



## Kimba Consultative Committee and Kimba Economic Working Group meeting

**Date:** Thursday 22 April 2021  
**Time:** 08:30am – 1:00pm (local time)  
**Location:** Kimba Soldiers Memorial Hall, Kimba

### MINUTES

**KCC Independent Convener:** Allan Suter | **KCC Deputy Convener:** Dean Johnson  
**KEWG Chair:** David Schmidt

Item	Lead	Key points
1. Welcome	Convener	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgement of Country</li> <li>Housekeeping</li> </ul>
2. Introduction	Sam Chard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffing update</li> </ul>
3. ARWA update	Sam Chard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislation</li> <li>UQ baseline survey—draft report</li> <li>Cultural heritage assessment</li> <li>Site Supervisor update</li> </ul>
4. Community Benefit Program	Sam Chard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rollout update</li> <li>Consideration for future grants programs</li> </ul>
<b>10.15am-10:30am Morning tea</b>		
5. Community Participation Plan	Nicholas Crowther	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of overall plan</li> <li>Suggested amendments from committee members</li> </ul>
6. Community Conversations schedule	Maree Barford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of draft schedule</li> <li>Suggestions for stakeholder groups</li> </ul>
7. Safety and Technical GM introduction	David Osborn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction</li> </ul>
8. Transport routes	David Osborn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of transport route(s)</li> </ul>
9. Future meetings	Sam Chard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule</li> <li>Anticipated topics for discussion</li> </ul>
10. Other business	Convener	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any other business</li> </ul>
<b>1.00pm Lunch and meeting close</b>		

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

Committee Member	Attendance
Allan Suter (Convenor)	Accepted
Dean Johnson (Deputy Convenor)	Accepted
Symon Allen	Apology
Jeff Baldock	Accepted
Heather Baldock	Accepted
Pat Beinke	Apology
Randall Cliff	Accepted
Kellie Hunt	Accepted
Sally Inglis	Accepted
Jeff Koch	Accepted
Meagan Lienert	Accepted
Kerri Rayson	Accepted
Toni Scott	Apology
Peta Willmott	Accepted
Peter Woolford	Accepted
Amy Wright	Accepted
David Schmidt (Chair KEWG)	Accepted
Laura Fitzgerald	Accepted
Debra Larwood	Accepted
Christine Lehmann	Accepted
Charlie Milton	Apology

**Australian Radioactive Waste Agency**

- Sam Chard, General Manager, Australian Radioactive Waste Agency
- David Osborn, General Manager, Australian Radioactive Waste Agency
- Nicholas Crowther, Manager, Community Engagement
- Clare Butterfield, Assistant Manager, Community Engagement
- Jim Haskett, Site Supervisor
- Maree Barford, Community Liaison Officer

**Common acronyms**

Acronym	Meaning
AECOM	AECOM Australia Pty Ltd
ANSTO	Australian Nuclear Science Technology Organisation
ARPANSA	Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency
ARWA	Australian Radioactive Waste Agency
ASNO	Australian Safeguards and Non-proliferation Office
BDAC	Barngarla Determination Aboriginal Corporation
CBP	Community Benefit Program
CE	Community Engagement

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

Acronym	Meaning
CHA	Cultural Heritage Assessment
CLO	Community Liaison Officer
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
DCK	District Council of Kimba
DISER	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources
EPBC Act	<i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth)</i>
GM	General Manager
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IE	Indigenous Engagement
ILW	Intermediate Level Waste
KCC	Kimba Consultative Committee
KEWG	Kimba Economic Working Group
LLW	Low Level Waste
NRWM Act	<i>National Radioactive Waste Management Act 2012 (Cth)</i>
NRWMF	National Radioactive Waste Management Facility
RCC	Regional Consultative Committee
WAC	Waste Acceptance Criteria

**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/A07</b>	KCC/KEWG to discuss Economic Development Officer in a meeting after this round of CBP has been finalised	<b>PENDING</b>
<b>KCC20210304/A06</b>	Circulate overview of the CSDP prior to detailed consultation with the community	<b>PENDING</b>
<b>KCC20210304/A13</b>	ARWA to arrange for RDA-EP to present their draft report into visitor centre scenarios to the committee for their feedback, prior to finalising report	<b>PENDING</b>

**New action items**

Item number	Detail
<b>KCC20210422/A01</b>	ARWA to scope out the opportunity for long term social impact assessment research proposal and put on agenda for a future meeting.
<b>KCC20210422/A02</b>	Committee members to consider other indicators that ARWA could use to assess social impact of the facility.
<b>KCC20210422/A03</b>	ARWA to hold a workshop to discuss eligibility for future funding rounds, should they be available.
<b>KCC20210422/A04</b>	ARWA to circulate information about why businesses are eligible for CBP but partnerships aren't.

Item number	Detail
KCC20210422/A05	Sam to discuss CBP guidelines re: businesses vs partnerships with AusIndustry.
KCC20210422/A06	ARWA to provide talking points for committee about how funding programs are decided on, should there be future funding rounds.
KCC20210422/A07	Arrange for AusIndustry to present to the committee about their role in deciding funding, should there be future funding rounds.
KCC20210422/A08	Provide conflict of interest guidelines and advice about legal ramifications and penalties for not declaring conflicts of interest, should there be future funding rounds.
KCC20210422/A09	Circulate presentation from meeting.

## 1 Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country

The Convenor opened the meeting at 9:09am (local time). The Convenor delivered an Acknowledgement of Country, before outlining housekeeping arrangements and proposed breaks throughout the day.

## 2 Introduction

The Convenor invited ARWA General Manager—Policy and Governance, Ms Chard, to provide an update on recent activities. Ms Chard thanked members for their attendance and introduced the new General Manager—Safety and Technical for the Australian Radioactive Waste Agency, Mr David Osborn.

Mr Osborn said that he was very happy to be back in Australia and is looking forward to meeting people in the Kimba community. Mr Osborn spoke to members about his 25 years of experience in government, international affairs, and working in the nuclear science and technology field, particularly from an environmental management viewpoint. Mr Osborn is trained in environmental science and law, and has worked for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) leading their Environment Division and Laboratories.

Mr Osborn has a passion for environmental management and looks forward to getting to know the area and settling into Adelaide, while spending a lot of time in Kimba as the project continues.

## 3 ARWA update

### Legislation

Ms Chard advised she was disappointed that the legislation was not debated earlier in the year, but is hopeful of debate in early June. She reminded the committee of the Minister's view on the matter, when he spoke publicly on 15 March, highlighting the project is still high on his agenda. Some members suggested that the legislation is not going anywhere in its current form, and questioned why the Minister won't just make a declaration about the site's location.

Ms Chard advised that the Minister could make a declaration, however he is committed to pursuing the path of the legislation being debated in the Senate. As such, ARWA will continue to work on appropriate aspects of the project despite delays with site acquisition.

### UQ baseline survey—draft report

Ms Chard recalled discussions at the last committee meeting and advised that ARWA has sent out the previous UQ baseline study to members, and had received no feedback or comments about it.

Ms Chard informed members that UQ are undertaking interviews with certain people to help inform the updated economic analysis:

- Heather Baldock, in her capacity as Chair of the Kimba Community Development Group.
- Deb Larwood, in her capacity as CEO of the District Council of Kimba.
- Phil Arcus, in his capacity as a real estate agent.
- Michael Seal, in his capacity as an insurance expert.
- Dean Johnson, in his capacity as Mayor and a member of the KCC.
- David Schmidt, in his capacity as Chair of the KEWG.

The purpose of these interviews is to inform the economic analysis rather than the social analysis, which isn't being re-assessed this time.

ARWA expects the draft report back at the end of April and will circulate it to members when it's finalised. Ms Chard also mentioned that UQ could come to Kimba and speak to the report if members were interested.

Discussion ensued about whether the social research completed by UQ in 2018 would have changed. Ms Chard advised that it's the view of ARWA that the social values in Kimba (such as community spirit and passion for volunteering etc.) would not have changed much in such a short period of time. Members of the committee were concerned that the social impact of the site selection process and the delays have had a significant effect on the community, and that this should be assessed and recorded by ARWA. Ms Chard agreed to investigate the opportunity to find out more information on how ARWA could assess the social impact. Mr Osborn asked members to consider other indicators that ARWA could look at and would like to hear their ideas on how to assess the social impact.

Action item number	Details
KCC20210422/A01	ARWA to scope out the opportunity for long term social impact assessment research proposal and put on an agenda item for a future meeting.
KCC20210422/A02	Committee members to consider other indicators that ARWA could use to assess social impact of the facility.

### **Cultural Heritage Assessment**

Following on from the groundwork laid last meeting, Ms Chard advised that ARWA is procuring services for a cultural heritage assessment and anthropologist services. Applications have closed and we are evaluating the submissions. This activity will update and progress the previous RPS preliminary report, and be targeted to the Napandee site, with an updated understanding of the design aspects of the facility.

Ms Chard spoke to members about the possible songlines identified in the desktop assessment on the south-west corner of the site that, if authenticated, will need to be managed, and advised that an on-ground survey is yet to be completed.

Shane Holland, Manager—Indigenous Engagement, and his team have been in discussions with a senior Barngarla member, who is interested in ARWA hosting an information event.

- This event would give Barngarla people an opportunity to meet with ARWA staff, discuss the facility, and get a better understanding of its purpose, safety and economic opportunities, while at the same time providing their cultural knowledge of the area for ARWA to include in decision making and the promotion of cultural awareness.

BDAC have expressed their interest in completing their own cultural heritage assessment at Napandee, to be undertaken by Dr Goring from the University of Queensland. However, at the time of the meeting (and confirmed on 3/5/21) they had not yet been in contact with the landholder Jeff Baldock to arrange access to Napandee to commence their assessment.

#### **Site Supervisor update**

Mr Haskett discussed the series of documents provided by AECOM regarding the updated site-specific concept design, that he and the Technical Team have been reviewing. They hope to have this completed shortly.

Mr Haskett also updated the committee on his progress developing a health and safety manual for the site.

## **4 Community Benefit Program**

#### **Rollout update**

Ms Chard informed members that all grant agreements are in place with the 18 Kimba grant recipients. All initial payments have been processed and there are some final payments that need to be paid this financial year, bringing the money out the door in 2020-21 to \$1 million. The rest will be paid next financial year.

#### **Consideration for future grant programs**

Ms Chard advised that ARWA has passed on the committee's expectations to Minister Pitt about the need for another round of funding under the Community Benefit Program, and that it is her understanding that he has raised with his colleagues as part of the current Budget process.

Ms Chard asked members to consider previous funding guidelines, and whether there were issues that need to be addressed, should future funding become available. Discussion ensued about geographic boundaries, particularly around whether they should be extended or not. There was general consensus that the boundaries need to be clear in the guidelines and that ARWA should explore different options on how the Gawler Ranges, Secret Rocks, and Koongwa could be included.

Action item number	Details
KCC20210422/A03	ARWA to hold a workshop to discuss eligibility for future funding rounds, should they be available.

Ms Chard spoke about some of the guidelines issues that have been raised previously, and sought the views of the committee. Members raised concerns about business partnerships not being eligible, conflicts of interest, gaining more information about projects, having an opportunity to ask applicants questions about their project, and a mechanism to seek the views of the broader community on projects seeking funding.

Action item number	Details
KCC20210422/A04	ARWA to circulate information about why businesses are eligible for CBP but partnerships aren't.
KCC20210422/A05	Sam to discuss CBP guidelines re: businesses vs partnerships with AusIndustry.

Some members raised concerns about funding applicants trying to lobby committee members and community members to get their project funded. Members would like more information from the

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

applicant about their financial contribution to the project. A suggestion was made that applicants write a summary of the project that is then made available to the community for them to provide feedback.

Some members were concerned that opening the discussion up to the whole of community could lead to members' time being taken up with talking about projects, when they are all busy.

Concerns were also raised that if members knew more about a particular project, their rating would be influenced, and that from their last session it was evident that some members did not read all the information provided on projects prior to the discussions, which could be unfair to the applicants.

There was further discussion from members about what worked well, such as having several weeks to go through the application prior to scoring the projects, having discussion in the room for one day, and voting on another day, and being able to change their score based on other members' comments.

Ms Chard said that ARWA will take all these comments on board, and the team will explore practical options with AusIndustry for any future funding.

Mr Osborn suggested that it might be useful for ARWA to provide committee members with talking points on how funding programs are decided on, should there be future funding, so that the same information was provided to the broader community. Members agreed this would be useful.

Action item number	Details
KCC20210422/A06	ARWA to provide talking points for committee about how funding programs are decided on, should there be future funding.

The Convenor noted that the committee has displayed a high level of integrity when discussing projects and making decisions in previous funding rounds.

Members sought more clarity from AusIndustry about how they make their decisions on which projects to fund. Ms Chard responded by saying there are two main parts to AusIndustry's decision making process:

1. Due diligence about the financial capability and the project's potential, including the realistic likelihood that this project will be completed.
2. Investigation into the technical accuracy in the project. If there are big discrepancies in the application, or if there are viability issues.

Action item number	Details
KCC20210422/A07	Arrange for AusIndustry to present to the committee about their role in deciding funding, should there be future funding rounds.

Ms Chard asked members whether it would be valuable for Mr Rowan Ramsey to observe funding deliberations, in his capacity as the local member. Most committee members agreed that it would not be necessary as the committee is broad enough representation of community interests.

Discussion ensued about conflicts of interest and whether there would be any legal ramifications of not declaring a conflict. The difference between real and perceived conflicts of interest were also discussed. While this information was previously supplied to members prior to the last CBP round,

the Convenor requested that ARWA provide members with a refresher if there is to be another round of funding.

Action item number	Details
KCC20210422/A08	Provide conflict of interest guidelines and advice about legal ramifications and penalties for not declaring conflicts of interest.

## 5 Community Participation Plan

### Discussion of overall plan

Mr Crowther led a brief discussion about the community participation plan and asked for any suggested amendments from committee members. Mr Crowther thanked members who provided feedback at the last meeting. He advised that ARWA is not reinventing the wheel and, to a large extent, the plan is simply formalising a lot of what ARWA has already been doing.

Mr Crowther said that ARWA will use the guiding principles in the plan to work on issues around key themes, such as skills and development, transport and agriculture, and identify what engagement methods best suit the particular issue.

### Suggested amendments from committee members

There were no questions or feedback on the community participation plan.

## Community Conversations schedule

### Discussion of draft schedule

Community Liaison Officer, Ms Maree Barford, led a discussion on the proposed schedule of community conversations, which was emailed to members for their consideration prior to the meeting. Ms Barford advised that ARWA is looking for a practical approach to inform the project and is seeking the views of the broader community, not just the people on the committee on a range of topics. These conversations move away from the divisive opinion debate and seek a more productive conversation.

Ms Barford sought the committee's feedback on the concept, asked for their suggestions on the topics, and asked members to contribute to, and advocate for, community members to get involved. Ms Barford talked through the planned schedule, topics, timings, and which groups should be involved. Committee members agreed that May is not a great time to start these conversations, due to seeding, and that June is much better.

There was a general discussion with the group about the purpose of the conversations, what the desired outcomes are, and how the information would be used.

Ms Chard said the two ways in which ARWA would use the information were:

1. To help inform the facility development and the type of services. For example the extent to which the facility can provide supplementary health services for the community, or how telecommunications at the facility can be leveraged for the broader community.
2. To help inform and shape the Community Skills and Development Program (CSDP). This may take the form of what education and training we need to get out into the community so that they can take advantage of the available opportunities as a result of the facility.

Questions were raised from members as to whether these conversations were to "tick a box for social licence," and Ms Chard reassured the committee that this process was not to demonstrate a

social licence, it was about trying to help inform ARWA's understanding of what's important to the community.

### **Suggestions for other stakeholder groups for community conversations**

Some concerns were raised that there is a portion of the Kimba community that isn't ready to participate constructively in this kind of conversation, and that parents may not want their children to be involved in these types of conversations if they are opposed to the facility. Other members felt that there had been sessions at the school with ANSTO and parents had the option to opt out for their kids. Discussion ensued about the fact that students are being taught about the nuclear industry at schools across Australia, but not at Kimba, and we need to start educating them like every other child in Australia. There was a view that it's important to see what the kids actually want, without parent input.

Other members felt that it wasn't too early to start these conversations, as the community needed to be ready for the CSDP; as long as the discussions were respectful. Members also commented that there may be some people in the community that will never be ready to have these conversations.

Ms Chard asked members if they had any suggestions on how ARWA could facilitate a way for people opposed to the facility to share their views and inform the project. Suggestions were made to include young mothers in the health conversation, tradespeople in the business and economic sector conversation, and offer community members the opportunity to write a submission on their preferred topics if they were uncomfortable with a face-to-face discussion. Members also noted it was important to keep the groups smaller and have more sessions as people would feel more comfortable to contribute to the discussion. Other suggestions included to use the online engagement tool, use the information gathered from Peter Kenyon's workshops in the community from two years ago, have a topic/discussion box for people to write their views, and to talk to the parents and friends committee before engaging with the school.

There was a brief discussion outlining the difference between the council Economic Development Officer (EDO) and the EDO position currently being recruited by ARWA, and how they would be involved in the community conversations.

Ms Barford thanked members for their suggestions and advised that this is a work in progress. ARWA will keep working on topics and the draft schedule, and that we will shape each conversation based on feedback from the previous conversations.

## **6 General Manager—Safety and Technical**

### **Introduction**

Mr Osborn informed members that his role will be to look after the technical aspects of building the facility and that Ms Chard will continue to be responsible for the governance, committees, and policy of the project. He reiterated his background and his excitement to be part of the project.

## **7 Transport routes**

### **Discussion of transport routes**

Mr Osborn spoke to members about transport, which is one of many work areas for the Technical Team. He advised that they will be working through the national routes via which the waste will be transported, as well as local routes within the Kimba district. Mr Osborn acknowledged that the transport of radioactive waste can be a sensitive topic in Australia, and reassured the committee that the transport of radioactive materials is very highly regulated and such materials are being transported around the country every day already, without major incident.

Mr Osborn said the transport routes will look at different contingencies, such as if a road is blocked due to road works or weather, what alternatives are taken. He advised that the regulator, ARPANSA, will have licencing control so the transport routes will need to meet their strict requirements, along with other authorities, should decisions be taken to move the waste by road, rail, air, or sea.

Mr Osborn noted that just because we are talking about a radioactive waste facility, the regulations won't change that much as there is radioactive material already being transported around the country, as with other dangerous substances.

Mr Osborn asked if members had any additional issues about transport, and spoke about the current issues that had been previously discussed, such as the sealing of Tola Road, double handling of ILW, primary responsibility for maintaining the roads, potential security issues surrounding the facility, and the increasing number of people passing through the facility.

Issues raised by members included telecommunications along the transport routes out to the site, and whether it would be a federal road with an agreement for DCK to maintain the road.

A member asked what would come first: the road or the facility, and Mr Osborn advised that this is part of their investigation work, however he would envisage that the road would need to be completed prior to construction and that it would need to be an all-weather access road prior to any substantial work on the site. Ms Chard also advised that the transport plans, including secondary access roads, need to be submitted to ARPANSA and Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment prior to granting the siting licence.

Members discussed the enabling works being completed prior to construction, who would be engaged to do a road assessment (including a national/local risk analysis), how the TN81 would be transported, and what security would be required and access to Tola Road from the Eyre Highway. Ms Chard informed members that any roads transporting radioactive waste will need to be identified and reviewed as part of ARPANSA's licencing process, and will be included in the relevant risk management plan.

Mr Osborn spoke about the TN81 being a large item, and that it would be reasonable for there to be additional security before transportation. Regardless of whether it is low level waste or intermediate level waste, it must be transported in secure packaging. Ms Chard also noted that aside from the TN81, other intermediate level waste will not look substantially different to the low level waste packages. It is likely that transportation of intermediate level waste will be discrete to avoid someone potentially doing something they should not; however all trucks need to note if they are transporting a hazardous substance.

Mr Osborn said that they will work closely with DCK when working through the local transport routes, including off the Eyre Highway and turning corners, as this was included in AECOM's report.

A suggestion was made to include the local roads as a good conversation starter in the community conversations. Mr Osborn said that he is happy to hear views from members and the broader community so that any and all issues can be addressed.

## 8 Future meetings

Ms Chard outlined proposed dates for future meetings: 3 June, 15 July, 26 August, 7 October, 18 November.

Ms Chard also outlined proposed topics for discussion:

- In depth look at ILW and an overview of the Common National Inventory of Radioactive Waste
- RDA-EP tourism + visitor centre work
- UQ's socioeconomic baseline update report
- EY economic assessment update
- Regional Consultative Committee guidelines workshop
- Site specific concept design
- Agricultural research area
- Briefings from consultants about the community fund
- AECOM 10km neighbour questionnaire
- CSDP guidelines workshop
- Overview of WHS procedures / site operating procedures.

Ms Chard asked members if there were any other topic that they would like to see on future agendas. Members didn't have any suggestions at this stage.

## 9 Other business

A member asked if the committee would see a report from the community conversations and Ms Chard confirmed that a report would be provided to members and the community. Ms Chard said that it is a big ask for members to inform all aspects of the facility and it will be great to get information from the broader community.

A member asked if the RCC would be part of the community conversations and Mr Crowther responded by saying that ARWA will consider it.

### Meeting close

There being no further business, the Convenor thanked members for their attendance, participation, and input, and the meeting closed at 1:00 pm (local time).