applications on 15 October.

The Chair closed the meeting at 2:55pm AEST / 2:35pm AST